



Brussels, 26.06.2013  
SWD(2013) 228 final

**COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT**

*Accompanying the document*

**REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND  
THE COUNCIL**

**on the evaluation of the Union's finances based on the results achieved**

{COM(2013) 461 final}  
{SWD(2013) 229 final}

## Table of contents

SECTION 1: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATIONS COMPLETED IN 2012.....	3
SECTION 2: RETROSPECTIVE EVALUATIONS .....	29
ABB 01 – Economic and Financial Affairs .....	30
ABB 02 – Enterprise .....	37
ABB 03 – Competition .....	48
ABB 04 – Employment and social affairs .....	50
ABB 05 – Agriculture and Rural Development.....	71
ABB 06 – Mobility and Transport.....	80
ABB 08 – Research.....	87
ABB 09 – Information Society and Media .....	100
ABB 11 – Maritime Affairs and Fisheries .....	114
ABB 13 – Regional Policy.....	125
ABB 15 – Education and Culture .....	133
ABB 16 – Communication.....	142
ABB 17 – Health and Consumer Protection.....	155
ABB 18 – Home affairs .....	162
ABB 19 - External Relations .....	164
ABB 20 – Trade .....	178
ABB 21 – Development and Relations with African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States .....	188
ABB 22 – Enlargement.....	205
ABB 23 – Humanitarian Aid .....	211
ABB 26 – Commission's administration.....	224
ABB 29 – Statistics .....	228
ABB 32 – Energy .....	234
SECTION 3: REFERENCES TO REPORTING ON PERFORMANCE IN THE ANNUAL ACTIVITY REPORTS 2012 .....	236

## **SECTION 1: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATIONS COMPLETED IN 2012**

This overview lists the titles of the available evaluations in order of Activity Based Budgeting Activity within each Policy Area.

Of all evaluations, 61% concerned expenditure programmes; 10% covered regulatory activities, linked to regulations, directives, regulatory policy communications and 'soft law'; 18% concerned communication, information and coordination activities; 6% internal administrative processes of the EU Institutions with the remaining 5% in other categories.

**01 – Economic and Financial Affairs**

<b>ABB-ACTIVITY</b>		<b>TITLE OF EVALUATION</b>
<b>N°</b>	<b>HEADING</b>	
01 03	International economic and financial affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ex-post evaluation of Macro Financial Assistance (MFA) operations to Lebanon</li><li>• Ex-post evaluation of Macro Financial Assistance (MFA) operations to Georgia</li><li>• Ex-post evaluation of Exceptional Financial Assistance (EFA) operations to Kosovo</li></ul>
01 04	Financial operations and instruments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evaluation of EIF own resources activity</li></ul>

**02 – Enterprise**

<b>ABB-ACTIVITY</b>		<b>TITLE OF EVALUATION</b>
<b>N°</b>	<b>HEADING</b>	

- **Error! Reference source not found.**

**Evaluation of Member State Policies to Facilitate Access to Finance for SMEs**

- 1) **ABB activities concerned:** 02 02 -
- 2) **Timing:** June 2012, (duration 2010-2012)
- 3) **Budget:** not applicable (evaluation of policy/legislation)
- 4) **Background, scope and focus:**

The objective of the study is to evaluate the efficiency, utility, sustainability, effectiveness and impact of existing Member States programmes to facilitate the access to finance of SMEs. This is important to provide recommendations on which (type of) programmes work best and which elements could also be used in other countries.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

In the context of the current crisis, it is increasingly difficult and expensive for SMEs to access private sources of finance. Member States and the European Commission have taken comprehensive measures to address the current tensions in financial markets and to safeguard the flow of credit to the real economy. To facilitate access to finance, this study provides information on how to access over EUR 50 billion of public financing in the 27 Member States. The study presents over 120 national or regional financing programmes and provides key information helping SMEs to apply for the different programmes in terms of characteristics, terms, conditions and contact information.

The study also provided an evaluation of public financing programmes in 5 Member States (Germany, France, the UK, Poland and Sweden) to exchange good practice and assess which programmes work best and could be used in other countries. The study stresses the importance of having efficient and flexible financing programmes that correspond to changing market conditions and to be well integrated in the local business environment. In terms of operation, public programmes need quick and efficient decision making processes and a strong collaboration with the private sector. In addition, financing programmes should also be aligned with business advice services.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/finance/guide-to-funding/indirect-funding/files/evaluation-of-national-financing-programmes-2012\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/finance/guide-to-funding/indirect-funding/files/evaluation-of-national-financing-programmes-2012_en.pdf)

- 
- 

**Evaluation of EU Member State Business Angel Markets and Policies**

- 1) **ABB activities concerned:** 02 02
- 2) **Timing:** October 2012.
- 3) **Budget:** not applicable (evaluation of policy/legislation)
- 4) **Background, scope and focus:**

Business Angels play an important role in the economy and in many countries c

02 02

Competitiveness, industrial policy, innovation and entrepreneurship

**EN** 5

Error! Unknown document property name.

**EN**

- Evaluation of the European Chemical Agency
- **Error! Reference source not found.****Error! Reference source not found.**
- 

### **Evaluation of the Impact of European Space Policy on European Space Manufacturing and the Services Industry**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 02 03

**2) Timing:** August 2012 (Period covered by the report: 2007-2011).

**3) Budget:** not applicable (evaluation of policy/legislation)

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation aims were to:

- Assess the impacts to date of the European Space Policy adopted in 2007 (strengthening space industrial competitiveness (in manufacturing and services));
- Assess the main challenges ahead for the European Space Industry in manufacturing and services in maintaining and strengthening space industrial competitiveness;
- Review the strategic importance and specific characteristics of the European Space Industry to assess whether a dedicated European Space Industrial Policy is appropriate;
- Develop quantitative and qualitative indicators to measure the future contribution of the ESP to strengthening European space industrial competitiveness in manufacturing and services and in wider sectors where space-based technologies and applications are a key competitiveness driver;
- Identify current and possible future developments in the space industry and competitiveness issues facing the upstream and downstream space sectors;
- Inform the preparation of a European Space Industrial Policy (and accompanying Regulations) in accordance with the Lisbon Treaty provisions (TFEU Articles 173 and 189);
- Analyse the potential role of EU regulation in future as an enabler in facilitating the development of new and emerging markets in space services, such as in the distribution of high-resolution satellite data and its commercial distribution.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

The overall conclusions were that:

- The adoption of the ESP in 2007 has provided an important framework in which critical precursor steps have been taken towards the development of the European Space Industrial Policy. It is highly doubtful without the existence of the ESP whether it would have been possible to launch a dedicated industrial policy for the space sector.
- Through the frame of the ESP, progress has also been made in strengthening governance even if some of the achievements predate the ESP's adoption, such as the EC-ESA Framework Agreement and the holding of regular Space Council meetings.
- Following the adoption of Article 189 of the TFEU, considerable political and legal progress has been made. This gives the EU joint competence, together with ESA and member states, to pursue a formal European Space Industrial Policy.
- Following the Lisbon Treaty's adoption, space is now formally an EU policy

02 03

Internal market for goods and sectoral policies



<b>03 – Competition</b>		
<b>ABB ACTIVITY</b>		<b>TITLE OF EVALUATION</b>
<b>N°</b>	<b>HEADING</b>	
03 AWBL 02	Policy coordination, European competition network and international cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study on co(re)insurance and on ad-hoc co(re)insurance agreements on the subscription market</li> </ul>
03 AWBL- 03	Control of State aid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study on the Implementation of the existing Broadband Guidelines</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

<b>04 – Employment and social affairs</b>		
<b>ABB ACTIVITY</b>		<b>TITLE OF EVALUATION</b>
<b>N°</b>	<b>HEADING</b>	
04 02	European Social Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of the reaction of the ESF to the economic and financial crisis</li> <li>• Evaluation of the ESF support to Lifelong Learning</li> <li>• ESF Expert Evaluation Network: Access to Employment and Social Inclusion</li> <li>• Analysis of costs and benefits of active vs passive labour market measures</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
04 03	Working in Europe - Social dialogue and mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ENEA preparatory action on active ageing and mobility of elderly people</li> <li>• Evaluation of Public Employment Services performance measurement systems and corresponding recommendations on geographical labour mobility indicators</li> <li>•</li> </ul>



04 04	Employment, social solidarity and gender equality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of a methodology for the systematic evaluation of Health and Safety at Work Directives and evaluation of the practical implementation of Directive 89/654/EEC "Work Places" testing the new evaluation methodology - Legislation evaluation</li> <li>• PROGRESS mid-term evaluation</li> <li>• Evaluation of flexicurity 2007-2010</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
04 05	European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mid-term evaluation of the European globalisation fund (EGF)</li> </ul>

### 05 – Agriculture and Rural Development

ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
05 02	Interventions in agricultural markets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of the Common Agricultural Policy measures applied to the cereals sector</li> <li>• Evaluation of the Common Agricultural Policy measures applicable to the wine sector</li> <li>• Evaluation of the European School Fruit Scheme</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
05 03	Direct aids	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of the Common Agricultural Policy measures applied to the cereals sector</li> <li>• Evaluation of the Common Agricultural Policy measures applicable to the wine sector</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
05 04	Rural development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ex-post evaluation of Rural Development Programmes 2000-2006</li> <li>• Synthesis of mid-term evaluations of rural development programmes 2007-2013</li> <li>• Ex-post evaluation of the EU Forest Action Plan</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

<b>06 – Mobility and Transport</b>		
<b>ABB ACTIVITY</b>		<b>TITLE OF EVALUATION</b>
<b>N°</b>	<b>HEADING</b>	
06 02	Inland, air and maritime transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of Regulation 1371/2007 on rail passengers' rights and obligations</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
06 03	Trans-European networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mid-term evaluation of TEN-TEA (The Trans-European Transport Network Executive <b>Agency</b>)</li> <li>• Ex-post evaluation of technical follow-up of TEN-T funded ERTMS projects carried out under Service Framework Contract TREN/E2/322-2008 (Lots 1, 2 and 3)</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

<b>07 – Environment</b>		
<b>ABB ACTIVITY</b>		<b>EVALUATION PROJECTS</b>
<b>N°</b>	<b>HEADING</b>	
07 03	Development and implementation of Union environmental policy and legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final evaluation of LIFE+</li> </ul>

<b>08 – Research</b>		
<b>ABB ACTIVITY</b>		<b>TITLE OF EVALUATION</b>
<b>N°</b>	<b>HEADING</b>	
08 02	Cooperation — Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of S&amp;T cooperation between the European Union and India</li> <li>• Review of S&amp;T cooperation between the European Union and Brazil</li> <li>• SME Participation in FP7 - Spring report2011 Monitoring Report of FP7</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

08 03	Cooperation — Food, agriculture and fisheries, and biotechnology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of International Science, Technology and Innovation cooperation between Member States and countries outside the EU and the development of a future monitoring mechanism</li> <li>• International cooperation in Science, Technology and Innovation: Strategies for a Changing World</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
08 04	Cooperation — Nanosciences, nanotechnologies, materials and new production technologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategy definition and road mapping for industrial technologies to address grand challenges</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
08 13	Capacities — Research for the benefit of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SME Participation in FP7 - Spring report</li> </ul>
08 19	Capacities — Support for coherent development of research policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of main activities and deliverables of ERAWATCH</li> <li>•</li> <li>• Review of main activities and deliverables of IRMA Administrative Arrangements with IPTS (Industrial Research Monitoring and Analysis)</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
08 03 AWBL	European Research Area Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interim Evaluation of Art. 185 European Metrology Research Programme (EMRP)</li> </ul>

09 – Information Society and Media		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	

09 02	Regulatory framework for the Digital Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study on the evaluation of BEREC and the BEREC Office - SMART 2011/0009</li> <li>• Inventory and Review of Spectrum Use: Assessment of the EU potential for improving spectrum efficiency - SMART 2011/0016 - PC</li> <li>• Implementation of the DAE - Action of the DAE - Actions under the responsibility of member states - SMART 2011/0023 – IAV</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
09 03	Information and communication technologies take-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SMART 2010/0048: assessment of the economic and social benefits of digitisation of cultural heritage</li> </ul>
09 04	Cooperation - Information and communication technologies (ICTs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report on Communication and Recommendation on mobilising Information and Communication Technologies to facilitate the transition to an energy-efficient, low-carbon economy COM (2009) 111; C(2009) 7604</li> <li>• Future impact of ENIAC and ARTEMIS - SMART 2012/0050 - IAV</li> <li>• Interim Assessment of the Future Internet Public-Private Partnership</li> <li>•</li> <li>• Study into the impact of FP6 IST</li> </ul>
09 05	Capacities — Research infrastructures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of impact measures for e-Infrastructures - SMART 2010/0051</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

<b>11 – Maritime Affairs and Fisheries</b>		
<b>ABB ACTIVITY</b>		<b>TITLE OF EVALUATION</b>
<b>N°</b>	<b>HEADING</b>	
11 02	Fisheries markets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ex-post evaluation on the implementation of the compensation regime the additional costs incurred in the marketing of certain fishery products from the outermost regions the Azores, Madeira, the Canary Islands, French Guiana and Réunion</li> </ul>
11 03	International fisheries and law of the sea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Union and Republic of Kiribati, and ex-ante evaluation including an analysis of the impact of the future Protocol on sustainability</li> <li>• Ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Union and Solomon Islands, and ex-ante evaluation including an analysis of the impact of the future Protocol on</li> </ul>

		<p>sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation ex-post du protocole de l'accord de partenariat dans le domaine de la pêche entre l'Union européenne et la Côte-d'Ivoire</li> </ul>
11 06	European Fisheries Fund (EFF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interim evaluation of the European Fisheries Fund (2007-2013)</li> <li>• <i>Synthesis of the 26 national evaluation reports</i></li> <li>•</li> </ul>
11 09	Maritime policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interim evaluation of marine knowledge-related preparatory actions and pilot projects. (internal evaluation)</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

<b>13 – Regional Policy</b>		
<b>ABB ACTIVITY</b>		<b>TITLE OF EVALUATION</b>
<b>N°</b>	<b>HEADING</b>	
13 03	European Regional Development Fund and other regional operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ex post evaluation of projects co-financed by ERDF and Cohesion Fund in the period 1994-1999</li> <li>• The use of the ERDF to support Financial engineering instruments (FEIs)</li> <li>• Jaspers Evaluation</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
13 04	Cohesion Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ex post evaluation of the Cohesion Fund (Incl. former ISPA) 2000 - 2006</li> <li>• Country reports on the performance of Cohesion Policy 2007 - 2013</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

<b>15 – Education and Culture</b>		
<b>ABB ACTIVITY</b>		<b>TITLE OF EVALUATION</b>
<b>N°</b>	<b>HEADING</b>	
15 02	Lifelong learning, including multilingualism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interim evaluation of Erasmus Mundus II (2009 – 2013)</li> <li>• External evaluation of the European Training Foundation (ETF)</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
15 04	Developing cultural and audiovisual cooperation in Europe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ex-post Evaluation of 2011 European Capitals of Culture</li> <li>• Ex-post evaluation of the Preparatory Action Media International 2008-2010</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
15 07	People — Programme for the mobility of researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FP7 Marie Curie Life-long Training and Career Development Evaluation: Individual Fellowships and Co-funding Mechanism</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

<b>16 – Communication</b>		
<b>ABB ACTIVITY</b>		<b>TITLE OF EVALUATION</b>
<b>N°</b>	<b>HEADING</b>	
16 02	Communication and the media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interim evaluation of PressEurop</li> </ul>
16 03	"Going Local" communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mid-term evaluation of Europe direct information centres (2009-2012)</li> <li>• Evaluation of the management partnership's actions within the scope of the 2008-2010 communication plans in Italy</li> <li>• 2009-2012 communication plans in Sweden</li> <li>• Evaluation of the management partnership's actions within the scope of the 2009-2012 communication plans in Finland</li> <li>• Evaluation of the management partnership's actions within the scope of the 2009-2011 communication plans in Malta</li> <li>• Evaluation of the management partnership's actions within the scope of the 2009-2012 communication plans in Greece</li> <li>• Evaluation of the management partnership's actions within the scope of the 2009-2012 communication plans in Lithuania</li> <li>• Evaluation of the management partnership's actions within the scope of the 2008-2010 communication plans in Belgium</li> <li>• Evaluation des opérations de communication menées dans le cadre du partenariat de gestion 2008-2010 en France</li> <li>• Evaluation of the management partnership's actions within the scope of the 2009-2012 communication plans in Poland</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
16 05	Fostering European citizenship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of the European year of volunteering 2011</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

<b>17 – Health and Consumer Protection</b>		
<b>ABB ACTIVITY</b>		<b>TITLE OF EVALUATION</b>
<b>N°</b>	<b>HEADING</b>	

## External evaluation of the Consumer Protection Cooperation Regulation

- 1) **ABB activities concerned:** 17 02
- 2) **Timing:** 17 December 2012, (Period covered by the report: 2007 – 2011)
- 3) **Budget:** not applicable
- 4) **Background, scope and focus:**

At the end of 2010 the Commission initiated an assessment of the enforcement mechanisms established by the CPC Regulation. This process was inserted as a new r the CPC Regulation in the framework of an amendment to the legal text (Regula 954/2011). The evaluation was part of this process. The main focus was put on the C its implementation in the Member States and the infrastructural and budgetary supp evaluation addressed both (1) the cooperation arrangements in the framework of the established by the CPC Regulation in the context of the enforcement of the legislati Annex to the Regulation and (2) the broader forms of cooperation established by the C under its Chapter IV.

### 5) **Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation** **Relevance of the CPC Regulation:**

The report concluded that the rationale for intervention is as valid and appropriate when the CPC Regulation was introduced in 2004. It may even be said that the C framework is even more needed than before given developments in technology and patterns of households (i.e. in digital and online purchasing) and the complexity of tr aspects such as advertising, bundling of products and trading internationally have rein to provide tools to deter rogue traders and to enforce the law. Even though, the curre the CPC Regulation are appropriate and relevant, none of the specific objective Regulation have been fully achieved. Therefore it would be appropriate to improve th text within the CPC Regulation in order to ensure more uniform understanding among r

**Scope of the CPC Regulation:** The analysis concluded that the current scope of the C annex is broadly correct in terms of the sensitivity of the legislation to public enforcen collective consumer interest, cross-border relevance and consistency. To maintain consumer protection the evaluation report suggested the possible inclusion of the R Rights Regulation, the Roaming Regulation and the Mortgage Credit Directive in th CPC Regulation. Also it was recommended to examine further the possible inclusion c provisions within certain legislative acts, such as the Air Services Regulation.

### **Legal barriers to cooperation under the CPC Regulation**

#### Applicable substantive law

The CPC Regulation does not regulate which applicable substantive law app assistance requests. This issue has been raised as a source of difficulties effectiveness of cross-border enforcement cooperation. The evaluation off recommendations to alleviate constraints arising due to differences in substantive l

- Provide guidance on applicable law in relation to the handling of mutual assi under the CPC Regulation in order to promote better awareness and compl consumer legislation;
- Foster a common understanding in relation to the application of EU consume through guidance, on-line legal resources, and interactive forums to also fa knowledge exchange;



17 03	Public health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assessment of the added value of the EU alcohol strategy and its implementation to enhancing action, cooperation and coordination to reduce alcohol related harm</li><li>•</li></ul>
-------	---------------	--

- 
- 

**Evaluation of the EU rapid response network, crisis management and communication capacity regarding certain transmissible animal diseases**

- 1) **ABB activities concerned:** 17 04
- 2) **Timing:** 1 August 2012 (duration of the evaluation 09.2012-07.2012, Period report: 1998 – 2009)
- 3) **Budget:** At the EU level the activity has no directly allocated budget. The relevant activities in the Member States (MS) are covered by national arrangements. Following outbreaks of certain transmissible diseases on the territory of MS, specific costs directly related to the emergency measures taken to control them (e.g. compensating to owners for the slaughter, destruction of animals, costs of transport, cleaning, disinfection of holdings and equipment, cost of supply of the vaccine etc.) are borne by the MS. The financial contributions met by the EU, adopted as Commission Decisions in accordance with Council Decision 2009/470/EC.
- 4) **Background, scope and focus:** The evaluation was carried out in the context of the EU Health Strategy for the European Union "Prevention is better than cure" (COM(2007)539 final) and was required by the Commission Communication from September 2007 COM(2007)539 final) and was required by the Commission Action Plan (**Commission** Communication from September 2008-COM (2008) 686 final). The focus was put on assessing the current legislative and non-legislative environment, the current state of preparedness and the capacity of the EU rapid response network, which encompasses the Commission Services, MS (especially the veterinary Competence Centres) and stakeholders, such as private sector veterinarians and the economic operators. During its work, the contractor involved all Member States and major stakeholders.
- 5) **Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation study:** Effectiveness, efficiency and added value of the EU rapid response network:

The EU rapid response system is considered generally to work effectively and efficiently and to have improved very significantly over the last decade. The availability of well developed and up to date Contingency Plans (CPs) as an indicator of preparedness can help prevent an emergency from becoming a crisis. The effectiveness of the response also depends on the cooperation and coordination within the overall rapid response network, including the Commission and MS, regular and timely exchange of information (including scientific data and advice) between laboratories and with stakeholders, and the building and maintaining of confidence and trust between all parties. The evolution of the EU animal health system indicates a decrease in the amount of EU co-funding for emergency veterinary measures from some EUR65 million in 2000 to EUR30 million in 2011. Over the last five years the Commission has averaged EUR37 million, well below the average over the whole period (EUR45 million in 2000-2011 in terms of outturn payments, i.e. the sum of credits generated by a Member State per year). This points to the more efficient use of funds to achieve longer term objectives, such as the reinstating of disease free status for major diseases in the EU. The comprehensive legislation now in place (including Contingency Plans and the EU emergency network components) can be considered as a valuable shield against traditional contagious diseases and appears to be quite effective in terms of triggering the relevant steps and controlling outbreaks. The fight against emerging diseases or new "profiles" of known diseases. As a result of the evaluation period, out of a significant number of outbreaks, relatively few have developed into a crisis. On the basis of the criteria of financial cost and economic impact, the following outbreaks were identified: Classical Swine Fever (1997 DE); Avian Influenza-AI (1999/2000 IT); H5N1 Influenza (2005-06); Foot and Mouth Disease (2001, UK); Bovine Tuberculosis (2001, UK);

17 04

Food and feed safety,  
animal health,  
animal welfare and  
plant health

<b>18 – Home affairs</b>		
<b>ABB ACTIVITY</b>		<b>TITLE OF EVALUATION</b>
<b>N°</b>	<b>HEADING</b>	
18 05	Security and safeguarding liberties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation on the European Union Crime Prevention Network</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

<b>19 – External Relations</b>		
<b>ABB ACTIVITY</b>		<b>TITLE OF EVALUATION</b>
<b>N°</b>	<b>HEADING</b>	
19 04	European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thematic evaluation of the European Commission support to respect of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (including solidarity with victims of repression)</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

## Evaluation of the EU cooperation with Colombia

1) **ABB activities:** 19 09:

2) **Timing:** October 2012, (period covered by the report: 2002-2011)

3) **Budget :Disbursements** over the evaluation period: EUR196.61 million

4) **Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation provides an overall independent assessment of the Commission's present cooperation with Colombia over the period 2002-2011 and identifies key lessons in order to improve the current and future strategies and programmes of the Commission, particularly considering the new development policy set in the "Agenda for Change"

The evaluation focuses on the following areas of investigation: Peace, Stability and economic Development; Rule of Law and Justice; Human Rights and Victims of Armed Conflict; Good Governance; Productivity and Competitiveness; Environmental Sustainability and the Linkage between Relief, Rehabilitation and Development. It analyses the instruments and aid modalities made available by the Commission, as well as the coherence, coordination and complementarity ("3Cs") of EU cooperation and its European added value.

5) **Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation**

The EU cooperation strategy with Colombia from 2002 to 2010 is characterized by its core objective of peace building. In general terms, the EU strategy was coherent with Colombian policies in relation to peace-building by contributing to address the root causes for conflict.

Key conclusions:

- Although the EU strategy has supported transition from relief to rehabilitation in a highly sensitive conflict situation, it did not sufficiently succeed to link the long-term objective of development to these medium term objectives. Determining factors were the lack of a comprehensive and structured strategic framework to mainstream good governance principles as well as a non-adaptive capacity development scheme, not only regarding the territorial development. Weaknesses have also been identified as lack of coordination and complementarity with other donors. The distinctive policy strategies of active EU Member States hampered visibility of EU added value.

- Conflict prevention and resolution: The EU contributed in strengthening civil society, creating social networks and promoting productive alternatives and reactivation in the most affected by conflict. However, sustainability remains a major concern.

- Rule of law, justice and human rights: By supporting the new Penal Oral Accusation System, the EU has helped to improve the application of the Justice and Peace Law and provided political and technical support for the protection of victims' rights and the promotion of human rights. However, impunity in relation to human rights violations remains a key problem and specific improvements can not conclusively be attributed to EU actions.

- Trade and competitiveness: By supporting the Local Economic Development approach, the EU has contributed to create the basis for development and competitiveness, notably in rural areas. The next step needs to facilitate participation in national and international markets.

- Environmental sustainability: Albeit not being a priority in its strategy and not

19 10	Relations with Asia, Central Asia and Middle East (Iraq, Iran, Yemen)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of the EU cooperation with Nepal</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
19 11	Policy strategy and coordination for 'External relations' policy area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of Visibility of EU external action</li> <li>• Thematic evaluation of EC support to Decentralisation processes</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

20 – Trade		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
20 02	Trade policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of the economic impact of the trade pillar</li> <li>• of the EU-Chile association <b>agreement</b></li> <li>• Evaluation <b>of the EU's trade defence instruments (TDIs)</b></li> <li>• Evaluation of the Market Access Partnership (MAP)</li> <li>• Trade sustainability impact assessment (Trade SIA) in support of</li> <li>• EU negotiations for deep and comprehensive free trade agreements (DCFTAs)</li> <li>• with Georgia and the Republic of Moldova</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

21 – Development and Relations with African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
21 02	Food security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final evaluation of the EU Food facility</li> </ul>
21 05	Human and social development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of the EU Support to the Health sector</li> </ul>

21 06	Geographical cooperation with African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of the EU cooperation with the Caribbean Region <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b>Evaluation of the EU cooperation with the Republic of Congo <b>Error! Reference source not found.</b>Evaluation of the EU cooperation with Djibouti Evaluation of the EU cooperation with Ethiopia<b>Error! Reference source not found.</b>Evaluation of the EU cooperation with Jamaica</li> <li>• Evaluation of the EU cooperation with Zambia</li> </ul>
21 07	Development cooperation actions and ad hoc programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of the Commission's cooperation with the Council of Europe (focused on the joint programmes)</li> </ul>
21 08	Policy strategy and coordination for "Development and relations with ACP States" policy area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

## 22 – Enlargement

ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
22 02	Enlargement process and strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of governance, rule of law, judiciary reform and fight against corruption and organised crime in the Western Balkans (Lot 2)</li> <li>• Thematic Evaluation of Rule of Law, Judicial Reform and Fight against Corruption and Organised Crime in the Western Balkans - Lot 3</li> <li>• Thematic evaluation on judiciary and fundamental rights in Turkey</li> <li>• Thematic Evaluation of EU's Support to Civil Society in the Western Balkans and Turkey</li> <li>• Strategic/interim evaluation of SIGMA programme</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

## 23 – Humanitarian Aid

ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	

23 02	Humanitarian aid including aid to uprooted people, food aid and disaster preparedness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation and review of humanitarian access strategies in DG ECHO funded interventions</li> <li>• The evaluation of dg echo's disaster preparedness and disaster risk reduction actions in southern Africa &amp; the Indian ocean</li> <li>• Evaluation of the European Commission in Ethiopia</li> <li>• Evaluation of the European Commission's Humanitarian Activities in Bangladesh</li> <li>• Evaluation of the European Commission's Humanitarian Activities in Colombia</li> <li>• Evaluation and Review of the DG ECHO financed Livelihood Interventions in Humanitarian Crises</li> <li>• The evaluation of echo's intervention in the occupied Palestinian territory and Lebanon</li> <li>• Evaluation of the European Commission supported humanitarian aid in urban settings</li> <li>• Evaluation of the DG ECHO Legal Framework for Funding of Humanitarian Actions (FPA 2008)</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
-------	---	--

<b>26 – Commission's administration</b>		
<b>ABB ACTIVITY</b>		<b>TITLE OF EVALUATION</b>
<b>N°</b>	<b>HEADING</b>	
26 01	Administrative expenditure of 'Commission's administration' policy area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of the language training organised in Brussels by DG HR</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
26 03	Services to public administrations, businesses and citizens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interim evaluation of the ISA programme</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

<b>29 – Statistics</b>
------------------------

ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
29 02	Production of statistical information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rolling Review for Regional Statistics</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px;"> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Rolling Review for GISCO</b></p> <p><b>1) ABB activities:</b> 29 02</p> <p><b>2) Timing:</b> October 2012</p> <p><b>3) Budget (annual):</b> Included in the overall budget of the CSP 2008-2012.</p> <p><b>4) Background, scope and focus:</b></p> <p>GISCO is a Eurostat service which promotes and stimulates the use of Geographical Information Systems (GIS) within the European Statistical System and the Directorates-General of the Commission. Rolling Review for GISCO is a part of the overall Quality Assurance Framework. This review was implemented between May 2011 and August 2012, and conducted in four parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two user satisfaction surveys (for data and maps).</li> <li>• Two checklists, completed by the GIS staff, assessing major steps within the provision of geographical reference data and production of maps.</li> </ul> <p>The results of these assessments are used to formulate recommendations for improvements and to identify ways for implementing these improvements.</p> <p><b>5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:</b></p> <p>An increasing relevance of geographically oriented analysis for administrative and political decisions was recognised in the last years. A great majority of respondents stressed the importance and even essentiality of georeference data. Characteristics such as accessibility, quality, clarity and comparability were generally assessed as good. Positive results of user satisfaction are also found with quality of Eurostat maps.</p> <p>What emerged from the review is the normal tension between the needs of the users of the georeference data and those who buy and supply the data. Users want a wider range of geographic data, while GISCO is more concerned with spending the limited resources to buy data which are required to support Eurostat's publications (thematic maps) and geographical oriented applications of the Commission (projects).</p> <p>A total of 18 recommendations were provided with highest priorities</p> </div>



concentrating on the fields of future trend for GISCO responsibilities and strengthening geographical data production and dissemination according to user demands.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa**

<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/RR%20GISCO%20Executive%20Summary%20FINAL.pdf>

•

**Rolling Review for Harmonised Indices of Consumer Prices and related price statistics**

**1) ABB activities:** 29 02

**2) Timing:** April 2012

**3) Budget (annual):** Included in the overall budget of the CSP 2008-2012.

**4) Background, scope and focus:** As part of Eurostat's quality assurance framework, a rolling review of Harmonised Indices of Consumer Prices (HICPs) and related price statistics was undertaken starting in the late Summer of 2011 to assess the quality of HICP data and the statistical processes used to produce them. The survey was conducted in three parts:

- User survey.
- Partner survey.
- Self-assessment performed by the staff of Eurostat Unit C5.

A number of recommendations for improvement were made based on the views, comments and concerns of users, partners and HICP staff.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:** The HICP and related price statistics domain is a well-established and well regarded statistical domain by users, partners and Eurostat alike. Data quality, assessed under the criteria of accuracy, timeliness, accessibility, completeness, clarity, comparability and coherence is rated as very good or good by users, partners and the staff, with all criteria being of importance. Partners are very positive about Eurostat's role in the organisation and functioning of the HICP programme and its direction of change. Data treatment, validation and dissemination, publications, data confidentiality and information exchange tools are all very highly rated. User responses also point out a good support service provided by Eurostat. This is consistent with staff evaluation of systems and processes for data production which are well established and work well. While the rolling review assessments positively endorse the areas above, 14 sets of recommendation are provided with highest priorities assigned to:

- Compiling of detailed inventories / technical manuals of national HICP implementation practices and procedures.
- Reviewing

compliance monitoring.

- Adopting a formal risk management approach for the HICP production processes at Unit level, coherent with Eurostat's overall risk management strategy.
- Improving to the on-going development of the HICP.
- Improving bilateral communications with key stakeholders

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/RR%20HICP%20Executive%20Summary.pdf>

•

**Rolling Review for Postal Statistics**

**1) ABB activities:** 29 02

**2) Timing:** August 2012

**3) Budget (annual):** Included in the overall budget of the CSP 2008-2012.

**4) Background, scope and focus :**

Rolling Review for Postal Statistics is part of the Quality Assurance Framework related to streamlining the existing quality activities in Eurostat and to position them in the wider framework of the European Statistics Code of Practice and Total Quality Management. The focus of this review is assessment of postal statistics which supports the purpose of Community policy in the postal sector. The importance of postal services both for the economic prosperity and social well-being and cohesion of the EU make this a priority area for Community action and emphasises the importance of postal statistics. The review was implemented during September 2011 to May 2012 and conducted in three parts:

- User satisfaction survey.
- Partner satisfaction survey.
- Assessment of the production process by the professional staff within Eurostat.

Results are used to formulate the actions to improve the performance of the European Statistical System in the field.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The results of user survey indicate there is a major demand for postal statistics.

Users, in general, perceive the quality of postal data as good or adequate. However, concerns were raised with regards to timeliness and

confidentiality.

Partners had a favourable opinion of Eurostat's work and were also very positive about the direction of change in Eurostat's performance over the past 3 years. Concerning data quality, partners had a positive appreciation of the Eurostat postal statistics, aside from timeliness.

A total of 14 recommendations were provided as the outcome of the survey. Importance was highlighted to the possible collection of European postal statistics by DG MARKT and processes related to the transfer as well as improvement of data collection

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/RR%20Postal%20Statistics%20Executive%20Summary%20FINAL%20VERSION\\_0.pdf](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/RR%20Postal%20Statistics%20Executive%20Summary%20FINAL%20VERSION_0.pdf)

•

**Rolling Review for Innovation and R&D Statistics**

**1) ABB activities:** 29 02

**2) Timing:** March 2012

**3) Budget (annual):** Included in the overall budget of the CSP 2008-2012.

**4) Background, scope and focus:** Rolling Review for Innovation and R&D Statistics is a part of the Quality Assurance Framework aimed at streamlining the existing quality control activities in Eurostat. A review was undertaken on Innovation statistics, covering both innovation surveys and R&D statistics.

The main components of the review, which were implemented between February and November 2011, were:

- User satisfaction survey.
- Partner satisfaction survey.
- Self-assessment checklist implemented by the staff of Eurostat Unit G6.

The survey aimed to identify and give recommendations for improvement which have been made available for general publication.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation :**

The results of user survey indicate that both R&D and Innovation statistics are essential tools for majority of respondents. The data are mainly used for research, policy preparation or trend analysis. The quality was considered to be quite good with respect to accuracy, coherence and relevance; however criteria, such as accessibility, completeness and

		<p>comparability needed further enhancements. Self-assessment responses indicate that information seems to be rather complete concerning both the data and metadata. The R&amp;D figures published by Eurostat are regarded as being accurate and the timeliness of dissemination considered satisfactory. There seems to be general partner satisfaction with the way the system of R&amp;D and Innovation statistics works within the European Statistical System. Two thirds of countries think that data quality has increased as a result of the introduction of the</p> <p>Regulation for R&amp;D statistics. However, several suggestions were made for simplification of the statistics.</p> <p>A total of 8 recommendations were given, with improvement of Eurostat internal processes given the highest priority.</p> <p><b>6) Availability of the report on Europa:</b></p> <p><a href="http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/RR%20Innovation%20and%20RD%20Statistics%20Executive%20Summary_0.pdf">http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/RR%20Innovation%20and%20RD%20Statistics%20Executive%20Summary_0.pdf</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme for the Modernisation of European Enterprise and Trade Statistics (MEETS)</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
--	--	---

32 – Energy		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
32 03	Trans-European networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of 5 TEN-E completed projects of European interest</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

## **SECTION 2: RETROSPECTIVE EVALUATIONS**

This section provides fact sheets for 130 retrospective evaluations (i.e. interim and ex post evaluations) and evaluation-related studies (e.g. focusing on monitoring or implementation), with information on their findings and conclusions.

**Evaluation of EIF own resources activity**

**1) ABB activities:** 01 04

**2) Timing:** 19/6/2012 (duration: 19/10/2011-19/6/2012)

**3) Budget (annual):** EUR 972,157,195

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The European Investment Fund (EIF or the Fund) has been set up in 1994 to "provide a significant contribution to the development of trans-European networks in the areas of transport, telecommunications and energy infrastructures and to the development of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)". It was intended to "stimulate sustained and balanced growth within the Community". EIF's own resources are used for venture capital and private equity investments as well as for securitisation transactions. The EU participated in the capital increase in order to maintain its 30% shareholding in the Fund to support the Fund's continued focus on EU policies.

The evaluation analyses whether the original objectives of the EU as a member of the EIF as well as for the participation in the capital increase have been achieved. Moreover, it should evaluate the added value of EIF's own resources activity compared to other EU actions supporting innovation and SMEs.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

*The Added Value achieved by EIF Own Resources Activity*

The added value of EIF own resources activity to the European Commission is achieved through the delivery of SME financing policy objectives from a unique market position and within a 'self-sufficient' Financial Envelope.

*Added Value of EU Shareholding*

Whilst own resources activity provides a specific 'blended return' (reflecting the EIF's market orientated approach to delivery of policy impacts), the further added value of EU shareholding in the EIF can be identified in terms of maintaining focus on EU policy objectives; the working relationship with EIB and other shareholders: presence in a 'post crisis world' and supporting enhanced leverage and policy impacts through rating stability.

*Effectiveness*

The evaluation has demonstrated the added value of EIF own resources activity in delivering European SME finance activity (risk capital and debt finance) including investment volumes, development of innovative financial instruments, and the building of investment infrastructure and ecosystems based upon partnership and shared knowledge.

Nevertheless, the business processes within the EIF that might provide comprehensive assessment of market failures across SME finance markets and reporting of policy impacts should be developed further to better measure and evaluate own resources policy impact.

### *Efficiency*

EU shareholding is efficient (the current value of EU shareholding largely exceeds the cash contribution provided by the EU budget), but can be enhanced. Efficiency includes the added value achieved by the limited budgetary commitment currently supporting EIF own resources activity undertaken on a 'blended returns' investment approach (for example, leverage, innovation and market development) and the particular additional value achieved by a shareholding approach (for example, enhanced leverage and credibility and position amongst financial institutions, markets and partners).

Overall, any calculation of policy benefits and impacts which might be realised through the re-allocation of EU shareholding capital to alternative delivery mechanisms for SME financing would need to strongly consider the impact of a reduction in the scale and scope of added value of own resources activity not only within the remit of own resource activities but, additionally, across the broader activities of EIF including, principally, mandate activity.

### *Recommendations*

In summary, the EU shareholding in EIF and EIF own resources activity remains relevant in pursuit of SME financing policy objectives and generally effective in delivering policy impacts – notwithstanding limitations in the EIF's ability to demonstrate optimal policy impacts.

Added value and impact of EIF own resources activity for the European Commission comprises the value achieved by policy activity undertaken within a 'blended returns' framework, activity supported by specific shareholding positions and additional benefits resulting from other (mandate) activity of the EIF which supports EU policy objectives. Given this, other more efficient policy mechanisms are not immediately evident.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/evaluation/pdf/final\\_reprt\\_eval\\_eif.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/evaluation/pdf/final_reprt_eval_eif.pdf)

## **Ex-post evaluation of Macro Financial Assistance (MFA) operations to Lebanon**

- 1) ABB activities:** 01 03
- 2) Timing:** 7/5/2012 (duration: 6/7/2011-7/5/2012)
- 3) Budget:** EUR 80 million (total amount of support)
- 4) Background, scope and focus**

Macro-Financial Assistance (MFA) is a policy-based financial instrument of untied and undesignated balance-of-payments support to partner third countries. It takes the form of medium/long-term loans or grants, or a combination of these, and generally complements financing provided in the context of an International Monetary Fund's reform programme.

Ex-post evaluations focus on assessing the contribution of EU Macro Financial Assistance

to macro-economic and structural adjustment of the recipient country.

The exercise covers three main areas of analysis:

- Economic impact of the MFA assistance operation on the economy of the recipient country (e.g. GDP growth, Balance of Payments, exchange rates, fiscal balances); with and without IMF involvement.
- Value added of EU intervention (stand-alone and/or in combination with IMF intervention) provided through the operation.
- Sustainability of the country's external position as a result of the assistance.

## **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation**

### *Impact on macroeconomic stabilisation*

The analysis of macroeconomic developments in Lebanon suggests an improvement in areas to which the objectives of the MFA operation were related, i.e. (i) to support Lebanon's domestic efforts of post-war reconstruction and sustainable economic recovery; (ii) to alleviate the financial constraints on the implementation of the government's economic programme; and to support Lebanon's efforts to reduce public debt to a sustainable level. Specifically, Lebanon has clearly made substantial progress in post-war reconstruction and experienced economic recovery that was sustained over a period of four years, despite the particularly unfavourable global economic environment. While implementation of the government's economic programme defined before the Paris III conference has faced several obstacles, financial constraints on the implementation have eased and were not among major problematic issues. Since early 2011 the economy lost momentum largely owing to rising domestic political uncertainty and regional turmoil. Issues related to the third identified macroeconomic objective of supporting Lebanon's efforts to reduce public debt to a sustainable level are discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

The conclusion is that the two macroeconomic objectives of the MFA assistance were largely achieved.

### *Impact on external sustainability*

The high public debt in Lebanon cannot be described as sustainable. Sensitivity analysis of the baseline scenario to adverse shock confirms the existence of substantial downside risks. Slowdown in GDP growth, higher interest rates or a weaker primary government surplus would result in a quite substantial increase of the debt to GDP ratio. The risk to the public debt outlook is therefore considered to be medium.

### *Impact on structural reforms*

The selection and formulation of structural conditions played a prominent role in the design of the MFA operation. The decision making was informed in particular by the government reform philosophy, the challenges identified in a number of reviews which were carried out prior to MFA, as well as consultations with various stakeholders.

### *Value added of MFA*

Two particular aspects can be emphasised, namely (i) the confidence building effect at the time of announcement of the MFA as part of the comprehensive EU package, and (ii) the positive signal that was provided by inclusion of MFA in the EU package which advanced



the dialogue between the EU and the government.

#### Recommendations

- Value the announcement effect of MFA assistance as part of larger support packages and align conditions to this by agreeing on quick disbursing conditions.
- Value the additional value MFA may have on strengthening relations with the respective country, but do not see this as an additional objective of MFA.

#### 6) Availability of the report on Europa:

[http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/evaluation/pdf/evaluation\\_lebanon\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/evaluation/pdf/evaluation_lebanon_en.pdf)

### Ex-post evaluation of Macro Financial Assistance (MFA) operations to Georgia

1) **ABB activities:** 01 03

2) **Timing:** 11/4/2012 (duration: 9/8/2011-11/4/2012)

3) **Budget:** EUR 46 million (total amount of support)

#### 4) Background, scope and focus:

Macro-Financial Assistance (MFA) is a policy-based financial instrument of untied and undesignated balance-of-payments support to partner third countries. It takes the form of medium/long-term loans or grants, or a combination of these, and generally complements financing provided in the context of an International Monetary Fund's reform programme.

Ex-post evaluations focus on assessing the contribution of EU Macro Financial Assistance to macro-economic and structural adjustment of the recipient country.

The exercise covers three main areas of analysis:

- Economic impact of the MFA assistance operation on the economy of the recipient country (e.g. GDP growth, Balance of Payments, exchange rates, fiscal balances); with and without IMF involvement.
- Value added of EU intervention (stand-alone and/or in combination with IMF intervention) provided through the operation.
- Sustainability of the country's external position as a result of the assistance.

#### 5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:

*How would the economy of Georgia have evolved in the absence of MFA assistance?*

In the absence of the MFA, it is highly likely that one of the following scenarios would have occurred:

Scenario A: reduced public spending by the Georgian government in 2009 and 2010 (lower expenditure matches the lower revenue);

Scenario B: reduced public spending in 2009 but no change in spending in 2010 (the

revenue gap in 2010 in the absence of MFA is replaced with additional deficit financing).

In both cases, Georgia would have experienced a greater fall in GDP in 2009 as compared to what actually happened (i.e. a 4 per cent reduction in GDP instead of 3.8 per cent). Moreover, under Scenario A, real GDP would have grown by a smaller amount in 2010 (6.2 per cent instead of the actual observed growth of 6.3 per cent). On the other hand, under Scenario B, real GDP would have grown at a slightly higher rate in 2010 (6.5 per cent) – as the economy would have grown from a much smaller base in 2009 when compared to the baseline scenario.

The unemployment rate would have been slightly higher in 2009 (+0.1 per cent) under both counterfactual scenarios. Under scenario A, a slightly higher unemployment rate (+0.3 per cent) would also have been observed in 2010.

*To what extent has the MFA assistance been effective in terms of the short-term macroeconomic stabilisation of Georgia?*

The modelling results suggest that the MFA had the following impact on Georgia's economy, although the size of these impacts is small (less than 0.5 per cent): Overall, the results of the modelling exercise show that the net effect of MFA on Georgia's economy was marginal: the impact on real GDP ranging from -0.2 per cent to +0.2 per cent. The MFA had a bigger impact in conjunction with the IMF-SBA: the impact on real GDP ranging from -1.0 per cent to -1.3 per cent.

*To what extent has the MFA contributed to returning the external financial situation of Georgia to a sustainable path over the medium to longer-term?*

The MFA, which was provided in grant form, has contributed to improving Georgia's external financial situation in the short term. However, given the small size of the effects described above, relative to Georgia's economy and its balance sheet items, it is difficult to argue convincingly from the model results that MFA contributed substantially to averting a crisis through improved external sustainability. However, the modelling fails to capture confidence effects and conditionality that may well have longer-term implications for the country's economic trajectory.

*To what extent has the MFA assistance been effective in terms of supporting structural reform in Georgia?*

Overall, the MFA has made a positive but marginal difference in promoting PFM reforms in Georgia. The scope and impact of the MFA conditions was limited. The MFA conditions were heavily concentrated on the simpler reform activities or 'softer and low lying fruit' such as action plans, capacity development plans, manuals, and training. This narrow focus of conditionality on simpler reforms was relevant and appropriate, given the need for quick disbursement of support and the scale of the assistance.

The added value and reinforcing effect of EU support was most clearly evident in the case of internal audit reforms. In other areas, the added value of EU support was less obvious due to existence of strong domestic ownership and/or other donor support.

*How has the way in which the MFA operation was designed and implemented conditioned its effectiveness and efficiency?*

The Commission should be more specific in formulating conditionality and be clear about its expectations, especially in the case of softer actions such as development of action

plans.

The Commission should take steps to improve the visibility of the MFA instrument in the recipient country through, for example, local press releases.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/evaluation/pdf/mfa\\_georgia\\_final\\_report-apr\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/evaluation/pdf/mfa_georgia_final_report-apr_en.pdf)

**Ex-post evaluation of Exceptional Financial Assistance (EFA)  
operations to Kosovo**

**1) ABB activities:** 01 03

**2) Timing:** 17/10/2012 (duration: 9/3/2012-17/10/2012)

**3) Budget:** EUR 50 million (total amount of support)

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

Macro-Financial Assistance (MFA) is a policy-based financial instrument of untied and undesignated balance-of-payments support to partner third countries. It takes the form of medium/long-term loans or grants, or a combination of these, and generally complements financing provided in the context of an International Monetary Fund's reform programme.

Ex-post evaluations focus on assessing the contribution of EU Macro Financial Assistance to macro-economic and structural adjustment of the recipient country.

The exercise covers three main areas of analysis:

- Economic impact of the MFA assistance operation on the economy of the recipient country (e.g. GDP growth, Balance of Payments, exchange rates, fiscal balances); with and without IMF involvement.
- Value added of EU intervention (stand-alone and/or in combination with IMF intervention) provided through the operation.
- Sustainability of the country's external position as a result of the assistance

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The main findings and conclusions of this evaluation are as follows:

*Macro-Economic Stabilization and External Sustainability*

The macro-economic performance of Kosovo between 2006 and 2011 was positive, overall. Fiscal deficits fluctuated during the review period, and Kosovo's public finances remain fragile and exposed to high-probability, high-incidence risks.

The EFA helped alleviate the financial situation of Kosovo. The disbursement of the first tranche of EFA in 2010 provided a useful contribution to the stabilization of bank balances following the steep reduction observed in 2009 and 2010. Some recovery of bank balances is visible in the 2012 data, and their level is expected to fully recover in 2013 through the receipts from the expected privatisation of PTK. Paired with the intended reduction in fiscal deficit from 2014 onwards, these recent developments point to the fact that the

financial situation of Kosovo has been supported by EFA, also by exercising some soft pressure on GoK towards more prudent spending.

The EFA supported the development of a sound economic and fiscal framework. The study concluded that progress was made on the reform items included as EFA conditions due to a variety of factors, including the commitments made in the context of the EFA agreement itself.

Kosovo's level of public debt is low and the risk of debt distress is moderate. Kosovo's current account deficit was consistently high but the structure of Kosovo's imports and exports has improved over the period.

#### *Structural Reforms*

The structural conditions attached to the EFA operation were relevant in light of Kosovo's situation in 2007. The gross effect of EFA conditionality was highest on "quick win" technical issues and more problematic on contentious issues.

The political reinforcing effect of EFA's conditionality is its most important legacy.

#### *Design and Implementation*

The special situation of Kosovo and the strong political commitment of the EC to support it resulted in a number of design peculiarities of the EFA operation which played an important – but not exclusive – role in the disbursement delays.

#### *EU Value Added*

The value added of the EFA was highest through its impact on:

- lifting the credibility of the country to the international community and to potential investors; and
- tilting the internal balance of power in the GoK in favour of the MoF. The MoF focused on macroeconomic and fiscal stability and was willing to reform along the lines suggested by international community. The EFA conditions helped to put pressure on other members in the cabinet who were less eager to implement reforms.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/evaluation/pdf/efa\\_kosovo\\_eval\\_final\\_report\\_oct\\_2012.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/evaluation/pdf/efa_kosovo_eval_final_report_oct_2012.pdf)

### **Evaluation of the European Chemical Agency**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 02 03

**2) Timing:** March 2012. (Period covered by the report: 2007-2010).

**3) Budget:** ECHA budget 2008-2010: EUR 212,329,000;  
EU subsidy 2008-2010: EUR 165,071,000

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) created on 1 June 2007 and located in Helsinki plays a central role in the implementation of REACH and CLP. It manages the main processes of both Regulations and its Scientific Committees adopt opinions which serve as a basis for the Commission to take decisions in the context of the restriction and authorisation of hazardous chemicals and with regard to the harmonization of classification and labelling of substances. The Agency also takes decisions, notably in the areas of registration and evaluation under REACH.

The purpose of the study was to assess the Agency's efficiency, effectiveness and economy in building up its capacities and in managing its operations as well as assessing the Agency's role/added value, its acceptability and location.

This evaluation was part of a set of studies and reports to be delivered by Member States, the European Chemicals Agency and the European Commission and contributing to the Commission's review required by the REACH Regulation (REACH review, adopted on 5 February 2013).

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

The quality of ECHA's goal setting improved as the Agency developed; ECHA has met most of its key objectives in terms of outputs but could have improved its performance at the level of outcomes.

ECHA's overall efficiency was reduced by unforeseeable circumstances and by complementary activities that often increased effectiveness.

It has responded with flexibility to changing external circumstances and has demonstrated flexibility in the allocation of its resources.

The Agency performed well in most work areas during the review period, although dissemination left room for improvement. ECHA has had a good start-up as an organization and implemented most of its REACH and CLP tasks effectively. It has successfully involved all stakeholders, but it could have done more to ensure its perceived independence.

In addition to recommendations aimed at drawing lessons from the ECHA experience for

other and future agencies, the evaluation report recommends ECHA to be more transparent about its contribution to REACH and CLP objectives, to develop scenarios to ensure efficiency and economy in the future, to broaden management activities to prevent disengagement (with a specific focus on SMEs and increasing the number of organizations allowed to attend Committee meetings). The main recommendation to the Commission is to maintain the current role of ECHA under REACH and CLP.

The results of this evaluation were further analysed and screened together with the results of other eleven studies and evaluations for the purpose of overall evaluation of Reach in the REACH Review adopted on 5 February 2013 (COM(2013)49).

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/201203-final-report-echa\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/201203-final-report-echa_en.pdf)

**Evaluation of the Functioning of the European chemical market  
after the introduction of REACH**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 02 03

**2) Timing:** March 2012. (Period covered by the report: 2007-2010).

**3) Budget:** not applicable (evaluation of legislation)

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The objective of the study was to evaluate the implementation of the REACH Regulation (that came into force on 1 June 2007) in relation to its impact on the operation of the single market and the competitiveness of the European chemicals industry. The evaluation aimed to evaluate the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact of the REACH Regulation in relation to the operation of the market of chemical substances. It also aimed to identify strengths and weaknesses of the REACH implementation with respect to the dynamics of the market, consumer choice and prosperity, costs of compliance and administrative procedures. The impact on SMEs was given particular focus given the presence of relevant provision in REACH Regulation and the expectation that any discrimination against them is avoided. This evaluation was part of a set of studies and reports to be delivered by Member States, the European Chemicals Agency, and the European Commission and contributing to the Commission's review required by the REACH Regulation (REACH review, adopted on 5 February 2013).

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

The evaluation concludes that the REACH Regulation is relevant in enhancing the competitiveness of the EU chemical industry and for the development of a harmonized market for chemicals. REACH is clearly relevant to the development of a level playing field and a harmonized market. The costs of compliance are sizeable and appear to have some impact on the profitability of firms and the competitiveness of certain sectors in relation to their access to non-EU markets. The negative impacts are expected to be reduced in the future. The typical cost of registration per substance by one firm has been

about EUR70 000; representing about 1% of firms' total annual turnover. Additional costs arise from the information exchange requirements and the handling of Safety Data Sheets and affect all firms in the chemicals supply chain. It is still too early to identify long term impacts of REACH on the firms' financial position. Firms active in basic chemicals and metals absorb the costs while in the specialty chemicals markets firms have greater capacity to pass costs down the supply chain. REACH costs and the introduction of substances in the candidate list have led to the withdrawal of some chemical substances; there are only limited cases where this has become problematic for the access of firms to critical raw materials. There are indications that REACH leads to a reduction in the number of suppliers of certain substances increasing concentration in some chemicals markets. The scale of this effect is so far rather limited.

On the basis of the limited information available, the overall conclusion is that REACH has not had a sizeable impact on the prices of final consumer products.

There is no supportive evidence as to the effect of REACH on consumer confidence or the development of new substances and creation of new business opportunities at this stage. REACH contributes to the strengthening of communication along the chemicals supply chain even though this has yet to materialize.

On REACH mechanisms, the operation of consortia appears to be much more effective than Substance Information Exchange Fora. There is no evidence that REACH mechanisms have led to the loss of confidential information. However, the participation in SIEFs provides information that can present important business intelligence. There is generally a positive view on the role of ECHA and national helpdesks and the respective tools developed. Still, firms also need the assistance of Trade Associations and private consultants for more practical and tailored guidance. Overall Only Representatives appear to have a positive role in supporting non-EU firms and facilitating their access to the EU chemicals market.

Main recommendations:

Avoid, to the extent possible, changes to any of the key or provisions of the Regulation;  
Aim to clarify any unclear requirements, increase predictability and improve tools and implementation structures to reduce or eliminate unnecessary costs;

Prepare for the following registration periods with focus on the needs of SMEs;

Expand the awareness raising and information provision tools. Continue monitoring of market and industry developments;

Support industry in the use of knowledge.

The results of this evaluation were further analysed and screened together with the results of other eleven studies and evaluations for the purpose of overall evolution of Reach in the REACH Review adopted on 5 February 2014 (COM(2013)49).

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

<http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/201203-final-report-chemical->

## **Evaluation of the Impact of the REACH regulation on the innovativeness of EU chemical industry**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 02 03

**2) Timing:** June 2012. (Period covered by the report: 2007-2010).

**3) Budget:** not applicable (evaluation of policy/legislation)

### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

The overarching objective of the study was to evaluate the changes in the dynamics of the chemicals market after the introduction of the REACH regulation. Specifically the evaluation aimed to:

- Identify, test and apply methodologies for evaluating the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact of the REACH regulation in relation to the ability to innovate by EU chemical industry.
- provide recommendations to improve the mechanisms introduced by the REACH regulation to stimulate innovation (by e.g. encouraging private investments, increasing patenting or trade marking, speeding time-to-market, increase communication in the supply chain, secure financing for innovation, etc.);

This evaluation was part of a set of studies and reports to be delivered by Member States, the European Chemicals Agency and the European Commission and contributing to the Commission's review required by the REACH Regulation (REACH review, adopted on 5 February 2013).

### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

The report concluded that the Regulation's objectives regarding the innovativeness of the EU chemical industry are highly relevant in terms of EU industrial and innovation policies. The industrial information creation, capture and dissemination mechanisms created by the Regulation have acted as stimuli to product conception or innovation to varying degrees. Some 72% of companies surveyed thought it had led to an increase in access and scrutiny of information about chemical substances and 24% indicated that they had been able benefit from this through increased knowledge of substances and properties. However, this has come at a significant cost to the industry. More positive results may be apparent in the longer term, as companies reorient their R&D and innovation programmes.

The registration process has had an impact on innovation, but the candidate list is currently creating the greatest deal of innovative activity (with the SIN list, and more recently, possibly the CoRAP). Authorisation and restriction are affecting a smaller part of the industry. It has not been possible to discern overall unequivocal benefits for consumers, the market and society at this stage of implementation.

SMEs, and particularly small firms, seem especially affected by the Regulation due to



issues surrounding access to input markets such as costs of specialised staff, training, and Letters of Access for formulators; and also access to finance in the view of increased risks and uncertainties associated with innovation. Highly innovative SMEs have a more negative view of the overall effect of REACH on innovation than large firms for the present and the future.

Main recommendations:

- Enablers: increase awareness of REACH-related innovation, identify and promote research funding into substitution of substances on the authorisation list and encourage private and public funding for REACH-related innovation
- Firm activities: address uncertainties surrounding the candidate list, increase encouragement of the development of QSARS and similar alternative testing methods, promote the use of the PPORD (and consider a smaller firms friendly version of the PPORD), consider raising the volume exemption to a level that would provide for higher volume testing and piloting, consider lengthening the consultation times for animal testing, identify bottlenecks in supply at the level of GLP labs, identify ways to make it easier and cheaper for firms to protect IP and CBI within REACH.
- Outputs: increase predictability about timing and costs and reduce expected times for registration for phase-in substances, consider developing a new category in REACH, that of a “small chemical company” which could, for example, be subject to reduced REACH registration obligations, or be able to claim reduced costs for Letters of Access.

The results of this evaluation were further analysed and screened together with the results of other eleven studies and evaluations for the purpose of overall evaluation of REACH in the REACH Review adopted on 5 February 2013 (COM(2013)49).

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/final-report-reach-june-2012\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/final-report-reach-june-2012_en.pdf)

### **Evaluation of the Ecodesign directive (2009/125/EC)**

**1) ABB activities concerned** 02 02

**2) Timing:** March 2012 (Period covered by the report: 2009-2011).

**3) Budget:** not applicable (evaluation of policy/legislation)

#### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

Under Article 21 of the Ecodesign Directive, the Commission was required to review, no later than 2012, the effectiveness of the Ecodesign Directive and of its implementing measures and to assess the appropriateness of extending the scope of the Directive to non-energy related products.

The evaluation was aiming at the review of the effectiveness of (i) the Directive and its implementing measures, (ii) the Ecodesign methodology, (iii) the threshold for implementing measures as described in Article 15 of the Directive, (iv) market

surveillance, and (v) self-regulation measures.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

The evaluation study concluded that, in general, the Ecodesign Directive is achieving its policy objectives (free movement of goods and environmental protection) and that no revision of the Directive is deemed appropriate at the moment or necessary to increase its effectiveness and that of its implementing measures.

The study has, in particular, pointed out that:

- In principle, the Directive is achieving its policy objectives. Since 2005 the main focus of the implementing measures has been on energy efficiency. The available data illustrates a move towards energy efficiency for all products regulated by the Ecodesign implementing measures.
- It is too early to correctly evaluate the full effect of the Directive and of the implementing mandatory and self-regulation measures because of the insufficient period of their application. For one out of the twelve ecodesign Regulations adopted at the time of the evaluation, Tier-1 requirements had not yet entered into force and for eight implementing measures, Tier-2 requirements had not yet entered into force. Furthermore, out of two proposed voluntary agreements, none has so far been officially endorsed by the Commission.
- It is considered that the indicative criteria for adopting implementing ecodesign measures, defined in Article 15 of the Ecodesign Directive, remain appropriate.

As pointed out, there have been some limitations on the conduct of the evaluation: the early timing of the evaluation and data related issue, due to the official statistical sources referring to the period before the Implementing Measures were adopted. These limitations need to be taken into account in reading the evaluation report.

Based on the findings of the evaluation, the Commission adopted, on 17 December 2012, a Report to the European Parliament and the Council: ‘Review of Directive 2009/125/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 establishing a framework for the setting of ecodesign requirements for energy-related products (recast)’ [COM(2012) 765].

The report confirmed that no legislative changes were necessary in the Directive, as it is achieving its policy objectives reasonably well. It also concluded that it would be premature to enlarge the scope of the Directive, but referred to the forthcoming review of the Energy Labelling Directive in 2014 for a wider assessment of the EU's sustainable product policy.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/csес\\_ecodesign\\_finalreport\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/csес_ecodesign_finalreport_en.pdf)

## **Evaluation of Member State Policies to Facilitate Access to Finance for SME**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 02 02 -

**2) Timing:** June 2012, (duration 2010-2012)

**3) Budget:** not applicable (evaluation of policy/legislation)

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The objective of the study is to evaluate the efficiency, utility, sustainability, effectiveness and impact of existing Member States programmes to facilitate the access to finance of SMEs. This is important to provide recommendations on which (type of) programmes work best and which elements could also be used in other countries.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

In the context of the current crisis, it is increasingly difficult and expensive for SMEs to access private sources of finance. Member States and the European Commission have taken comprehensive measures to address the current tensions in financial markets and to safeguard the flow of credit to the real economy. To facilitate access to finance, the study provides information on how to access over EUR 50 billion of public finance in the 27 Member States. The study presents over 120 national or regional financing programmes and provides key information helping SMEs to apply for the different programmes in terms of characteristics, terms, conditions and contact information.

The study also provided an evaluation of public financing programmes in 5 Member States (Germany, France, the UK, Poland and Sweden) to exchange good practice and assess which programmes work best and could be used in other countries. The study stresses the importance of having efficient and flexible financing programmes to correspond to changing market conditions and to be well integrated in the local business environment. In terms of operation, public programmes need quick and efficient decision making processes and a strong collaboration with the private sector. Public financing programmes should also be aligned with business advice services.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/finance/guide-to-funding/indirect-funding/files/evaluation-of-national-financing-programmes-2012\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/finance/guide-to-funding/indirect-funding/files/evaluation-of-national-financing-programmes-2012_en.pdf)

## **Evaluation of the Impact of European Space Policy on European Space Manufacturing and the Services Industry**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 02 03

**2) Timing:** August 2012 (Period covered by the report: 2007-2011).

**3) Budget:** not applicable (evaluation of policy/legislation)

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation aims were to:

- Assess the impacts to date of the European Space Policy adopted in 2007 in strengthening space industrial competitiveness (in manufacturing and services);
- Assess the main challenges ahead for the European Space Industry in manufacturing and services in maintaining and strengthening space industrial competitiveness;
- Review the strategic importance and specific characteristics of the European Space Industry to assess whether a dedicated European Space Industrial Policy is appropriate;
- Develop quantitative and qualitative indicators to measure the future contribution of the ESP to strengthening European space industrial competitiveness in space manufacturing and services and in wider sectors where space-based technologies and applications are a key competitiveness driver;
- Identify current and possible future developments in the space industry and on competitiveness issues facing the upstream and downstream space sectors;
- Inform the preparation of a European Space Industrial Policy (and possible accompanying Regulations) in accordance with the Lisbon Treaty provisions (TFEU – Art. 173 and 189);
- Analyse the potential role of EU regulation in future as an enabler in facilitating the development of new and emerging markets in space services, such as in the distribution of high-resolution satellite data and its commercial distribution.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

The overall conclusions were that:

- The adoption of the ESP in 2007 has provided an important framework through which critical precursor steps have been taken towards the development of the future European Space Industrial Policy. It is highly doubtful without the existence of the ESP whether it would have been possible to launch a dedicated industrial policy for the space sector.
- Through the frame of the ESP, progress has also been made in strengthening space governance even if some of the achievements predate the ESP's adoption, such as the 2003 EC-ESA Framework Agreement and the holding of regular Space Council meetings.
- Following the adoption of Article 189 of the TFEU, considerable political and legal progress has been made. This gives the EU joint competence, together with ESA and the member states, to pursue a formal European Space Industrial Policy.
- Following the Lisbon Treaty's adoption, space is now formally an EU policy in its

own right, rather than part of the broader industrial policy landscape.

- Moreover, the Competitiveness Council’s legal jurisdiction has been extended to the space sector. Gaining wider acceptance that space is a key strategic sector and of vital importance in promoting growth and jobs is a major step forward.
- Although more could be done to strengthen the ESP’s visibility among industry and wider space stakeholders, it has played an important role in providing strategic direction and a focal point for national space agencies, national authorities and wider stakeholders across the EU.
- Progress has also been made through the frame of the ESP in promoting industrial competitiveness through EU expenditure programmes and specific policy initiatives. While the ESP has not had a dedicated budget of its own, seen through the ESP’s prism, various EU research and innovation and operational programmes have contributed to the achievement of objectives relating to industrial competitiveness.

The evaluation’s recommendations deal with:

- the definition of the European Space Industry Policy,
- the prerequisites for the adoption of a EU regulatory framework,
- the need for a stable industrial base with balanced SME participation,
- ways to ensure technological non-dependence and independent access to space,
- the promotion of the development of new markets for space applications and services,
- the need for defining indicators and monitoring the general performance of the European space industry.

The results of this evaluation have fed into the Communication on EU Space industrial policy, adopted on 28 February 2013 (COM (2013)108). The recommendations on the EU regulatory framework will be further analysed in an impact assessment and submitted to extensive consultation in 2013.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/space\\_final\\_report\\_evaluation\\_of\\_the\\_impact\\_of\\_esp\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/space_final_report_evaluation_of_the_impact_of_esp_en.pdf)

## **Evaluation of the Pressure Equipment Directive**

**1) ABB activities concerned** 02 03

**2) Timing:** October 2012 (Period covered by the report: 2002-2012- 10 years of implementation of PED Directive).

**3) Budget:** not applicable (evaluation of policy/legislation)

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

After ten years of implementation, the evaluation aimed to assess the performance of the Pressure Equipment Directive since its introduction and to make a judgement of the Directive's continuing relevance. The purpose of the evaluation has been to assess how, and to what extent, the Directive has met its objective of guaranteeing free circulation of stationary pressure equipment within the EU while ensuring a high degree of safety.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

The introduction of the PED has proven relevant for the improved functioning of the Internal Market and successfully combined market integration with maintaining the high levels of product safety that Europe was already accustomed to. One of the core objectives of the Directive, the removal of barriers to trade and improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the Internal Market, has been realised to a significant extent. The PED has opened up trading opportunities across the Internal Market with the benefit of providing users with greater levels of choice. The conclusion of the report is that no urgent revision of the Pressure Equipment Directive is needed. This gives time to focus on better implementation and prepare gradually for full revision later on. The PED has been well formulated and meets the needs of the target beneficiaries. In relation to other pieces of European legislation, the scope of the PED is generally clear and the Directive fits into a relatively stable and coherent regulatory environment. Overall, the PED has achieved European added value. The largely harmonised legislative framework has had a positive impact on the European pressure equipment sector. This outcome could not have been achieved through Member States acting alone or bilaterally. The issue of market surveillance at national level has been raised as a scope for improvement. The report calls for stronger and more consistent enforcement of the rules with a view to ensuring that the same conformity assessment procedures are correctly applied to the same types of pressure equipment. This and other evaluation recommendations have been taken into account for the subsequent actions in 2013, mainly through the foreseen alignment of the Directive to the New Legislative Framework. The Commission proposal on strengthening market surveillance in the Member States (Product Safety and Market Surveillance Package, adopted in February 2013) is also going to contribute to address weaknesses highlighted in the report.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/evaluation-of-the-pressure-equipment-directive\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/evaluation-of-the-pressure-equipment-directive_en.pdf)

**Evaluation of EU Member State Business Angel Markets and Policies**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 02 02

**2) Timing:** October 2012.

**3) Budget:** not applicable (evaluation of policy/legislation)

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

Business Angels play an important role in the economy, and in many countries constitute the largest source of external funding, after family and friends, in newly established ventures. Given the importance of informal investors for the creation and maintenance of an entrepreneurial economy, more data is needed from the angel investment market in order to make rational and well-grounded policy decisions. The objective of the evaluation was to improve policy-making regarding SMEs' access to seed and early stage capital by increasing the knowledge of the characteristics of the Business Angels market and sharing EU Member States best practices of policies and programmes supporting Business Angel financing. The project aimed to review the existing public policies and to gather evidence concerning the effectiveness of public support.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

The project provided an overview of the key characteristics and results of programmes or policies aimed at increasing and supporting Business Angel investment in the selected Member States. It provided interesting details on how Business Angels operate, their number and volume of investment, public policies and support for business angels, as well as providing recommendations on further data collection needs and issues for public policy. The review of the evidence on public policy schemes supporting Business Angels suggested a rather mixed picture. Each of the various types of public policy tool has its own advantages and disadvantages and a combination of tools may be needed in many cases. Given their possible contribution of business angels as a source of finance for both mainstream and technology intensive early stage and new companies, public policy must take into consideration the needs of business angels when new legislation or regulations are introduced. Public support measures that directly provide risk capital to early stage business should be designed in a way to attract investment by business angels, complementing their role and making use of the non-financial aspect of their involvement including management expertise and networking. It was also suggested that existing data collection procedures be continued, and continually improved to create more comparability, consistency and completeness, as the existing data sources regarding Business Angels' market. These should be supplemented with a series, or well-designed programme, of specific studies aimed at meeting gaps in existing knowledge which are quite fundamental to the notion and support of Business Angels. The Commission's policy is to identify and spread good practices that can help improve the conditions for business angel investment across the EU. The evaluation contributes to the specific objective of facilitating access to finance for the creation and growth of SMEs.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/ba-rep\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/ba-rep_en.pdf)

## ABB 03 – Competition

### Study on the Implementation of the existing Broadband Guidelines

1) **ABB activities concerned:** 03 AWBL 03

2) **Timing:** 7 December 2011, (Duration: 6/2011 to 11/2011)

3) **Budget:** not applicable

4) **Background, scope and focus:**

The Commission prepared a review of the Broadband Guidelines of 2009 by December 2012. The core objective of the study was to support the revision process by drawing lessons from the implementation of past decisions and by clarifying a given set of technological issues. A sample of 10 broadband projects (9 in the EU, 1 in New Zealand) was selected. Five of the selected EU case studies were approved before the Guidelines were adopted in 2009 (between 2005 and 2007) and four were approved during the validity of the Guidelines (in 2010). Based on the case studies and the expert opinion on technical issues the contractor identified several challenges associated with the Guidelines: basic principles (definition of NGA, harmonisation of SMP regulation and State aid rules), State aid and broadband projects in general (compatibility conditions in point 51 of the Guidelines, amendments with regard to broadband networks in general), State aid and NGA projects (distinction of NGA areas, additional conditions for NGA networks, amendments with regard to NGA networks) and separation.

5) **Summary of findings:**

The Guidelines provide appropriate demarcations of the respective terms, distinct between basic, NGA and ultra-fast broadband and request a proper reporting to the Commission on aid projects.

*Time lag between the implementation of the projects and the evaluation:*

The case studies did not provide the same level of detail regarding their empirical information. Quantity and quality of the information received from the case studies depend on the concrete implementation of the measures (e.g. internal monitoring/reporting procedures, status/progress of implementation).

6) **Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2011\\_broadband\\_guidelines/final\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2011_broadband_guidelines/final_report_en.pdf)



## **Study on co(re)insurance and on ad-hoc co(re)insurance agreements on the subscription market**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 03 AWBL 02

**2) Timing:** 15 November 2012.

**3) Budget:** not applicable

### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

The study constitutes a first step in the process to prepare for the potential review of the BER, which will expire on 31 March 2017, as well as for the report which the Commission will have to submit to the European Parliament by 31 March 2016. It is also a follow up to the Commission's report on the Business Insurance Sector Inquiry ("BISI"), published on 25 September 2007.

The Commission performed the study in order to collect empirical knowledge concerning the functioning of co(re)insurance pools and co(re)insurance agreements on the subscription markets and to gather information on the application of the BER. Its aim was also to contribute to the Commission's market monitoring of the operation of these co(re)insurance schemes.

### **5) Summary of findings :**

The study provides an overview of the functioning of co(re)insurance pools and ad-hoc co(re)insurance agreements in the EEA. It identifies the types of risks which are usually insured by the above mentioned structures and explains the functioning and specificities of co(re)insurance pools and ad-hoc co(re)insurance agreements. Therefore it constitutes a key basis to undertake the work necessary to review the functioning of the existing BER and make appropriate proposals for its potential modification.

A number of respondents were difficult to identify. Some respondents declined to reply and others provided incomplete information, in particular with regards to questions of the functioning of the BER.

### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/competition/sectors/financial\\_services/insurance.html](http://ec.europa.eu/competition/sectors/financial_services/insurance.html)

## ABB 04 – Employment and social affairs

### Analysis of costs and benefits of active vs passive labour market measures

1) **ABB activities concerned:** 04 02

2) **Timing:** March 2012 (duration: December 2010 - March 2012; Period covered 1990- 2010 with a focus on the recent crisis period (2008-10).

3) **Budget:** not applicable

4) **Background, scope and focus:**

The study analysed the use of active and passive Labour Market Policies (LMP) since 1990 to help formulate LMP in the framework of the Europe 2020 strategy and the exit strategy from the 2008 crisis. It covers the following elements:

- the rationales and theoretical impacts of active and passive measures (APM);
- trends in public expenditure on active and passive LMP;
- the origin of funding and the main institutions responsible for key LMP delivery in the EU as well as the implications of the different funding mechanisms.
- an analysis the effectiveness of active labour market measures
- conclusions on the priorities, pitfalls and timing of the implementation of a mixture of active and passive measures.
- identification of gaps in the knowledge of the measures effectiveness and the implications of the gaps for future policy measure design and research.

5) **Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

The study was **not an evaluation** of an existing Programme. It was a study (funded under the PROGRESS Programme) analysing the efficiency of labour market measures and expenditures (active as well as passives), notably on the basis of a review of the literature of existing evaluations.

The final recommendations are structured around the following points:

- **Mobilizing labour:** integration of benefits to avoid unemployment trap; extensions of job search and acceptance requirements for other benefits such as social assistance; reduction of the implicit benefit of a non-working spouse; sanctions; continuous job search assistance oriented on employer demand; training for all groups that lack specific skills needed in the labour market; controlled expansion of training activities; mid-term job placement targets.
- **Supporting employment especially of young people:** reducing legal differences between temporary and permanent contracts; rewarding the actor investing in activation of hard-to-place (young) workers; promote quality apprenticeships and traineeship contracts;

discontinue/decrease employment incentives for work experience when the economy recovers.

- **Protecting the vulnerable:** extend coverage and eligibility of social protection; organise coverage on the basis on "apparent employment relationship" rather than on specific forms of contracts; more generous social assistance with strict job search and acceptance criteria; apply active measures from the start for vulnerable groups; focus employment incentives on long-term unemployed

- **Improving effectiveness of measures and funding:** anticipate crisis period by raising tax/contribution rate sufficiently in advance; address potential risks associated with combination central funding and local implementation; build in flexible arrangements to facilitate budget shifts; if budget cuts , focus on fewer costlier measures to assist larger number of unemployed; offer public sector job at min wage to tackle recipient of benefits having informal job; make continuation of measures contingent on evaluation results  
Finally the last point was more specifically about evaluations :

- **Improving quality of evaluations:** include ex ante evaluations of policy proposals; experiments in specific regions to measure results and compare different options; take inspiration from US evaluations; distinguish initial and long-term effect; attempt to estimate deadweight loss, substitution and displacement effects

#### 6) Availability of the report on Europa

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7602&langId=en#>

### Evaluation of the reaction of the ESF to the economic and financial crisis

1) **ABB activities concerned:** 04 02

2) **Timing:** March 2012 (duration: December 2010- March 2012).

3) **Budget:** whole budget for the 2007-2013 programming period is EUR 76.6 billion.

4) **Background, scope and focus:**

For the purpose of this assignment the crisis was – on the basis of GDP and employment growth figures – defined as the period between IIIQ 2008 and IIIQ 2009. This evaluation analysed how ESF management and support was adjusted in reaction to the crisis, whether the changes helped mitigating the effects of the crisis and how the ESF could be made more responsive to the needs of post-crisis recovery. The changes to the ESF implementation were analysed in the context of the labour market and policy developments in the Member States. The focus of the evaluation was on governance. It has not dealt with the effectiveness or impacts of the specific measures undertaken, for which the delays are still too short. An analysis of the effectiveness of different labour market instruments has recently been undertaken in another study.<sup>1</sup> The 2 main criteria were: 1) Coherence: "Have the changes in the use of the ESF been 'coherent'

<sup>1</sup> Analysis of costs and benefits of active compared to passive measures, ECORYS and IZA, 2012.

with the short term needs of the labour markets in the Member States?" and 2) Rationality: "Have the changes also helped foster the recovery from the crisis in a longer term perspective?"

#### 5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study

**The ESF proved to be a flexible instrument which has been used for quick reaction against the crisis.** By the end of 2010 84 out of 117 OPs had been adapted in response to the crisis. In only 27 cases a formal change of OP was required. Most of the changes concerned broadening of scope, launching specific calls and including further target groups in the OP.

17 Member States introduced at least one of the simplification measures proposed by the EC:

- The most utilized measure was the extension of the use of the 2000-6 funds; used by BE, CZ, DE, ES, HU, PT, SK and SI. Some MS did not take advantage of this option for fear that this upfront liquidity would delay the implementation of the funds for the current programming period.
- HU, IE, MT, PT, RO, SI and UK took advantage of advanced payments.
- 'Front loading', i.e. a temporary reimbursement of 100%, was reported to be used only by ES, LV, SI and UK, as it has to be counterbalanced later in the implementation and disbursement period by additional national funding.
- Further elements of simplification (such as flat-rate costs, standard unit costs, etc.) were introduced in AT, BE, DE, FR, IT, LV, MT, NL, PT, SI and UK.

In an emergency situation like the economic crisis MS preferred to stick to already tested solutions. The **introduction of any kind of modification to the financial management or the delivery system was considered time-consuming and seemed difficult in the middle of the implementation.** Especially in MS with limited administrative capacity the proposed simplification measures could not be really used because the national and regional administrations were not sufficiently flexible to change their procedures.

The **role of the ESF in mitigating the crisis varied** considerably according to the impact of the crisis on the respective economy and to the volume of the ESF in active labour market policy. While in the 'better off' countries, such as AT, BE, DE, SE, UK, it is possible to orient the ESF towards anticipation and innovation, in the other countries the immediate needs and governance issues remain of utmost importance. The evaluation furthermore identifies two groups of Member States where the ESF plays a major role in active labour market policy, but where governance structures will need further attention (BG, EL, RO, where various problems of implementation occurred, and CZ, HU, SK, SL, where the absorption rates are extremely low so far).

**The reaction of the ESF was coherent with the immediate needs of the labour market in the crisis.** The focus of the ESF shifted temporarily from the traditional target groups (young, low skilled, women, disabled, migrants) to the groups that were hit the most in the first phase of the crisis (i.e. prime-aged men having worked in construction or manufacturing), and from more strategic interventions (e.g. means-tested training) to interventions aimed at directly maintaining or creating employment (e.g. combination of

short time work with training, supported employment).

**The ESF improved the consistency of the anti-crisis measures with the long-term perspective requiring structural adaptation.** The ESF was broadly used to finance the training schemes offered in the short time working arrangements adding thus a structural/active component to the otherwise passive measures.

#### 6) Availability of the report on Europa

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7671&langId=en>

### PROGRESS mid-term evaluation

1) **ABB activities concerned:** 04 04

2) **Timing:** January 2012 (Duration: June 2010-December 2011. Period covered 2007-mid 2010).

3) **Budget:** The overall multi-annual budget of PROGRESS is: EUR 683 million (Progress Microfinance budget excluded).

#### 4) Background, scope and focus

The mid-term evaluation of PROGRESS was performed by ECORYS. The evaluation covers the five policy sections of the programme: employment, social protection and social inclusion, working conditions, anti-discrimination and gender equality. It focuses on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and EU added value of the programme for the period 2007-mid 2010. In addition, it reviews horizontal issues, notably the programme management, partnership strategies and gender mainstreaming. It is based on the review of relevant literature, operational reports, interviews with PROGRESS stakeholders, and a survey of grant beneficiaries. One case study for each policy section illustrates key success factors and obstacles and provides illustrative examples of the EU added value. The evaluation also benefited from the data and reports produced in the framework of the on-going PROGRESS monitoring contract.

#### 5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study

**On the whole PROGRESS has delivered positive results.** The nature of PROGRESS-funded activities is often indirect, in the sense that the activities try to improve the quality of debate, processes, cooperation or sharing of best practices, rather than directly aiming at core policy final outcomes (such as employment targets). As a consequence the achievements are also often indirect and dependent on further actions at the Member State level and sometimes causality is difficult to establish. But study findings point to overall positives results;

The shift to a single programme has had advantages in terms of reduction of administrative burden and, to some extent, economies of scale, but the development of cross-cutting issues could be improved, as the programme still has silo characteristics between the policy fields;

**Improvements could be made to the functioning of the PROGRESS Committee.** Whilst the Committee is considered a valuable forum for discussions and coordination, there is some frustration among Member States on its working. More substantial and thorough discussions

and earlier involvement on the design of the priorities would be desirable;

**PROGRESS-funded activities have influenced EU policies and legislation** (e.g. Europe 2020 anti-poverty targets, reform of pension systems, implementation of law on health and safety at work, labour law). They have also influenced emerging/changing policy areas – the anti-discrimination theme features strongly here;

**PROGRESS has generated value by operating as a complement to other policies and programmes** (for instance the European Social Fund, the European social dialogue). Another strong point is the production of statistical tools/indicators to provide an evidence base for policy making;

The findings show that the **communication and dissemination of results** is an area that needs to be clearly further developed to support awareness raising and mutual learning. Whilst the European Commission is very active in making brochures, newsletters and leaflets to spread the word, on other aspects of dissemination (e.g. the availability of study reports, the use of websites etc.) more could be done;

**Financial and administrative monitoring is normally well executed.** At the same time it is desirable that monitoring becomes more substantive in nature;

**A particular area where there is substantial room for improvement is gender mainstreaming.** There is little evidence of strong support for the concrete implementation of this principle in programme management. This view is further confirmed by poor results in terms of numbers of activities which carry out a gender analysis prior to implementation or which disaggregate project data by gender, and limited examples of gender mainstreaming in activities funded in policy sections other than gender equality.

### **Recommendations**

As for the different policy sections:

**Employment:** the budget for policy advice, research and analysis and policy debate events should be increased. Provisions should be introduced that allow for more flexible responses to information needs.

**Social protection and inclusion:** the link between PROGRESS and the Flagship Initiative 'European platform against poverty and social exclusion' should be strengthened. The methods for peer reviews used in the SPSI and employment sections should be shared and compared; the involvement of MS officials from public authorities in specialised communities of practice should be more targeted; the co-operation with social partners should be increased.

**Working conditions:** it should be clarified how PROGRESS outputs match the need for initiating preventive actions and fostering a prevention culture in the field of health and safety at work. Tasks on evidence production should be further streamlined and divided with EU-OSHA and Eurofound; external access to studies and reports should be made easier; timeliness of report availability should be improved by streamlining procurement and improving the use of networks of experts; more attention should be paid to gender and discrimination on various grounds and other cross-cutting issues that affect working conditions.

**Antidiscrimination and diversity:** action should focus on the development of comparable data and statistics for all EU27. Even in absence of new legislation, awareness-raising should be continued where necessary in relevant Member States; awareness around legal rights and obligations should be improved.

**Gender equality:** focus on producing statistical tools/indicators should be increased, in order to provide an evidence base; support for the expert networks and the NGOs should continue; the identification and dissemination of good practice should be strengthened, with more structured follow-up to events and better dissemination of successful PROGRESS outputs from other policy sections should contribute more to achieving a better integration of gender equality as a cross-cutting issue.

As for horizontal themes:

**Programme management:** a multi-annual, strategic perspective should be added to the annual cycle. Monitoring should be kept distinct from communication and should better trace back outputs to activities and people. A central outputs storage system would facilitate monitoring. Additional instruments could also be produced to communicate PROGRESS' good results, such as thematic best practice directories. The role of the PROGRESS Committee should be rethought: the policy and expert committees could be more deeply closely involved as this would allow reinstating the discussion on policy themes that was possible when separate funding programmes were attached to policy strands.

**Increasing dissemination of results** is recommended for most policy fields, together with the recommendations to: develop good practice dissemination tools; ensure greater diversity in participation in events; widen stakeholder involvement in policy debate, and strengthen role of social partners; increase involvement of local and regional government as stakeholders.

**Gender mainstreaming:** It is necessary to ensure that gender equality is mainstreamed in a meaningful way across all PROGRESS-supported activity. The most effective way to mainstream gender and antidiscrimination is to explicitly incorporate them in policy objectives, not just as a cross-cutting issue.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa**

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7430&langId=en>

### **Evaluation of the ESF support to Lifelong Learning**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 04 02

**2) Timing:** July 2012 (Duration: October 2010-July 2012. Period covered: programming period 2000-06 and the first four years of the period 2007-13).

**3) Budget:**

Overall multi-annual budget of the ESF for the 2007-2013 programming period is EUR 76.6 billion

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The purpose of the evaluation was to analyse the reach and impact of the ESF supported LLL activities on young jobseekers, low skilled workers and older workers. The report identified activities which are more successful in reaching these target groups and other factors of success. Furthermore, the evaluation looked for European Added Value which could be attributed to the ESF support to LLL activities. This information could improve the content and delivery of the ESF supported LLL activities aimed at the three target

groups in the 2014-2020 programming period. The work covers the EU27 and comprises an EU-wide overview as well as more detailed case studies on eight Member States (Austria, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Sweden and the UK).

**Methodology:** The evaluation is on the one hand based on the secondary analysis of the operational programmes, evaluations from these two programming periods, SFC 2007 as well as ESTAT data (such as the LFS) and LLL research, especially concerning the three target groups. On the other hand the consultants undertook own empirical work, mainly in the form of interviews with ESF managing authorities and implementing bodies in the Member States.

## **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

ESF is a major funder of LLL across the EU. Approx. EUR 55.3 billion is allocated to expenditure categories related to LLL for 2000-13. An estimated 25 million young people, 18 million individuals with low skills, and 1.9 million older people benefitted from ESF supported LLL activity across the EU between 2000 and 2010.

Without the ESF many of these interventions would not have taken place. The ESF has allowed more people to participate in LLL and has ensured that groups which otherwise would not have been reached (in particular subgroups among the low skilled and the young) benefit from targeted interventions.

While all MS have some sort of LLL strategy in place, so with considerable qualitative differences, the participation of the adult population in LLL differs between 1.2 % in Bulgaria and 32.8% in Denmark.

ESF support to LLL is closely linked with national policy priorities (such as high attention towards transition of young people into the labour market and a much higher social acceptance of older workers leaving the labour market prematurely), traditions and the skills level of the active population (e.g. in Italy and Spain more than 40% of the working age population have at most ISCED level 2, while in Poland or Lithuania the figure is below 15%).

The report shows that it is possible to reach these specific groups, but they need to be targeted and prioritised at the level of OPs and during the actual delivery.

Delivery arrangements and mechanisms such as: managing and tracking progression of participants between ESF activities, referral systems between different LLL activities, or long term strategies are important to achieve an impact in particular for the more difficult groups. Output targets linked to LLL are important for the success of the interventions.

### **Young people**

Young people are in general overrepresented in ESF-supported LLL activities compared to their proportion in the working age and active population, which shows that the ESF is overall well equipped to reach this target group. They account for more than 40% of all ESF participations in Germany, Hungary and France and 30% or more in Spain, the UK, Poland, Malta, Belgium and Latvia. In contrast to that, it is 15% or less in Italy, Portugal, Cyprus and Greece, reflecting national policy decisions. Thereby e.g. the low participation in Italy contrasts with low educational attainment of a large group of young people and high youth unemployment.



Activities which are particularly successful in attracting and helping young people are: promoting work experience (internships, traineeships), activities to support progression into higher education (providing a taste of what further education is like), career guidance and personal action plans. Informal approaches and social activities are also important elements.

The main impacts for this group are transition into employment, to encourage further learning and to develop softer skills linked including increased self-confidence.

#### **Older workers**

With less than 5% of all participations, older workers are underrepresented in ESF supported LLL. This is in line with their general participation in LLL. The proportion of older workers in all participations ranges from 12% or more in Estonia and Sweden to less than 2% in Greece in 2007-10. Attracting older workers to LLL remains a rather low priority in the MS. Even in cases where older workers are targeted, these targets are frequently not met and revised downward. While LLL is important also for this age group, relatively low levels of unemployment amongst this age group provided a welcomed reason to not strongly focus on this group. Updating skills so to increase job-security is particularly important for this target group. It also needs specific motivation and encouragement for older workers to (actively) participate in training events, as their confidence in the ability to learn is often low.

#### **Low-skilled**

Low-skilled workers are under particular pressure in the labour market, they count for about one third of the training related participations. There are huge variations between Member States, ranging from more than 50% in Greece, France, Germany and Malta and Luxemburg to less than 15% in Cyprus, Slovenia and Estonia. Low skilled workers are not at all a homogenous target group. They are often structured into subgroups – such as people with a migration background or long-term unemployed with outdated skill sets, or as single mothers (with little professional experience).

Furthermore, well qualified people become low-skilled when they have been out of an adequate job for some time. Thus this group is rather difficult to grasp and this makes personalised instruments (guidance, job matching activities, up skilling in specific sectors) particularly important.

Positive impacts of ESF interventions for this group are finding a new job but also increased job-security and quality (by achieving a formally acknowledged qualification) as well as an increased willingness to undertake further training and – more generally – increased confidence and self-esteem.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7922&langId=en>

**Development of a methodology for the systematic evaluation of Health and Safety at Work Directives and evaluation of the practical implementation of Directive 89/654/EEC "Work Places" testing the new evaluation methodology - Legislation evaluation**

1) **ABB activities concerned:** 04 04

2) **Timing:** 29.04.2012

3) **Budget:** not applicable

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The objective of the contract was to develop a methodology for the systematic evaluation of OSH Directives and testing it in a pilot evaluation of Directive 89/654/EEC concerning the minimum safety and health requirements for the workplace.

The evaluation methodology and the test on Workplace Directive 89/654/EEC will contribute to the upcoming ex-post evaluation of the implementation of the EU legislation on Health and Safety at Work in the EU Member States.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

Development of common methodology for future evaluations of OSH legislation (including the ex-post evaluation ending 2015). The Generic Methodology report presents a viable generic evaluation approach based on a comprehensive set of questions (indicators) using available documents accompanied by focused surveys/interviews. Although no "turn key" method was provided that can be imposed as the only one and sole approach for the evaluation of health and safety at work directives, it provides one possible and workable evaluation approach as well as many useful components which can inform future evaluation efforts. The second objective, namely the cross-nationally comparative evaluation of the Workplace Directive 89/654/EEC in all 27 Member States and a sample of EFTA-EEA countries, has also been achieved. The report contains a fully-fledged and comprehensive evaluation of the impact of Directive 89/654/EEC. The main findings are:

*Initial relevance*

The goal of the Directive was clearly to progressively improve the level of occupational safety and health through the harmonisation of already existing national regulations. In a broader sense, the respondents agreed on the high initial relevance with regard to the importance of the requirements of the WPD. Those requirements provide a fundamental basis for guaranteeing occupational safety and health at the workplace.

*Quality of the preparation*

On a general level, the good quality of the preparation of the WPD is widely accepted by the stakeholders. The majority of stakeholders agree that the WPD, in general, targets relevant and basic OSH aspects and that the requirements are clearly formulated. The level of detail is sometimes considered as not sufficient but some countries already had details in their national regulation or added details when transposing the WPD, or published practical guides and

recommendations for the implementation at company level.

#### *Implementation*

In many countries, the *legal implementation* did not change the national regulations to a large extent. Many pre-existing legislative frameworks already covered the legislative scope of the WPD. In some cases, the transposition made it possible to modernise the existing legislation and add some missing provisions. Most of the stakeholders mentioned that the transposed requirements were relevant for their national regulation. Overall, the transposition was not the subject of a controversial national debate.

The *practical implementation* (compliance with) of WPD-related OSH obligations can be considered as 'good'. According to the analysis of the collected data, the level of implementation of the specific WPD-related requirements was better than the level of implementation of the general provisions (such as risk assessment, information, workers' consultation and training). The global compliance seems therefore to lead to lesser results.

#### *Impact*

OSH results are very difficult to measure in a quantitative way, but the perception of the results among stakeholders tends to indicate a slightly positive result. A number of stakeholders were convinced that the WPD generally contributed to the improvement of the working conditions.

#### *Effectiveness*

If we compare the initial relevance with the overall impact, we can conclude that the Directive has proven its effectiveness. However, it may vary from one country to another as this is related to the corresponding pre-existing legal framework.

#### *Current and future relevance*

There were few suggestions for changes to the WPD in the future. An important part of the stakeholders, employers and workers argued that no changes were needed. The practical improvements on specific topics were linked to the level of detail and concreteness of the provisions. Suggestions to include additional provisions relate to psychosocial risks, ergonomic design, indoor air quality or specific types of mobile workplaces (referring to specific work situations such as telework, transportation).

### **6) Availability of the report on Europa**

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=8761&langId=en>

## **Evaluation of flexicurity 2007-2010**

- 1) ABB activities concerned:** 04 01
- 2) Timing:** December 2012 (Period covered 2007-2010).
- 3) Budget:** not applicable

#### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

The objectives of the evaluation were twofold:

- To assess, more than three years after their publication/adoption the impact of the Communication “Towards Common Principles of flexicurity” and the Common Principles on national policy making in the EU Member States; and
- To analyse the impact of the implemented integrated flexicurity policies on labour market outcomes at EU and national level in terms of strengthening employment security, facilitating transitions and reducing labour market segmentation.

The evaluation covered the 27 Member States looking at the time frame between the publication of the two key Commission Communications on Flexicurity so far i.e. “Towards Common Principles of flexicurity”, adopted in June 2007, and “An Agenda for new skills and jobs”, adopted in November 2010. However, the evaluation also includes developments occurring after November 2010 when they resulted in significant changes in national policy making, such as Spain’s February 2012 labour market reforms. 12 Member States have been subject to in-depth case study research.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

The evaluation recommends the Commission to:

- Bring the debate and lessons on the implementation of flexicurity from a conceptual to a practical level, by better exploring ways to replicate *evaluated best practices* in the area of flexicurity;
- Stress balanced approaches of policies promoting flexibility and security in labour markets, by shifting the emphasis from flexicurity (which is the outputs / component parts) to ‘mutual responsibility’ and to the concept of policies aimed at restoring "dynamic equilibria";
- Emphasise the link between a balanced approach to flexibility and security and the wider economic policy framework by giving greater attention to the interaction between economic and labour market policy (although this is highlighted in the processes and outputs of the European semester at EU level, the link is currently less evident in the National Reform Programmes and ought to be emphasised further);
- Make better use of the Open Method of Co-ordination to emphasise flexicurity related policy recommendations by using OMC better in the process of the European Semester to address implementation of country specific recommendations;
- Demonstrate the added value of the strong involvement of social partners by further action at Member State level to foster and achieve greater involvement, including through capacity building as well as the establishment of suitable avenues for interaction;
- More “telling” and monitoring of indicators by selecting and suggesting most “telling” indicators to be monitored more regularly to provide assessment of the key

policies and their impact on labour market outcomes.

One observation to be made on the evaluation is that the time covered would fall short of important reforms that have indeed been undertaken by a number of Member States in the flexicurity area after 2010. The report acknowledges that. But a thorough assessment felt outside the mandate of the evaluation.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa**

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=10018&langId=en>

### **Mid-term evaluation of the European globalisation fund (EGF)**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 04 05

**2) Timing:** 8 December 2011 (duration: April 2011-November 2011. period covered January 2007- April 2009).

**3) Budget:** overall multi-annual budget of the evaluated Programme: 500 million EUR per year (7 years).

#### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation was to assess the effectiveness and sustainability of the EGF through analysis at two levels: (a) the EGF instrument (b) the level of the 15 individual cases implemented between January 2007 and June 2009. The latter also included an assessment at the level of the individual measures funded by the EGF in each of these cases and their beneficiaries. The mid-term evaluation was required by Article 17 of the EGF Regulation (Regulation (EC) No 1927/2006), which stipulates that an evaluation on the effectiveness and sustainability of the results obtained by the EGF must be delivered by 31 December 2011.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

The headline findings and conclusions on the effectiveness and sustainability both the EGF as an instrument and the performance of the individual cases are:

**(i)** The average gross re-employment rate was 41.8% and ranged from 78% to 4% in individual cases. In the longer term, re-employment rates tended to rise after 12 months after the closure of EGF assistance.

**(ii)** Stronger performing cases tend to be associated with the provision of personalized support for workers and tend to be complemented by strong further national support measures.

(iii) Unsurprisingly, the subjective assessment of the value of EGF support is relatively positive among participants, however, it is noteworthy that independent experts also have a quite positive qualitative assessment of the value of EGF action.

(iv) Apart from the direct re-employment, EGF assistance also generated other positive effects, in particular in the form of distance travelled towards the labour market for individuals (increased confidence, improved job search and other skills).

(v) EGF budget absorption varies widely across the cases and it is not possible to generalize about the contributing factors.

In interpreting the findings it should be borne in mind that:

(i) EGF support can sometimes arrive in a locality a significant time after job-losses occur. In such cases, some redundant workers had already re-entered the labour market while those remaining tend to have a 'harder-to-help' profile. The theme of more responsive procedures is reflected in the recommendations.

(ii) The evaluators found that lower educational levels were associated with those cases where re-employment rates were lowest, while higher re-employment rates tended to be associated with areas with lower general unemployment and more favourable economic conditions.

The report makes a number of **recommendations** on EGF 'architecture' and processes at the level of the instrument:

(i) Maintain the current triggering **threshold** of 500 redundancies

(ii) Promote awareness that workers made redundant outside the 'reference period' can be considered as eligible.

(iii) Increase **flexibility** of implementation

(iv) Review possibilities to speed up the **application process**

(v) Strengthen the capacity for submitting applications at national and regional/local level, and provide further opportunities for sharing lessons and good practices

(vi) Clearer **monitoring requirements**, including follow-up of beneficiaries, and financial means to carry out this monitoring.

(vii) Provide practical advice on **monitoring and reporting**, and support exchange of good practice

(viii) Greater local **dissemination** efforts to raise the visibility of the EGF

(ix) Ensure **communication** between institutional stakeholders

## 6) Availability of the report on Europa:

## **Evaluation of Public Employment Services performance measurement systems and corresponding recommendations on geographical labour mobility indicators**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 04 03

**2) Timing:** 15.05.2012, (Period covered by the report: December 2010 – March 2012,)

**3) Budget:** Multi-annual budget for EURES activity plans (2006-2013): EUR 100,000,000 (ca. EUR 14,200,000 on a yearly basis)

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

In the framework of the preparation of the EURES reform to contribute to the objectives of the EURES 2020 strategy, it was deemed necessary to obtain a clear picture of the Public Employment Services (PES) performance measurement systems and indicators to monitor transnational and cross border geographical labour mobility. The PES being members of the EURES network, there is a considerable degree of diversity in their monitoring tools.

The study was thus aimed at a) carrying out a comparative analysis PES monitoring and performance systems and b) mapping, compiling and proposing suitable qualitative and quantitative indicators. The scope has been the transnational and cross border geographical labour mobility activities implemented by the PES in the framework of the 2010-2013 EURES guidelines.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

EURES is undergoing a reform with a view to transform the network into an economic and result-oriented EU job mobility tool, with the potential to contribute to achieving the employment and economic growth milestones of the Europe 2020 strategy. Apart from information and advisory activities related to the free movement of workers in the EU, EURES is deemed to enhance its performance when it comes to recruitment, job matching and job placement, i.e. it should help jobseekers to find work in other EEA countries and employers to find workers across borders.

In this context the study gave an EU-wide insight in the existing PES performance measurement systems; it examined their strong and weak aspects as well as the areas for further development. The main deliverable of the final study report has been a toolbox with commonly accepted output and result indicators, tailored to enhance employment services effectiveness and efficiency when it comes to support intra-EU job mobility. Some of these indicators will be included in the EURES business model as from 2014.

EURES will be more accountable under the coming 2014-2020 MFF namely in terms of quantitative results. Consequently, the study findings are timely appropriate to feed into

the on-going design of the post-2014 EURES operational set up. This will of course have an impact on the PES data sources and management tools to be used across the network.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa**

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7876&langId=en>

**ENEA preparatory action on active ageing and mobility of elderly people**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 04 03

**2) Timing: Period covered by the report:** 2006-2011

**3) Budget:** The total sum of grants for all ENEA projects amounts to EUR 3.6 million.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The preparatory action was launched at the initiative of the European Parliament. The action intended to finance measures to "encourage the establishment of exchange programmes for the elderly through specialised organisations tasked with developing, inter alia, resources for mobility and the adaptation of infrastructures". These exchange programmes should also promote the European mobility and freedom of movement of older persons, enabling them to develop themselves culturally and helping them to fulfil their role vis-à-vis other people and other generations.

The evaluation of the ENEA projects aimed at assessing the feasibility and usefulness of mainstreaming of this preparatory action into an EU-programme, on the basis of the knowledge, know-how and experiences generated in the ENEA projects.

The scope of the evaluation focussed on the effectiveness, efficiency and added value of these ENEA cooperation and exchange projects. It also assessed how sustainable the realised impacts were and what were the main factors behind success or failure of each project.

The following target groups were addressed:

- In terms of age groups: 55 years and older (55+), 50 years and older (50+)
- In terms of social status: unemployed persons, elder workers / employees, retired persons, senior volunteers, disadvantaged persons (low-skilled, educationally disadvantaged, low financial means, socially excluded), persons with low language skills, elder migrants
- Stakeholders such as employers, authorities/ decision makers and organisations as well as people living around migrants.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

Those ENEA projects which aimed at increasing employment struggled with a number of (systemic) obstacles: The different labour market and social security regulations hampered



the possibilities of working abroad and this has not always been anticipated in the project planning. Also the geographic differences in work cultures have been underestimated. These problems were reinforced by the economic crisis making companies reluctant to offer internships and recruiting employees. Thus, the projects' effectiveness in terms of enhancing employability was rather low and even weaker in terms of a concrete re-integration into the labour market. The attempt of a transnational job matching for elderly unemployed turned out to be too ambitious.

By comparison, the promotion of volunteering among elderly persons was more successful and effective. A higher involvement of the target group in voluntary activities could be: not only the participants were willing to engage in voluntary but also the volunteer organisations have become aware of the potential of elderly persons as volunteers. In addition, ENEA seems to have contributed to initiating a change of mind-set in favour of voluntary work in the Eastern European countries and resulted in a know-how transfer from the old Member States' third sector organisations to the new Member States' NGOs.

The projects promoting the integration of older migrants dedicated their work to a relatively new topic: Both the fact that migrants often stay in their host country beyond the retirement age and people migrate after retiring to another Member State have not been considered in many policy schemes up to now. Thus, ENEA functioned to bring this issue on the agenda. Additionally, the project which worked with elderly migrants arrived at activating the target group in general terms (integration in social life, take up of LLL activities). The other project - which did not involve the target group directly - contributed to raising the awareness of the stakeholders.

The using of cross-border mobility in the form of international exchanges can only be recommended under certain conditions: A successful international exchange programme (especially for older people) requires a detailed preparation of the target group. Intercultural training, workshops for personal development, and a preparation in practical issues are to be mentioned. Detailed planning is a prerequisite and refers to travel costs and cost of living abroad but also the management of the running expenses of the participants in their home country during the exchange.

The ENEA programme addressed a wide range of issues regarding active ageing. This goes in line with the character of the programme as preparatory action, but implied a set of targets where rather different approaches were required. Future programme designs should ensure that projects focus on a more specific (or homogeneous) target group and respectively on a specific target.

The evaluators suggested that focussing on the border regions seems to be most promising in terms of the international exchange programmes and cross-border mobility projects.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

Not yet available.

## **ESF in the future: Measuring the impact of changing regulatory requirements on administrative cost and administrative burden of managing the European Social Fund**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 04 02

**2) Timing:** 12 June 2012 (Period covered by the report: 2000-2012)

**3) Budget:**

Overall budget of the ESF for the 2007-2013 programming period is EUR 76.6 billion

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The aim of the study was to analyse the **administrative costs** (costs for personnel, costs for external services which are bought, and overhead costs, including costs arising from Information Obligations). Moreover, it studied the **administrative burden**, which is the cost of administrative activities that organisations conduct only because of ESF. In addition, the study analysed the impact of the introduction of the Simplified Cost Option.

The study had to provide overall conclusions and suggestions for future 2014-2020 ESF regulations based on the analysis of major drivers of administrative costs of the ESF in the 2000-2006 and 2007-2013 programming period.

The study surveyed 12 ESF 2007-2013 Operational Programme Authorities in seven case study Member States: Belgium, Czech Republic, Finland, Italy, Malta, Poland and UK

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

- Total administration costs across the seven MSs amount to EUR1,227,242,000 or 4.8% of the total ESF 2007-2013 budgets (however, it ranges from 2% to 13% of total ESF 2007-13 programme budgets across the seven MSs);
- When compared to similar programmes run by the World Bank, IMF, United Nations and other programmes, levels of ESF administrative costs appear reasonable. The range in the level of administrative costs of these comparable programmes is from 3% (in the case of the ERDF/CF) to 12%, with other national public sector programmes having much higher levels (for example the administration of healthcare). The administrative costs of ESF, therefore, are towards the lower end of the spectrum;
- ESF tends to have higher administrative costs than ERDF/CF (Table 1), spending however less on National Strategic Policy Level, Programme Certification and Programme Audit;
- ESF administration costs are two percentage points higher than of ERDF/CF (4.8% to 2.6%) reflecting ESF's large numbers of projects, beneficiaries and participants, and the average smaller size of projects.
- 39 specific administrative tasks were organised into five administrative groups: National Strategic Policy Level (NSPL); Programme Preparation; Programme

Management; Programme Certification; and; Programme Audit (Table 2).

- The large majority of costs (85%) were within the Programme Management tasks - Information and publicity requirements (18.5%); Verification of deliverables and compliance (10.2%); Ensuring a system for data recording (7.9%), and; Selection of operations (5.3%). Guiding the work of the monitoring committee falls just below the 5% threshold (4.8%);
- Beneficiary administrative costs ranged between 4% and 8% of total ESF support;
- Based on the definition of administrative burden used in the Study 74% of administrative costs are administrative burden. However, levels of administrative burden are highly sensitive to how burden is defined and measured. If a strict measure of the term is used (i.e. any activity defined in the regulations, excluding 'other' administrative tasks, overheads and national/regional regulations) levels of burden would appear to be even 85%. Similarly, if the measure takes into account 'business as usual', which is expected to be variable across Member States depending on the degree to which their national systems either mirror or diverge from EU practices, levels of administrative burden would be lower (41%);
- Larger OPs lead to lower administrative costs and workload. However, the relationships between level of administrative costs and geographical coverage, management experience, governance and OP complexity were not found by this Study to be significant. Levels of administrative costs for Audit Authorities and Certifying Authority, despite having similar administrative functions, vary considerably between OPs. The same for the levels of external, overhead and national regulation administrative costs;
- The availability of SCOs had generally been positively received by OP Authority pointing out both their advantages and disadvantages. There is also evidence to suggest that the flat rate and unit cost SCOs have reduced administrative costs, in some OPs. Respondents believed that the overall level and costs of ESF administration had increased compared to the 2000-2006 ESF Programme.

The study has been completed in the middle of 2012, after the cohesion policy legislative package had been presented by the Commission. However, the outcomes of the study will be used during the negotiation process as well as during the preparation of the Operational Programmes.

The analysis has proved that the overall administration costs are reasonable, but indicated that further efforts to reduce administrative costs and burdens should be targeted on those administrative tasks which account for the largest proportion of administrative costs and workload, and therefore are likely to have a bigger impact (e.g. information and publicity requirements (18.5% of administrative costs)). However, further reductions in administrative costs and burdens must not be at the expense of positive aspects of programme administration. For example, selection of operations, is designed to ensure the effective targeting of resources where need is greatest, and influences the quality of operations. Reducing administrative costs may therefore reduce the cost effectiveness of a programme.

It has not been possible for this Study to undertake a full assessment of the impact of the SCOs on administrative costs in the 2007-2013 ESF programme. At the time of the Study,

for many OPs, SCOs had been implemented partially or belatedly, with only limited impact measurable within the timeframe of the Study. However, according to the study SCO alone have not, and are unlikely to, reduce administrative costs and burdens significantly.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=9119&langId=en>

**ESF Expert Evaluation Network: Access to Employment and Social Inclusion**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 04 02

**2) Timing:** October 2012, (Period covered by the evaluation: 2007-2013)

**3) Budget:** Overall budget of ESF for 2007-2013 programming period is EUR 76.6 billion.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The Expert Evaluation Network (EEN) involves one/two national expert(s) in each Member State. They collect and analyse all evaluations related to ESF Operational Programmes carried out by the MS in the 2007-2013 programming period to produce Inventories of evaluations, Country Reports for all 27 MS, and Synthesis Reports at EU level. The ESF EEN was launched in 2011, and lasts until end of 2013. In 2012 two thematic semesters were conducted. The first on “Access to Employment”, the second on “Social Inclusion”. The reports cover ESF related evaluations conducted so far in the 27 MS, related to the programming period 2007-2013.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

Report on Access to Employment:

Key Figures:

- Around EUR23 billion committed
- Over 12.5 million final recipients supported
- Over 2.4 million final recipients achieved an employment result
- but little evidence on sustainability of employment

Good practices identified in some MS:

- Designing interventions to reflect needs and assets of individuals and priority groups
- Engaging effectively with employers
- Building strong partnerships between agencies and beneficiary organisations

Factors helping effective implementation:

- Opportunity to refocus OPs after recession
- Good quality staffing, systems and management arrangements
- National Employment Service with strong capacity

#### Learning Points:

- People with multiple disadvantages need more intensive and/or lengthy interventions
- Important value of key worker/personal adviser working closely with final recipients on one to one basis
- More support needed for final recipients after they enter employment, particularly given weak labour market
- Main constraints:
  - Impact of economic crisis on labour market opportunities
  - Poor design of some key areas of intervention (no baseline, no quantification of targets, etc...)
  - Despite its importance, evaluation evidence on is often fragmented and lacking robustness
  - Simple indicators (i.e. initial job entry) too much dependent on exit data supplied by beneficiary organisations (not always reliable and correct)
  - With rising numbers of unemployed and greater pressure on budgets, big challenge for ESF around balance between helping those closer to and those further from labour market
  - More evaluation evidence needed around this specific issue to guide policy makers
  - Counterfactual evaluations are very rare. Need for more impact evaluations

#### Report on Social Inclusion:

##### Key figures:

- Nearly EUR24 billion committed.
- Over 14.5 million final recipients engaged, although this might involve double counting as SI final recipients engage in different interventions.
- Broad range of target groups: over 2.4 million unemployed, over 1.3 million migrants, and over 1 million young people have been supported by SI interventions.

##### Particularly effective interventions:

- Working in schools with young people at risk of early leaving or at the point of transition from school to work
- Interventions with families from Roma communities
- Activities to bring adults back into the education system

##### Factors supporting effective implementation:

- Focussing on the needs of individuals.
- Well integrated interventions and services.
- Intelligent design of interventions using evaluation evidence but also involving final recipients themselves.
- More emphasis on early interventions, for example to reduce early drop out from school.
- Responding flexibly to changing economic circumstances.
- Building the capacity of the organisations designing and delivering interventions.
- Key support services (drug counselling, money advice, etc.)

- Raising awareness and changing attitudes and behaviours (e.g. towards disabled people) among employers and key agencies.

Main constraints:

- Little robust evidence. In particular on soft results (recognizing the difficulty of measuring these) this is particularly lacking.
- The impact of the economic crisis is pushing socially excluded further back in the queue for job opportunities
- Difficulties in engaging with hardest target groups to reach
- Poor design of some key areas of intervention (no baseline, no quantification of targets, etc...)
- Poor design and delivery of interventions
- Counterfactual evaluations are very rare. Need for more impact evaluations  
Need to know what types of interventions produce significant net effects

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=8954&langId=en>

### **Evaluation of the Common Agricultural Policy measures applied to the cereals sector**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 05 02 and 05 03

**2) Timing:** December 2012 (covered the period from 2000 onwards)

**3) Budget:**

This evaluation covered several instruments and their related budget, as it focuses on the combined impact of policies in one particular sector within agriculture (cereals). The evaluation covered the phasing in of the single payment scheme (SPS) and single area payment scheme (SAPS), which removed the link between the obligation of cultivating a particular crop and payment. For the whole of the agricultural sector, in 2010 SPS payments amounted to EUR 29.07 billion, SAPS payments to EUR 4.46 billion. In the last decade, cereals accounted for between 31% and 33.5 % of the Utilised Agricultural Area in the EU.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation, which was carried out in the context of the 6 year cycle stipulated by the Financial Regulation, covered all direct support schemes laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 and the changes introduced by Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 where these could already be observed. It also covered Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 on the Single CMO in so far as it affected the cereals sector, and its predecessor, Council Regulation (EC) No 1784/2003 on the common organisation of the market in cereals. The changes introduced by Council Regulation (EC) No 72/2009 were examined as far as the effects of these changes could already be observed.

In practice for most data the year 2010 was the last for which information was available. Thus, it covers the period before the introduction of decoupled direct payments (decided in the 2003 'mid- term review' CAP reform), the phasing in (2004-2006) and the post-reform period.

The evaluation covered all 27 Member States and focussed on the period from 1 January 2005 onwards. However, for analytical reasons, data going back to 2000 were used. The analysis focussed on the following crops: common wheat, durum wheat, maize, barley, rye, oats and triticale.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The evaluation concluded that taken as a whole, the reforms have encouraged an

increasingly market oriented approach to cereal growing, without reducing support to producers, endangering the supply for users, or placing an increased burden on the environment. The reforms have been relatively efficient, in that the cost of cereal- specific measures has declined, while national payment agencies and, to a lesser extent, producers see the administrative burden as manageable. Increasingly, support for producers and for protection of the environment is driven by Pillar II schemes, which was outside the direct scope of this evaluation.

The measures have promoted the development of cereal crops and end-uses in which the EU-27 has a comparative advantage. Common wheat is the cereal in which this comparative advantage, judged by international cost competitiveness, is greatest. The reforms included the decision not to grant export refunds, which meant that WTO Uruguay Round limits upon subsidised exports were less relevant.

The reforms promoted efficiency and the outcomes were both coherent and relevant. The exceptions tended to be in sectors where measures worked against the emergence of comparative advantage. The retention of some durum wheat coupled aids (including those via Article 68 payments) created deadweight and failed to prevent a substantial decline in output in traditional areas. The other notable exception affecting cereals was a consequence of non-CAP measures, namely the excessive promotion of silage maize cultivation in some Member States in response to national incentives and the Renewable Energy Directive.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/market-and-income-reports/2012/cereals-2012/fulltext\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/market-and-income-reports/2012/cereals-2012/fulltext_en.pdf)



## **Evaluation of the Common Agricultural Policy measures applicable to the wine sector**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 05 02 and 05 03

**2) Timing:** October 2012 (period covered 2001-2011 with a focus on the impact of the 2008 reform)

**3) Budget:**

From 2004 until 2008, year of the reform, the spending for the common organisation of the market for wine had increased from around EUR 1.1 billion to EUR 1.5 billion per year. Since then, it has decreased to around EUR 1.3 billion per year.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation assesses the effects of the 2008 reform of the wine sector . The reform represents a shift from a support system based on intervention and measures for limiting production to a system aimed at decoupling and with a reduced number of regulatory instruments.

The evaluation covers the years 2001-2011, distinguishing between the period before and after the implementation of the 2008 reform. It covers the 18 wine producing Member States and was based on detailed case studies of wine producing regions and the UK market.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

This evaluation concluded that there is overall coherence between the objectives of the reformed wine CMO and the principles of the 2003 CAP reform, as well as the overall objectives of EU agricultural policy. However, it observed some inconsistency between the measure for promotion on third country markets (promotion of private brands) and those of Regulation (EC) No 3/2008 (allowing generic promotion). The implementation of measures in the form of national support programmes, allowing the flexibility and adaptability of support measures to local needs of wine sectors, has been effective. However, some problems limiting the effectiveness (and efficiency) have appeared, but these are related to the policy management. The evaluation concluded that the objective of simplification seems not have to been achieved with the current programming approach.

The evaluation concluded that for the stabilisation of the wine market grubbing-up is more efficient than the distillation measures, in particular crisis distillation. Moreover, in Sicilia, crisis distillation is more efficient than green harvesting.

Regarding the objective of stabilising producer incomes, in Spain aid for potable alcohol distillation is efficient. In the same MS, the single payment, which substitutes the aid to potable alcohol distillation, is efficient (but not sufficient) for growers who continue producing for potable alcohol distillation, whereas it is not efficient if they have re-orientated production towards non-protected designations of origin wines. The latter case

is likely to distort competition between wine growers receiving the single payment and those who are not entitled.

Regarding the objective of strengthening the competitiveness of EU producers and wines, the measures for "conversion/restructuring of vineyards" and "investments" are efficient, but the terms of implementation in some Member States/Regions have reduced efficiency.

A judgment on the efficiency of the measure "promotion on third country markets" is less straightforward, due to factors related to implementation strategies and rigidity of procedures adopted by some MS/regions.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/market-and-income-reports/wine-2012\\_fr.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/market-and-income-reports/wine-2012_fr.htm)

### **Evaluation of the European School Fruit Scheme**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 05 02

**2) Timing:** October 2012, (period covered: school years 2009/2010 and 2010/2011).

**3) Budget:**

The maximum EU contribution to the financing of the scheme is EUR 90 million per school year.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

In recent years, the consumption of fruit and vegetables has been falling in the EU. The majority of Europeans and in particular children fail to meet the minimum intake of 400 g per day recommended by the World Health Organisation. An estimated 22 million children in the EU are overweight, and 5.1 million of them are obese. Developing healthier eating habits by consuming more fruit and vegetables can play an important role in combating health problems related to poor nutrition, such as child obesity and other risk factors and disorders.

In November 2008 the Agriculture Council of Ministers agreed on a Commission proposal for an EU-wide scheme to provide fruit and vegetables to school children. The EU provides co-financing for the scheme (50% or 75% for convergence regions), with EU funds being matched by national or private funding.

The evaluation was intended to contribute to the reporting obligations laid down in Article 184 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 which provides that: "The Commission shall present a report before 31 August 2012 to the European Parliament and the Council on the application of the School Fruit Scheme, accompanied, if necessary, by new proposals. The report shall in particular address the issues of the extent to which the scheme has promoted the establishment of well-functioning School Fruit Schemes in Member States and the impact of the Scheme on the improvement of children's eating habits".

The School Fruit Scheme started in the school year 2009/2010 and it is not limited in time. The Scheme has a one year policy cycle.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The evaluation has found that the scheme was effective in increasing children's fruit and vegetables consumption. The majority of Member States has observed a positive impact of the scheme on children's fruit and vegetables consumption meaning an increase of consumption beyond the fruit and vegetables distributed to the children. Regarding the influence of the EU funding on the scheme's effectiveness, the evaluation suggests that the EU aid has a positive or even essential impact. The scheme is found to be pivotal for the implementation of nation (or region) wide School Fruit Schemes in nearly all participating Member States. The analysis of potential success factors of the scheme has identified the following factors: a wide range of products, a high frequency and long duration of offering fruit and vegetables, free distribution.

A systematic comparison by the evaluation study of the original National Strategies sent to the Commission on the one hand and their factual implementation, as documented in the annual monitoring reports on the other, showed that many changes occurred between the plan in the strategy and its implementation.

The ex post evaluation suggests that an increase of the EU funding share, provided that other funding remains constant, leads to a higher uptake and a larger scale of the scheme. The scheme was also found to improve the image of the EU and increase public awareness of the importance of the work of the EU.

The results of the evaluation and the specific recommendations were taken into account in the changes proposed to the scheme in the context of the CAP 2020 reform proposals.

The EU evaluation complemented the evaluations carried out by the Member States. The EU evaluation proved useful to put the national and regional implementation data, such as frequency of distribution, in a common format for all participating Member States and regions.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/market-and-income-reports/2012/school-fruit-scheme/fulltext\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/market-and-income-reports/2012/school-fruit-scheme/fulltext_en.pdf)

### **Ex-post evaluation of Rural Development Programmes 2000-2006**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 05 04

**2) Timing:** February 2012, (period covered 2000-2006)

**3) Budget:**

The overall envelope for the rural development programmes 2000-2006 was EUR 59.189 billion.

#### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

For the programming period 2000-2006, the main instrument of rural development policy was Council Regulation (EC) No 1257/99, which originally provided a menu of 22 measures. The 2003 CAP reform added a further four measures, through Council Regulation (EC) No 1783/2003. In addition, the accession of the EU10 on 1 May 2004 added a further seven measures available to the new Member States. The evaluation covered all 15 Member States benefiting from EU co-financed rural development programmes (RDPs) during the 2000-2006 period, plus the 10 Member States which joined the EU on 1 May 2004 and whose RDPs covered the years 2004-2006. The evaluation examined the relevance, coherence, effectiveness and efficiency of the different rural development measures and programmes. In addition, the evaluation also sought to identify factors influencing the contribution of rural development measures to the new challenges under the CAP Health Check and to EU priorities for the post-2013 period.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

At the overall policy level, the objectives reflected identified needs: to change and access markets; reverse the trends of economic and social decline and depopulation of the countryside; remove inequalities and promote equal opportunities; improve environmental conditions and protect/preserve the environment and ensure the viability of farming. In the new Member States, policy objectives addressed the need to restructure the farming sector and reduce dependency on semi-subsistence farming, as well as to meet EU standards and diversify the rural economy and improve the rural infrastructure.

As to complementarity between RDPs and other support instruments, the evaluation indicates that while good examples of complementarity at programme level can be identified, lack of efficient coordination between authorities designing and implementing development interventions in rural areas, seems to be the main reason for low levels of complementarity.

Overall, RDPs demonstrate a capacity to generate positive economic and environmental impacts, although most measures have more impact at the individual beneficiary level than at the level of the whole rural economy and population

Income effects seem to be highly correlated with efficient targeting of measure- specific support and the combined application of measures. In addition, rural development measures maintained and/or generated employment in rural areas, especially at the local and regional level. Net employment effects of RDP measures seem to be generally lower than net income impacts, though it is difficult to distinguish the impact of RDP interventions from that of other factors.

Evidence of environmental impacts is mainly of a qualitative nature due to a lack of robust baseline and monitoring data. The greatest environmental impacts were linked to the agri-environment and forestry measures, and were highly positively correlated with the financial weight of these measures in the RDPs. Effective use of training and advisory services improved the overall environmental impact of programmes.

As to impacts on the quality of life and maintenance of working and living conditions in rural areas, the adaptation measures seem to have produced positive effects on the quality of life and sustainability of rural communities.

Based on the evidence collected and subsequent analysis, the evaluators formulated the

following general recommendations in relation to rural development policy:

(1) Improve targeting: Better targeting is key to improving the efficiency of rural development measures. Targeting should be programme-specific to meet specific needs of the territory. Effective targeting is based on the identification of priority areas, beneficiaries, types of activity or achievement. Therefore improved strategy making is a prerequisite for improved targeting.

(2) Creating synergy: Complementarity between measures should be enhanced within future rural development policy. Synergetic groups of measures should be identified, and links between them strengthened, either in the legal framework and/or in the implementation process.

(3) Unlock potential of underperforming measures. Action should be taken in relation to measures with high but unrealised potential to contribute to objectives e.g. training.

(4) Consider wider rural development needs and opportunities: A better balance should be struck within RDPs, with a stronger focus on the wider rural economy and environment, compared to the agricultural sector.

(5) Develop complementarity with other funds and programmes: Strengthen complementarity between RDPs and other programmes and funds.

(6) Focus on territory rather than individual beneficiaries: Moving the vision of efficiency and competitiveness from the farm and business level to the rural area level as a whole, would improve the impact on rural economies and populations.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/rural-development-reports/2012/ex-post-evaluation-rdp-2000-2006/fulltext\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/rural-development-reports/2012/ex-post-evaluation-rdp-2000-2006/fulltext_en.pdf)

### **Synthesis of mid-term evaluations of rural development programmes 2007-2013**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 05 04

**2) Timing:** November 2012, (period covered 2007- 2009)

**3) Budget:**

The overall envelope of the rural development programmes 2007-2013 amounts to EUR 96.241 billion.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development provides the legal framework for the preparation and the implementation of rural development programmes (RDPs) in the Member States for the period 2007-2013. RDPs were subject to a mid-term evaluation (MTE) organised under the responsibility of Member States and carried out by independent evaluators

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The synthesis of the MTE reports was undertaken by the Commission with the purpose of summarizing and analysing the reports focusing on results and impacts achieved so far by the 2007-2013 RDPs and on the effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation framework. The evaluation covers all 27 Member States. It is based mainly on the 88 national and regional RDPs and 4 Network Programmes 2007-2013 but considers also other supporting documents and data sources, such as the RDPs, Annual Progress Reports and National Strategy Plans for Rural Development. As the MTEs are carried out relatively early in the programming period when many programmes/measures are not yet very advanced in their implementation, conclusions from the synthesis can only give preliminary results on the performance of the RDPs. These preliminary findings are presented below, structured according to the different types of effects on rural areas.

- Economic impacts (growth, employment, labour productivity): 69% of the MTEs report a net positive impact of the RDPs on growth while a modest positive impact on employment was observed in 62% of the reports. As far as growth is concerned, some MTEs that do not state any positive impacts underline that at the stage of the MTE the scale of RDP funding is still too small to have a notable impact on the rural economy. In terms of employment creation, there is evidence that programmes have funded projects which have created new jobs, sometimes in significant numbers, and that they have helped to sustain jobs in farming. As for labour productivity, mixed outcomes are noted. While some positive impacts are stated, some programmes are also evaluated as having prioritised job creation at the expense of labour productivity.

- Environmental impacts (biodiversity, water quality, climate change): Some positive environmental impacts were inferred in the MTEs, mostly on the basis of expert judgments. It is apparent that there has been a significant increase in the area of land under agri-environmental management in a number of Member States and this should help to ensure positive programme outcomes for the environment, insofar as the management obligations are tailored carefully to the environmental strengths and opportunities of each territorial context.

- Impacts on quality of life in rural areas: Qualitative benefits to social capital and reduced social inequalities are cited as RDP benefits in several MTE reports. Furthermore, improved rural services, including waste and water management, as well as tourism benefits, were noted in some cases. These benefits seem to be valued elements for successful and sustainable rural development in the local communities. The synthesis also looked at various aspects of the Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for RDPs, such as the overall functioning of the system and the performance of the output, result and impact indicators used in the evaluations. The MTEs assess the monitoring system as good overall (58%) and as ensuring a relevant set of data in general. However, the system is often regarded as being too complex. On the basis of the analysis, the evaluation recommends a simplification and slimming down of the common indicator set as well as improved guidance and explanation of the calculation, use and aggregation of the indicators. These recommendations are being used in the design of the monitoring and evaluation system for rural development for the period 2014-2020.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/rural-development-reports/2012/synthesis-mte-2007-2013/fulltext\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/rural-development-reports/2012/synthesis-mte-2007-2013/fulltext_en.pdf)

## Ex-post evaluation of the EU Forest Action Plan

**1) ABB activities:** 05 04

**2) Timing:** August 2012, (period covered 2007-2011 with a focus however on the period not studied by the mid-term evaluation published in November 2009)

**3) Budget:** Not applicable

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The EU Forest Action Plan (FAP) was adopted by the Commission on 15 June 2006. Building on the principles of the EU Forestry Strategy (sustainability and subsidiarity), it provides a framework for forest-related actions at EU and Member State level. It aims at serving as an instrument of coordination between Union actions and the forest policies of Member States.

The evaluation covered the 18 key actions and activities as well as additional activities of the Member States carried out in the context of the Action Plan. It also considered the other EU instruments relevant to the implementation of the key actions of the EU Forest Action Plan.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The evaluation reported the implementation of the activities foreseen in the context of the 4 objectives of the forest action plan (to improve the long-term competitiveness of EU forestry, to improve and protect the environment, to contribute to the quality of life, and to foster coordination and communication).

The evaluation concluded that EU Forest Action Plan has had a beneficial impact on the implementation of the EU Forestry Strategy. It indicated that the FAP and its organisational setup was adequate for its purpose at the time, taking into account the core principles defined in the EU Forestry Strategy from 1998. However, there were higher expectations for the implementation of the Action Plan. Yet, fulfilling those expectations would have required a higher level of commitment from the parties involved. With respect to the needs the Action Plan was intended to address, international policy developments have caused and are causing shifts in priorities which were not foreseeable to a full extent when preparing the Action Plan. The EU Forest Action Plan was able to respond to changing needs to a certain extent, but its ability to facilitate open dialogue between different interests related to forests was limited.

The conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation provide a main input in the review of any future EU Forest Strategy.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/market-and-income-reports/2012/forest-action-plan/fulltext\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/market-and-income-reports/2012/forest-action-plan/fulltext_en.pdf)

**Mid-term evaluation of TEN-TEA  
(The Trans-European Transport Network Executive Agency)**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 06 03

**2) Timing:** Completed in July 2012 (period covered 15 April 2008 -14 April 2011)

**3) Budget:** The Administrative costs of the Agency for the period 2008-2011 amounted to EUR 36.06 million.

The TEN-T Programme budget for the period 2007-2013 amounts to EUR8.13billion

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation was required under article 25 §1 of Council Regulation (EC) N° 58/2003 that lays down the status for Executive Agencies and stipulates that an external evaluation report for the first three years of operation shall be prepared by the Commission.

The main objectives of the evaluation were

- To provide a mid-term evaluation of the TEN-T EA, including a Cost-Benefit analysis, and to determine whether the Agency continues to be the most cost-effective solution for the management of the European Union's financial support of the TEN-T Network.
- To identify any problems in the systems and processes used by the Agency.
- To identify permanent monitoring (of the agency) requirements by DG MOVE (periodicity, type etc.).

The scope of this mid-term evaluation included the overall organisation of the Executive Agency, the effectiveness and efficiency of the Agency's operations, the reliability of financial and non-financial data provided by the Executive Agency and the relations of the Executive Agency with other Commission services and with external service providers.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation study:**

The overall conclusion of the evaluation is that the TEN-T EA is a well-run organisation that has successfully met the targets that have been set. The evaluation shows that the Agency is performing its mandated tasks in an effective and efficient way. It has a very high performance in relation to project management tasks. The Agency performance has indirectly facilitated an improvement in the operational implementation of the TEN-T Programme. Using an Agency to manage the projects financed by the TEN-T programme is the most cost-effective option and, as such, the relevance of the TEN-T EA continues to be high. The cost and delivery of the Agency fulfils the objectives and expectations of



improved implementation of the TEN-T programme, as sought at the time of establishing the Agency.

The tasks carried out by the Agency are still consistent with the ones defined in the Commission Decision to establish the Agency and the Act of Delegation. The outsourcing to the Executive Agency remains the most cost-effective manner to ensure the management of the EU's support to the TEN-T network. There are no factors in the organisational environment that have changed to the extent that the merits of the outsourcing option should be questioned. If anything, given the more pronounced constraints on the EU budget, the need to maximise efficiency gains through arrangements such as outsourcing has become even more pressing.

Overall, the TEN-T EA is operating effectively and in compliance with Council Regulation 58/2003, the Financial Regulation and the legal framework by which it was established. The Agency's objectives have been achieved to a high degree and overall target-achievement has improved continuously from 2008 to 2011. The creation of the Agency also offered the possibility of increasing the number of staff dealing with TEN-T project management compared to the level of staff available in DG MOVE. Furthermore, the level of satisfaction of the stakeholders with the services provided by the Agency is high.

The organisational structure of the Agency is well suited for managing its tasks and objectives. The Agency possesses a high level of expertise in project and financial management, but could acquire additional skills in some areas of transport expertise such as traffic-flow forecasting, cost-benefit assessment of transport infrastructure and cost engineering.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

<http://ec.europa.eu/transport/facts-fundings/evaluations/doc/2012-no95-ten-tea-report.pdf>

### **Evaluation of Regulation 1371/2007 on rail passengers' rights and obligations**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 06 02

**2) Timing:** July 2012, (period covered: from the entry into force of the Regulation in December 2009 until mid-2012)

**3) Budget:** Not applicable.

#### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

Under Article 36 of the Regulation, the Commission needs to report to the European Parliament and Council on the implementation and the results of this Regulation, notably

on the service quality standards. The evaluation study was carried out in order to provide input into that report.

The main objective of the evaluation was to gather information on the implementation of the Regulation and to assess whether there is evidence of non-compliance. The evaluation also provides recommendations on how to deal with shortcomings and improve the application.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation study:**

Overall, the evaluator has not identified any single major problem with the implementation of the Regulation, either by Member States or by railway undertakings. There is no evidence of systematic non-compliance with the Regulation, or a major requirement which is so unclear that it cannot be implemented. However, it has been signalled in the report that some provisions of the Regulation are not fully clear and that the implementation of some requirements by certain Member States and railways undertakings is lagging behind. Some of the objectives of the Regulation have only been partially achieved. Main limitations are the following:

- The fact that Member States were allowed to derogate certain services from the application of the Regulation has severely limited its impact.
- Several Member States either have national laws providing for rights similar to those in the Regulation, or they impose similar rights and policies through other means (eg. public service contracts or government decisions).
- Most Member States showed little pro-active enforcement actions. Some specific problems with enforcement have been detected.
- Compliance of railway undertakings was rather poor with the requirement to publish service quality reports.
- There are also some interpretative issues with the text of the Regulation.

Based on the above findings, main recommendations of the evaluation report are the following:

- Exemptions: The Commission should consider whether exemptions should still be permitted for domestic long distance services.
- Actions to improve awareness of passenger rights: There could be a requirement to display notices, in a prominent position, at rail stations and on board trains, informing passengers about their rights. The Commission and NEBs should also take measures to promote passenger awareness of the rights defined in the Regulation.
- Actions to improve enforcement: The Commission should develop guidelines for NEBs, including also the development of an appropriate complaint handling procedure, the provision of information to passengers, and (subject to national law) the circumstances in which sanctions should be considered. NEBs should take a more pro-active approach to

enforcement, in particular through inspections.

- Service quality reports: NEBs should verify that the reports are published and that their content is compliant with the Regulation, and take enforcement action if this is not the case.
- Issues requiring clarification: Some elements of the Regulation, which could be subject to more than one interpretation, should be clarified.
- Issues which are not fully covered by the current Regulation: A number of issues are addressed by passenger rights' Regulations in other transport sectors but not fully by the rail Regulation. In some cases, but not always, this reflects objective differences between transport modes. The Regulation could be extended in the some areas.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/transport/facts-fundings/evaluations/doc/2012\\_reg1371\\_07.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/facts-fundings/evaluations/doc/2012_reg1371_07.pdf)

**Ex-post evaluation of technical follow-up of TEN-T funded ERTMS projects carried out under Service Framework Contract TREN/E2/322-2008 (Lots 1, 2 and 3)**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 06 03

**2) Timing:** Completed in December 2012, covering the period 2008-2012

**3) Budget:** Framework contract with a maximum total budget of EUR2.2 million.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

In 2007, the European Commission entered into a 4-year Service Framework Contract TREN/E2/322-2008 (comprising several lots) to strengthen its capacity to monitor EU funded projects for the deployment of the ERTMS programme. The framework contracts for the technical follow-up and monitoring of ERTMS projects came to an end in December 2012.

The evaluation was undertaken to assess the effectiveness of the Service Framework Contract in delivering the technical expertise which enabled the mitigation and minimisation of interoperability threats within TEN-T funded ERTMS projects. The Commission aimed to determine whether technical follow-up of such projects (and possible future projects) should be continued from 2013 and if so, evaluate the most appropriate way to ensure that these projects (and future ERTMS projects) are fully

interoperable taking into account resource constraints faced by the Commission.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation study:**

The technical follow-up of ERTMS projects carried out between 2008 and 2012 was effective and the experts were able to raise awareness of the importance of interoperability and detect interoperability risks. Experts also identified solutions to mitigate interoperable risks and in some cases, the intervention of experts led to solutions that would not otherwise have been implemented in order to mitigate risks.

Given this demonstrated added-value there is still a serious and on-going need for the level of support that has been provided by the technical follow-up of TEN-T funded ERTMS projects to date. The risk of funding "non-interoperable projects" is still high because ERTMS implementation is still in a critical phase and because there are still some concerns with Notified Body certificates. The report also underlines that the cost of the follow-up compared to the amount of funding provided to ERTMS projects is very small.

The evaluation recommends that technical follow-up should be extended beyond 2013 and 2014 until after 2020 and that the European Railway Agency is the best-placed entity to be in charge of the technical follow-up in the future. An adequate level of resources for the technical follow-up is estimated by the evaluators to be approximately 530 annual man-days. Continued follow-up by ERA would bring highest benefits in terms of effectiveness and efficiency compared to other options involving EU entities. This option also coincides with the DG MOVE agenda for externalisation from 2014.

Key recommendations:

- Technical follow-up should be conducted as early as possible on projects, even in the pre-tender phase;
- The buy-in from stakeholders should be enhanced by making participation in the technical follow-up a compulsory requirement;
- All projects benefitting from EU funding should be subject to technical follow-up.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

<http://ec.europa.eu/transport/facts-fundings/evaluations/doc/2012-no98-ten-t-funded-ertms-projects.pdf>

**Final evaluation of LIFE+**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 07 03

**2) Timing:** 17.12.2012 (period covered 2007-2013)

**3) Budget:**

The on-going Financial Instrument for the Environment (LIFE+) has a budget of EUR2.143 billion covering both the operational expenditure of the DG and the co-financing of projects.

**4) Background, scope and focus**

The LIFE Programme is the EU's main financial instrument to support the implementation of Community policy and legislation in the environment sector. It was launched in 1992 and is now in its fourth programming period. LIFE+ (2007-2013). New elements will be added to LIFE in the next programming period, including the further expansion of the programme scope

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

This final evaluation of LIFE+ comes just over two years after the Mid Term Evaluation and one year after the proposal for a new LIFE programme. From the evidence and opinions collected there have not been any major changes to the nature of the programme, or the quality of its outputs, in the last two years. However there is evidence of the continual improvements in the programme that have been noted in previous evaluations.

The presence of EU added value has been given more weight in bid selection and is more extensively explained in the guidance. Though it is recognised that there is a need to continue reminding projects of this objective and encouraging applicants to look for more.

External monitoring is working well and beneficiaries as well as LIFE units are satisfied with the services provided by external monitors.

The expenditure on public procurement is appropriate and responds to the needs of the policy cycle. There is some high profile communication and outreach supported, but it is hard to assess its strategic impact. Nevertheless it is delivered in line with quality criteria and strategic need.

The administrative burden for participants is slightly higher than for other EC programmes. The participants generally find this acceptable but would like to see it reduce.

The electronic application process, despite some teething problems, has reduced the administrative burden. There is potential to expand the use of electronic reporting in project monitoring.

There are some impressive results; summing up the project output indicators shows 194m hectares of land purchased, 49 600 actions expected, 95 267 training sessions planned, 6.1m people to be targeted by communications and 1.2m pupils and students to be engaged.

There has been an improvement to feedback to NGOs and some improvements on payment timing, though this is limited by EC procedures.

External and inter-project communication within the programme (which is important to dissemination) has improved, e.g. better website and project database, platform meetings, themed brochures and conferences and clustering of projects.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

The report has not yet been published on Europa, but will become available soon.

**Interim Evaluation of Art. 185 European Metrology Research Programme (EMRP)**

**1) ABB activities concerned:**

**2) Timing:** 30 November 2011 , (duration June to November 2011)

**3) Budget:** Total budget Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) around EUR 55 billion (Euratom included) for 2007-2013.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

**Aim of the evaluation study**

1. Assess the **progress towards the objectives** of the EMRP.
2. Assess the **level of financial contributions to the Programme** by participating countries compared to initial commitments.
3. Assess the **performance of EMRP as an integration of national metrology research programmes** in the spirit of Article 169 of the EC Treaty (new Article 185 of the TEU) and assess scientific, management and financial integration. In this context, the role of the European Commission should also be addressed.
4. Assess, with a focus on operations and results, the **EMRP** as operational structure, taking into account the **quality and the efficiency of the implementation**. In this context, the role of the European Commission should also be addressed.
5. Assess the **European added value** of EMRP, using Article 185 TFEU, compared to other forms of support to R&D (via the Framework Programme, via ERA-NETs, via National & Regional programmes).
6. On the basis of this assessment what is the **impact of EMRP** and draw possible lessons to be learnt and **recommendations for adjustments** as appropriate of the current EMRP.
7. On the basis of this assessment, **make recommendations for a possible continuation of EMRP (if applicable)**.
8. On the basis of lessons learnt on the case of EMRP, provide **possible recommendations for future joint programmes** involving Member States and the European Commission using Article 185.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

**Panel Conclusions**

The overall opinion of the Panel is that the EMRP is a well managed joint European research programme that has already achieved a relatively high level of scientific, management and financial integration. After only two years of implementation it is too early to assess the quantitative impacts and so the Panel has concluded on four main questions: how well is the EMRP performing

compared with the original expectations, how can it be improved, how can its impact be increased if there is a successor programme and what lessons have been learned for other Joint Programming Initiatives.

#### Qualitative Impact of the EMRP

The 12 point framework of the ex-ante impact assessment was also used by the Panel to structure its qualitative conclusions on the impact of the EMRP. This had two advantages. It allowed a direct comparison with the expectations and minimised the risk of appearing to be over-critical in areas where the potential impact was not expected to be so great.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/pdf/archive/other\\_reports\\_studies\\_and\\_documents/mtr\\_report\\_final.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/pdf/archive/other_reports_studies_and_documents/mtr_report_final.pdf)

### **Review of S&T cooperation between the European Union and India**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 08 02

**2) Timing:** June 2012, (period covered 2007-2011)

**3) Budget:** FP7 total budget around EUR 55 billion (Euratom included) for 2007-2013.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

*Aim of the evaluation study* Perform an analysis of the impact of cooperation with countries with an S&T Agreement, comprising an in-depth desk research on the achievements and scope of the S&T agreements as well as on-site visit in the targeted country.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:** Overall the Agreement establishes that EU-India S&T cooperation relies on reciprocity and symmetry. Cooperative activities are many and include: the participation of Indian institutions and scholars in the projects funded by the Framework Programme, the pooling of projects, the mobility of researchers and exchange of information. However, the report argues that the Agreement is only partially adequate to enhance EU-India S&T partnership and that internal and context weaknesses need to be addressed including:

1. Mutual knowledge may be improved by means of several types of courses (including e-learning) directed to the actors of the EU-India S&T partnership;

2. Solid and rigorous monitoring and ex-post evaluation of EU-India projects in S&T should be considered as a priority; 3. Coordinated calls might be enhanced by creating joint funding schemes with the participation of the EU and MS. The action of the India Group of the Strategic Forum for International S&T Cooperation should be supported to enhance EU-MS coordination;

4. The EU and India should mobilize stakeholders to produce viable innovations and new technologies through joint projects. EU, MS and India's public funding can play a facilitating but subsidiary role, leaving the private sector as main driver;

5. The EU and India may join in the promotion of inclusive technology in order to find common



solutions to sustainable development needs, both in the EU and in India;

6. The gap between science and industry – and between research and innovation – can be addressed by enhancing the involvement of the private sector in EU-India S&T partnership. Field interviews have provided evidence of interesting initiatives which might promote the collaboration between India and EU's enterprises.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

<http://ec.europa.eu/research/iscp/pdf/india-review-brochure.pdf>

**Review of S&T cooperation between the European Union and Brazil**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 08 02

**2) Timing:** 30 June 2012 (period covered 2007-2012)

**3) Budget:** FP7 total budget around EUR 55 billion (Euratom included) for 2007-2013.

**4) Background, scope and focus**

Aim of the evaluation study: Review the first five years of the S&T Cooperation Agreement between the EU and Brazil

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

Over and above the participation of Brazil in the European Framework Programmes for Research and Technological Development (RTD), the Agreement had a positive impact in moving the cooperation from a bottom-up to a more programme-level approach. This is reflected in the roadmaps developed in the five-year period. However, for the cooperation to achieve a real strategic shape and greater visibility, there is still a need for both sides to converge more strongly on the thematic areas in which to focus the cooperation.

Both sides have openings for participation of the other party in their research programmes, however, Brazilian programmes only allow for individual researcher participation, not institutions.

The Steering Committee has met annually and discharged of its duties, but could strengthen its review of the efficient implementation and functioning of the agreement. S&T policy developments on both sides are regularly reported on and they had an influence on the development of the cooperation within the agreement.

Two joint calls have been implemented in biofuels and ICT respectively; another one in ICT is on-going while a joint call in health has not yet been implemented on the Brazilian side, 2 years after the European side has done so.

The BILAT project in support of the agreement has carried out a lot of useful technical work and promoted cooperation, contributing to a rise in Brazilian participation in FP7 compared to FP6 in terms of numbers of participations and financial compensation. The link to S&T policy in Brazil is not ensured. Brazilian stakeholders interviewed consider collaboration in S&T with the EU and its Member States a priority.

The agreement does not stipulate alignment or interaction with existing S&T agreements of EU Member States with Brazil (agreements, which do not either stipulate any alignment with the EU-Brazil agreement). Yet, they address similar objectives and thematic areas and constitute an important backbone of Brazilian partnerships in S&T with Europe. This duality in the cooperative approach between Brazil and Europe needs constructive consideration at the S&T policy level between the European Commission and EU Member States to avoid redundancies, create synergies and make European cooperation with Brazil more coherent and effective. In the interviews, the recently established Strategic Forum for International Cooperation (SFIC) was viewed as an interesting mechanism for coordination.

The major recommendations are:

- A more focused thematic orientation based on new strategies on both sides.
- Greater participation in planning and execution of the cooperation of relevant stakeholders, especially from the private sector.
- Improved functioning of the Agreement and institutionalisation (delegating technical tasks from Itamaraty (the Brazilian Foreign Ministry as official Brazilian party to the Agreement) to relevant research policy and management bodies.
- Alignment and coherence with agreements and activities of EU Member States.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/iscp/pdf/review\\_brazil\\_agreement\\_2007-2011.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/iscp/pdf/review_brazil_agreement_2007-2011.pdf)

**Review of main activities and deliverables of ERAWATCH**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 08 19

**2) Timing:** May 2012

**3) Budget:** Overall budget - EUR 5,359,200

**4) Background, scope and focus**

Aim of the study:

- to assess the extent to which the project is on track to achieve its objectives as stated in the ERAWATCH2 Administrative Arrangement;
- to formulate recommendations in view of the development of the future Research and Innovation Observatory that should monitor research and innovation policies after July 2013 (follow-up of the current ERAWATCH and TrendChart contracts).

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

The evaluation led to identify six main clusters of key challenges faced by the designers and implementers of policy information systems such as ERAWATCH and which should help guide the design and implementation of future systems. These relate to management, users, content,

infrastructure, quality and value.	
<b>Management</b>	Ensuring an effective and efficient management at all levels of the project.
<b>Users</b>	Appropriately scoping the project and managing accordingly the expectations of what it can deliver in terms of different outputs.
	Engaging with clients and users on a continual basis.
	Satisfying the information needs of multiple users with varying requirements, including stratifying information according to its value in the policy cycle.
<b>Content</b>	Engaging appropriate expertise to provide the necessary content and covering the appropriate breadth of both research and innovation policy.
	Ensuring homogeneity and comparability in the information collected across countries.
	Adapting to changing information requirements.
	Respecting important differences between countries, e.g. in terms of size, economic profile, state of development of the policy system, etc.
<b>Infrastructure</b>	Building a content management system that can support a range of search / information analysis / synthesis functions.
	Ensuring interoperability with other existing platforms / information services (e.g. IUS, OECD) and striving for continuity across the system (retaining historical memory).
<b>Quality</b>	Maintaining a high quality system from data logging and manipulation all the way to dissemination and marketing and implementing appropriate quality procedures for products and processes.
	Being timely and up-to-date.
<b>Value</b>	Providing and demonstrating value added, nurturing a learning network and managing a constructive, changing and flexible system of information providers.
	Disseminating products and promoting and branding the information service.
<b>6) Availability of the report on Europa:</b>	
Not yet available.	

### SME Participation in FP7 - Spring report

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 08 13

**2) Timing:** 14.6.2011 (duration: March-June 2011, period covered: until the 1st of April 2011)

**3) Budget:** FP total budget around EUR 55 billion (Euratom included) for 2007-2013

**4) Background, scope and focus**

Aim of the evaluation study: This "Spring 2011" report analyses the situation of the FP7 Grant

Agreements signed as of the 1st of April 2011.

## **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

Focusing on the SME participation in the Thematic Priorities, EUR 1.779,7 million, or 14.4% of the Cooperation budget, is going to SMEs.

For the 6,544 SME participations in Thematic Research Projects so far, the average EU contribution is 272,000EUR.

Over the full FP7 programme, including Research for the Benefit of SMEs and the Marie-Curie Actions, 10,127 of the participations are by SMEs, receiving an average EU contribution of 249,000EUR.

The Cooperation Programme still has EUR19,893 million available to spend (61.7% of the total budget in the remaining years of the Framework Programme, until 2013). From this remaining budget, 15.4% should go to SMEs in order to reach the 15% target for the whole period.

The SME strengthening measures for the Work Programmes 2011 are not yet visible in this report. The budgetary share of SMEs is forecasted to grow from the current 14.4 % to 15.7 % of the Cooperation Programme, slightly above the 15% target in the Framework Programme legislation. As a specific feature, this report provides a more detailed analysis of the SME support by some of the Joint Technology Initiatives (JTIs). Overall, 21% of the EU contribution to the JTIs goes to SMEs.

This report also includes maps with a regional analysis of the 15% target in signed Grant Agreements within the Cooperation Programme. Tables with the core data per call and on regional participation are enclosed in the annexes of the full report.

## **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/sme-techweb/pdf/smes-in-fp7-spring-2011\\_full-rep\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/sme-techweb/pdf/smes-in-fp7-spring-2011_full-rep_en.pdf)

## **Review of main activities and deliverables of IRMA Administrative Arrangements with IPTS (Industrial Research Monitoring and Analysis)**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 08 19

**2) Timing:** 2012

**3) Budget:** Overall budget -EUR 6,487,300 (over 2008 -2011)

**4) Background, scope and focus**

Aim of the study: To provide judgment and advice on:

- The general progress of the IRMA project: implementation of tasks and degree of attainment of objectives as set in the technical specifications of the project.

- The quality of the "products", in terms of both academic and policy relevance.
- The impact of the project, thus considering the dissemination activities performed with regard to the released "IRMA products" as well as the feed-back received from relevant stakeholders.
- What can be learnt for the IRMA follow up: Recommendations and guidance with regard to a successful implementation of the next phase of activities?

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

The IRMA project needs to be more focussed, more policy oriented with more integration between the various work packages so they can reinforce each other. The combination of the various work packages should lead to cumulative and stronger 'stories' with more political impact. The risk is that each individual work package (Scoreboard, Working papers, Survey, Case-studies) has its limits, without the other work package filling the gap, e.g. if the Survey is too general, the case studies should be chosen to deepen the issues that need more depth. That is, they need to inform each other. The research papers could be structured by a more programmatic approach focussing on a limited number of topics. Regarding the complementary relation between BERD and scoreboard data, additional analysis comparing/ combining the two complementary perspectives are recommended. Additional analyses on fast-growing companies and other companies "below the radar" (e.g. new entrants to the scoreboard sample) are also recommended.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:** not yet published

### **Overview of International Science, Technology and Innovation cooperation between Member States and countries outside the EU and the development of a future monitoring mechanism**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 08 03

**2) Timing:** 08.12.2012

**3) Budget:** FP7 total budget around EUR 55 billion (Euratom included) for 2007-013 period.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The objectives of this study were to provide:

- i) an overview of EU Member States international STI policies and policy implementation;
- ii) an analysis of the evolution and trends in the international STI cooperation policies of EU Member States and their implementation of over the last 10 years;
- iii) recommendations for a practical and cost effective methodology for monitoring the implementation of EU Member States' STI cooperation policies with international partner countries.

The study therefore included the following elements:

- Literature review and synthesis of recent studies/reports on international Science, Technology

and Innovation policies, policy expectations and cooperation activities of EU Member States with countries outside the EU;

- Preliminary screening review of international STI cooperation expenditure by EU Member States to identify the most active Member States in order to focus the subsequent, more detailed data/information gathering activities;
- Collation and overview of the policy objectives of EU Member States for international STI cooperation;
- Collation and overview of STI programmes of EU Member States to support international cooperation;
- Collection of data of EU Member States public sector expenditure on international STI cooperation;
- Identification and analysis of EU Member States funding instruments for international STI cooperation;
- Identification and analysis of EU Member States non-funding policy instruments for international STI cooperation;
- Identification of trends in support to EU Member States international STI cooperation;
- Analysis of the impact (financial and non-financial) of the implementation of public sector international STI cooperation policy of the EU Member States;
- Identification and overview of EU Member States national monitoring and evaluation systems for international STI cooperation;
- Preparation of practical recommendations for Member States and the European Commission for the monitoring the implementation of international STI cooperation policies.

##### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

Data and information relating to MS international cooperation activities exhibit a large variation in terms of availability and level of detail offered and a range of instruments are employed to implement internationalisation policy.

Financial data on international cooperation would ideally provide a strong indicator of related activity and effort. However, the study has identified a number of problems which makes this a difficult undertaking. Data on S&T expenditures at the national level, while available and relatively standardised, is rarely disaggregated into activities related to international cooperation, let alone cooperation with third countries. The same is valid for budgetary data for individual agencies or councils. Many of the problems concerning the lack of disaggregation stem from the fact that much international cooperation in research is driven from the bottom up, particularly through responsive mode research funding programmes. The international aspects within research grants often remain 'hidden' and are infrequently collected by research agencies. The increasing tendency for research agencies to 'mainstream' internationalisation efforts militates against the collection of relevant budgetary data. Nevertheless, based on the limited financial data that was available, it is possible to group the reviewed MS according to: overall expenditure on international S&T cooperation with

third countries and trends in expenditure on international S&T cooperation activities with third countries.

Bibliometric data appear to offer a very useful approach to assessing levels of international cooperation between countries in terms of identifying major partner countries, research focus and trend information. They reflect the bottom up nature of international S&T collaboration very well; but do not necessarily reflect top down policy priorities. They have a series of disadvantages identified and rather surprisingly, their use among the reviewed MS was found to be rather limited to international benchmarking exercises and little routine use for monitoring purposes was encountered.

A number of the reviewed MS reported the use of assessments of national internationalisation activities in S&T although few reported the use of specific indicators. Only one of the MS reviewed reported the use of indicators to monitor the progress of S&T internationalisation objectives. Very few agency-level monitoring exercises on international S&T cooperation activities were reported. Evaluation of individual programmes relating to international S&T cooperation was reported as quite widely established. However, most of the examples tended to focus on issues of scientific quality, with publication data tending to form the most commonly applied indicator.

Based on the analyses carried out the study has proposed a list of indicators that may be applied in the context of monitoring MS' activities in S&T international cooperation, both with regard to intra-EU and third country activities. The study also identified a number of barriers to the use of indicators for monitoring and evaluation purposes, which will need to be addressed. Finally the study came up with a set of recommendations for the design of a potential system of indicators for the monitoring of MS international S&T activities with third countries: 1) Derive accepted definitions, 2) Clarification of the purpose for indicator design and use, 2) Prioritisation of key indicator requirements, 3) Systematic Monitoring arrangements, 4) Allocation of responsibilities and oversight and 5) Derive a framework typology for instruments.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:** not yet published

### **Strategy definition and road mapping for industrial technologies to address grand challenges**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 08 04

**2) Timing:** 27.4.2012

**3) Budget:** FP total budget around EUR 55 billion (Euratom included) for 2007-013 period.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The main aim of this project is to assess the links and relevance of present Nanosciences, Nanotechnologies, Materials and new production technologies (NMP) activities to the major technical issues and bottlenecks associated with Grand Challenges, providing a set of operational recommendations.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:** The

study identifies a list of critical bottlenecks, R&D, legal and market obstacles, some of which are political in nature. These underlying bottlenecks need to be addressed first, in order to be able to set out constructive development processes in the context of the Grand Challenges. They require concentrated cooperation with other Directorates of the Commission as well as policy initiatives on a higher level.

There is a shift towards priorities addressing the Grand Challenges across the OECD and third countries. However these programmes vary in their focus on research, innovation and technologies; whilst a number of countries have developed programmes that support scientific and technological R&D in many or all of the Grand Challenges, far fewer countries have developed programmes of innovation support.

The study recommends encouraging competitive clusters that manage and implement R&D projects would be a strong strategy to address the needs for more commercialization and higher competitiveness as a policy options.

Recommendations for the European Commission:

Building the design of policies for the benefit of European innovation and economic growth on more comprehensive and well-informed social and economic studies.

Policy measures should aim at strengthening European corporate actors, and find ways to support decreasing levels of R&D funding by European companies. This would include predictability of regulatory regimes, tax credit schemes, and other investment incentives.

The European Commission should focus on technologies already close to the market today, searching for demonstration and scaling up solutions. The EC should support actions for regulatory tools to implement existing technologies in need of a bigger market to become competitive.

Undertake actions to create an open European VC market.

Introducing cluster-driven, large scale regional programmes for industrial technologies under Horizon 2020.

Act more proactively as facilitator to attract and pool more national funds for joint activities in the area of key enabling technologies.

Separate projects related to awareness building, testing and education about KETs and their possible influence on humans.

European-wide projects oriented towards integrating innovation results with cultural expression and social science investigation.

Results of frontier research projects should undergo screening by skilled engineers and other relevant professionals in the relevant field before publication, as there is a risk of intellectual property leakage.

Support for market-oriented public-private partnerships should be specifically implemented in areas that show strong science-technology linkages, such as chemicals, drugs, instrumentation and electronics, or other that may surface during thorough assessments of different research fields.



Partners participating in EC funded collaborative efforts to, e.g., solve Grand Challenges, should also sign up to a detailed and committing exploitation plan before embarking on the project, all the way down to who will build pilot and implement the manufacturing process.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:** not yet published

## **2011 Monitoring Report of FP7**

**1) ABB activities concerned** 08 02

**2) Timing:** 29.08.2012, (period covered: 2007-2011)

**3) Budget:** FP7 total budget around EUR 55 billion (Euratom included) for 2007-013 period.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The Commission has a legal obligation to continually and systematically monitor the implementation of the FP7 and its specific programmes and regularly report and disseminate the results of this monitoring (FP7 Decisions (EC and Euratom, Articles 7(1) and 6(1)).

FP7 monitoring is an annual exercise, with the resulting report covering the year preceding the report's publication. The main objective of the 2011 Monitoring Report was to comply with these requirements and to report about the implementation of FP7 in 2011.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

The 46 calls for proposals with call closure date in 2011 recorded in CORDA by February 2012 attracted in total 16.212 applications for funding. In February 2012 included and retained proposals involved a total of 59.955 and 12.932 applicants respectively with an overall success rate of 22%. The so-far recorded numbers of applicants in retained proposals are almost the same as in 2010 (13.710), but significantly lower than those recorded in 2009 (19.471), while their success rates are lower to those of last year (23,9%) and is the average for the five years (22%).

The aggregate figures for the period 2007-2011 show that for a total of 307 concluded calls, 95.862 proposals were submitted, out of which 79.145 – involving 386.812 applicants – were included, and 16.089 – involving 85.248 applicants – retained for negotiations. The average success rate for the five years period was 20% in terms of proposals and 22% in terms of applicants.

Under the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) Framework Programme on Research, in 2011, 40% of participants in retained proposals came from the Higher and Secondary Education sector, so mainly from universities, 26% from industry, and 23% from research organisations.

On the gender dimension of FP7 participation, it is estimated that 20% of contact persons for scientific aspects in FP7 funded projects are female. SMEs received 16.3% of the funding for the Cooperation Specific Programme compared to the initial aim of at least 15% SME funding.

The significant international dimension of FP7 is illustrated by the fact that during five years it

funds projects with participant organisations from as many as 169 countries. Outside the group of EU and Associated Countries the biggest participants are the USA, China, Russia, Brazil, South Africa, India, and Ukraine.

On the redress and ethical review procedures, out of the 2.678 requests for redress received, only 48 led to a re-evaluation, whereas 1.382 ethical reviews were organised so far with no project having been stopped.

Up to February 2012, over 14,000 grant agreements have been signed and over 1,000 projects completed. Based on the final reports of the completed projects, on average each project produced eight publications, four being 'open access'. On average, FP7 projects generated twenty-two direct full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/pdf/archive/fp7\\_monitoring\\_reports/fifth\\_fp7\\_monitoring\\_report.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/pdf/archive/fp7_monitoring_reports/fifth_fp7_monitoring_report.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none)

### **International cooperation in Science, Technology and Innovation: Strategies for a Changing World**

**1) ABB activities concerned** 08 03

**2) Timing: September 2012**

**3) Budget:** FP7 total budget around EUR 55 billion (Euratom included) for 2007-2013 period.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

With the development of the European Research Area since 2000 a clearer focus on the need for more synergy and effectiveness in European STI efforts has developed. The policy context of Horizon 2020 pays increasing attention to the need for economic growth, competitiveness and innovation. Against this backdrop, the Commission set up an Expert Group on international science, technology and innovation cooperation to provide advice for the further development of international cooperation policy and the international dimension of ERA. The EG was launched in parallel with the preparation of two important policy initiatives from the Commission: A Communication on the ERA Framework and a Communication on a European Strategy for international cooperation in STI to be published in the early summer and early fall respectively.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

The main message coming from the Expert Group is that the EU urgently needs a collaborative and integrated strategy for international cooperation in STI. With this in mind several recommendations are launched:

1. The strategy should focus on promoting European attractiveness as an international research and innovation hub and partner in order to strengthen European competitiveness and prosperity.
2. Theme- and problem-oriented prioritization is needed rather than geographic; Grand Challenges as a clear prioritization tool should be mainstreamed also in the international dimension.

Prioritization of international collaboration should follow closely the priorities of the EU's core research and innovation programmes, while the geographical approach should be the core of an implementation strategy.

3. Make the Horizon 2020 truly open and attractive to the best and brightest in the world allowing European actors to work with the best brains wherever they are.

4. The international perspective needs to be more fully integrated into 'regular' programmes at EU level.

5. Variable geometry should be exploited to the full, with flexible arrangements (within EU and with countries outside EU) including multilateral platforms for strategic cooperation. Variable geometry initiatives should also build on lead initiatives by individual Member States that expand their successful bilateral activities to several European partners.

6. A strong focus on firms and innovation is needed. This has not been properly addressed before and it requires a new/different approach; there are fundamental differences in drivers of international cooperation between academia and industry and between research and innovation.

7. Reinforce efforts to strengthen framework conditions for and removal of barriers to international cooperation.

8. Design targeted initiatives for strengthening cooperation in selected (prioritized) areas: these can be multilateral, bilateral, and unilateral. The key criteria should be achieving benefits for European stakeholders, effectively address global, grand challenges, and support the Union's external policies.

9. All initiatives must be based on more evidence- or analysis-based decision-making, including forward looking analysis to inform decision making about likely trends and future changes and systematic exchange of experiences.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

<http://ec.europa.eu/research/iscp/pdf/report-inco-web-4.pdf>

**Future impact of ENIAC and ARTEMIS - SMART 2012/0050 - IAV**

**1) ABB activities:** 09 04

**2) Timing:** 28.11.2012 (duration: 16/06/2012 and 14/12/2012)

**3) Budget (2010+2011):** EUR 850 million (total of the ENIAC and ARTEMIS current ceiling budgets)

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The objective of the study was to support preparation of the Commission proposal for the future ENIAC/ARTEMIS JTI. The study was to analyse the impact of potential synergies between the ARTEMIS and ENIAC JTIs in terms of industrial relevance (research agendas, stakeholders, volume of activities) and efficiencies / economies of scale, including the relationship with relevant Eureka clusters. The objective of the study was also to analyse / benchmark national practices in terms of financial commitments, procedures and funding sources and rates. Finally, the study was to propose key performance indicators for a potential future JTI, with respect to socio-economic data and strategic achievements.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The report provides some key findings and further two sets of recommendations related to the strategic research agenda and the implementation of the future Joint Technology Initiative. According to the study team, JTIs definitely need to be continued. There is a need to continue to support the European electronic components and systems industry in view of strengthening the position of the industry in global value chains and of reinforcing the European innovation system in the global innovation network. There are clear complementarities and strong links between the various parts of the value chain covered by ENIAC and ARTEMIS. These links are set to grow in the future as the components industry seeks to capture the opportunities offered in the higher parts of the value chain. Embedded systems suppliers will also seek to exploit more the possibilities brought by the increasing performance and functionalities of components. It is clear though that progress will also require focused research and innovation actions within the various parts of the chain covered by the two JTIs and that needs to be led by appropriate stakeholders including not only large companies but also SMEs. The study recommends setting up a one stop-shop efficient and effective operational unit for managing programmes for the European electronic components and systems industry, combining the current ENIAC and ARTEMIS JUs in a single entity. And it involves creating room for cross-cutting programmatic activities to better accommodate an already visible trend. The first set of recommendations relates to the development of the research and innovation agenda. First the study identifies that opportunities and conditions need to be created to strengthen the focus on key areas from the double perspective of positioning EU industry in the global value chain(s) and strengthening the relevant parts of the European innovation ecosystem in global innovation networks. In view of a need for focus and critical mass, it is important to develop the new JTI as a limited number of dedicated and focused research agendas linked to the respective

stakeholder communities. Especially a clear focus on the European value added will deliver more than the sum of national or single firm interests; the closer to market support may lead to a gradually growing involvement of users in the new JTI; and balancing short term and long term interests potentially becoming a key issue, applying Triple Helix principles, in which each stakeholder group has its own role, seems to lead to balanced outcomes. In addition, there are significant areas of synergy and some overlap between the JTIs which underlines the importance of creating room for cross-cutting activities between the JTIs. Furthermore, agility and flexibility are needed to face increased development speed and nearing of technological barriers. It is thus advised to create room for identifying new needs and opportunities which may come in parallel to the presently envisioned roadmaps. And finally the participation of SMEs is better than generally perceived, but still needs strengthening. To this end it seems to be vital that networks in which SMEs are embedded (often building on regionalised clusters) are easily recognisable and accessible. The second group of recommendations deals with issues of implementing this agenda and related governance and funding issues. Since the goal of this study was not intended to go into the detailed issues of European law and regulations, the focus was on key general issues which may give direction to the more detailed implementation. The analysis of available sources shows a strong preference for a “one-stop-shop” organisation while at the same time confirming the need for continuation of the present tri-partite model in which European Union and Member States’ funding comes together with industry funding. Unified operations and making the one-stop-shop work require considerable effort on aligning the research and innovation agendas, even when a limited set of different agendas is foreseen. This task might become easier if industry can be incentivised to present stronger focus and priorities which may lead to better focused proposals and better identification of cross-cutting issues, in turn expected to be a better basis for multilevel alignment of funding and other supporting actors. Moving the programmes closer to applied innovation requires also creating opportunities for more flexibility and agility in the management of the programmes. Inevitably the management of the programmes gets deeper entangled in the competitive operations of firms which requires recognition of the role of the programme managers.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/newsroom/cf/dae/itemdetail.cfm?item\\_id=9974](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/newsroom/cf/dae/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=9974)

### **Study on the evaluation of BEREC and the BEREC Office - SMART 2011/0009**

**1) ABB activities:** 09 02

**2) Timing:** 21.12.2012 (Duration of the study: 9 months, Period covered by the report: January 2010- December 2012)

**3) Budget (annual):** not applicable

#### **4) Background, scope and focus**

According to Article 25 of the Regulation establishing the BEREC and its Office, the Commission needs to publish a Report on the experience acquired as a result of the operation of BEREC and the Office within three years of the effective start of operations.

The evaluation report shall be forwarded to the European Parliament and to the Council. The European Parliament shall issue an opinion on the evaluation report.

The objectives of this study were to provide an assessment of the results achieved by BEREC and the Office and their respective working methods, in relation to their objectives, mandates and tasks defined in the BEREC Regulation and in their respective work programmes.

In order to comply with the above obligation and to ensure an impartial evaluation, DG CONNECT launched a call for tender for an external study and the contract was awarded to Price-Waterhouse Coopers (PWC). The work of the contractor has been coordinated by a Steering Committee, including representatives from the Commission, BEREC, market players (ETNO and ECTA) and consumer associations (BEUC). The conclusions of the study of PWC were also submitted to a public workshop, which took place in October 2012. The evaluation Study was published by DG CONNECT on 21 December 2012, on Europa.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The key findings of PWC Evaluation Report regarding the evaluation of BEREC and the BEREC Office are the following:

(1) The structure of BEREC is overall relevant and efficient. It has so far fulfilled its functions rather successfully, in particular under Article 7/7a procedures, but there may be elements for improvement. Furthermore, when considering the effectiveness of the platform to achieve its requirements and objectives, BEREC may be considered, until now, a success.

(2) BEREC can play a significant role to harmonise the electronic communications market. It may fulfil this activity through the development and dissemination among NRAs of regulatory best practices on the implementation of the regulatory framework, through its advisory role and through reports and common positions which should serve as guidelines for NRAs towards a harmonised approach. However, the advisory role should be further defined and the development of an EU approach different from the national interests is sometimes difficult.

(3) The advisory role of BEREC is not sufficiently defined, despite the clear willingness of the European Commission and other EU institutions to employ BEREC as such. Some stakeholders have argued that BEREC does not shed enough light on emerging issues or propose recommendations and/or guidelines to face them; it needs to be more proactive in choosing topics to tackle and in recommending clear solutions to the EU Institutions. The study indicates the difficulty of getting affirmed positions within BEREC - this will require a significant cultural change among NRAs. BEREC, being a bottom-up regulatory model, exemplifies in some cases more national considerations than a pure EU single-market driven approach.

(4) The independence of BEREC vis-à-vis the individual NRAs could be improved, in the sense of developing a collective European thinking different from the national interests of the NRAs which form it. BEREC, as a single entity, should be more focused on missions that concern the Single Market: harmonisation of the internal market and empowerment of EU consumers. Furthermore, BEREC has to be independent from any government or stakeholder. In order to achieve this, it is of utmost importance that, at the national level, each NRA composing BEREC carries out its functions independently.

(5) Better ensure the accountability of BEREC towards its own objectives. BEREC should

be more accountable for the tasks it chooses to tackle by itself, meaning the tasks included in its Work Programmes and the Mid-Term Strategy. To do so, BEREC could indicate in each Annual Work Programme the commitments chosen for the year and in each Annual Report detail what has been achieved with relation to these objectives, for example progress towards its long-term goals: In that perspective, BEREC should reflect on Key Performance Indicators to assess its own progress. However, BEREC's increased accountability shall not be at the detriment of its capacity to take up additional tasks on emerging issues, on its own initiative or upon request of the EU Institutions. If BEREC could express clearly the topics it considers as key, it could then define priorities and could strengthen, first, its role of advisor to the EU institutions regarding the harmonisation of the Single Market and, second, its role with regard to NRAs in relation to benchmarking, snapshots sharing and exchange of best practices.

(6) As to the efficiency of the organisation, the scope and the regular review of the BEREC Work Programme could be enhanced, in order to achieve greater prioritisation. The decision-making process should be more top-down and provide more room to the Board of Regulators (BoR) to take strategic decisions. BEREC is currently working with a bottom-up approach, with the technical work done at the EWG level. Moreover, the heavy agenda of Plenary Meetings prevents the BoR members from discussing strategic issues and considering the future role of BEREC with regards to the evolution of the electronic communications market.

(7) The use of the BEREC Office needs to be clarified and improved. It is the responsibility of the whole BEREC platform to best utilise the BEREC Office for both administrative and professional purposes. As per the professional support, the expertise of the Office staff is today not used as much as it could or should be. In that perspective, BEREC should decide, together with the Office and in line with the Regulation, on the exact tasks of the Office and on the role and responsibilities of each actor.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/newsroom/cf/dae/document.cfm?doc\\_id=1403](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/newsroom/cf/dae/document.cfm?doc_id=1403)

**Inventory and Review of Spectrum Use: Assessment of the EU potential for improving spectrum efficiency - SMART 2011/0016 - PC**

**1) ABB activities:** 09 02

**2) Timing:** 11.09.2012 (Period covered by the report: 10 months)

**3) Budget (annual):** not applicable

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

Spectrum is a scarce resource, but more and more wireless services need access in order to support important Union policy objectives. The need for a review and inventory of existing and future spectrum use was clearly accepted at the Spectrum Summit and in the RSPG Opinion in order to identify available spectrum but also to improve the efficiency of current use. A detailed investigation of actual spectrum use and future needs, as foreseen in the proposed Radio Spectrum Policy Programme, require expertise and resources that go beyond what is available in house.

## 5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:

The Study included a small-scale trial run of an inventory which was simulated by gathering as much spectrum usage information as possible on the supply side. The aim was to gain experience and draw conclusions on the methodology, and to identify specific frequency bands where efficiency could be improved.

The main results and messages of the Study are:

- **Gathering information:** Information on the planned or intended use (allocation and assignment) information is generally available at Member States' level, partly also aggregated at EU level. However, as for the real usage of the spectrum, Member States only partly collect data that is useful for assessing the situation, often only in selected bands. In general, Member States currently have little data on usage. The Study results have shown that there is considerable variation in the scope and level of detail of information on spectrum usage held by Member States. This status quo points towards a need to further build up our knowledge base in Europe so as to improve efficient use of spectrum over time.
- **Proposals for methods to assess data:** A certain number of generic criteria forming multiple metrics are proposed to evaluate the efficiency of spectrum use. These efficiency criteria were developed evolving around the notion of utilisation of spectrum, demand trends, technology inherent factors and geographic extent of deployment so as to evaluate technical efficiency. These are to be complemented by economic and social value assessments which are of more complex nature and do not directly result from the data gathered, but need to be assessed in light of the specific measures being proposed to remedy the inefficient use.
- **First identification of "suspect" bands based on technical usage efficiency:** In applying this method the Study identified a first set of bands which is underutilised or not used at all. While several bands confirm known problematic cases, these results should not be taken as final results, but as a demonstration how the proposed method leads to concrete deliverables.

The results of the Study are a basis for the Commission's work on the spectrum inventory. They also guide discussions with Member States on a bilateral basis and in the Radio Spectrum Committee, in order to clarify the positions of the Member States with regard to a proposal from the Commission for an implementing act on spectrum inventory.

A potential limitation can be the accuracy of data gathered by consultants.

## 6) Availability of the report on Europa:

<http://emplaps1.empl.cec:7779/scc-upl-info/67703.pdf>

## Development of impact measures for e-Infrastructures - SMART 2010/0051

1) **ABB activities** :09 05

2) **Timing:** 7 March 2012 (Period covered by the report: 14 months)

3) **Budget (annual):** The total EU contribution to the projects selected for the study



survey is EUR 211 million.

#### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

The study was conceived to contribute to FP7 mid-term and final assessment with the development of measures and indicators and the evaluation of results and impact of the e-Infrastructures part of the Capacities programme. It served as a pilot for e-Infrastructure program impact assessments. Its main function was to gain knowledge of and insights into the direct and indirect impacts and achievement of objectives at the program level. This was approached by analysing single projects as components of the program to understand the program's impacts, pertinence and acceptability

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The study developed a set of five general characteristics that are representative of the goals of the e-Infrastructure program:

- **Accessibility:** provide access to scientific data, scientific information (e.g. scientific publications) and infrastructure capacity based on interoperable, standardized platforms. Examples of this are access to unique facilities (EVALSO) or access to scientific information (OpenAIRE, Geo-Seas).
- **Efficiency:** contribute to a more efficient way of working by providing improved or new problem solving capacities (software and infrastructures). Examples of this are EGI and PRACE providing efficient computing capacities.
- **Innovativeness:** contribute to fields beyond services to science by laying down new foundations in ICT and exploring usage potential in other areas. Examples of this are Géant activities towards Future Internet or the MMM@HPC objectives for the better use of infrastructures for industrial users.
- **Sustainability:** contribute to interoperable sustainable availability of scientific data, information and capacities. One example is the work of SIENA towards standardisation of data infrastructures.
- **Transformative Character:** contribute to the process of transformation in scientific work towards e-science through increasing collaboration between researchers from different locations and disciplines and enhancing human capital for e-science. For each of these general characteristics, intervention logic and relevant survey items and data analysis tools were developed. The study surveyed 21 projects to test and refine survey questions and assessed outputs, outcomes and impacts based on the pilot survey results. In addition to the quantitative analysis of the survey data, case studies were carried out to gain a better understanding of the interrelations of the five characteristics. The study draws two main conclusions regarding the monitoring and evaluation of e- Infrastructures. A first conclusion is that continuous monitoring is needed to understand the evolution of e-Infrastructures and to support the e-Infrastructures program in fostering their development. However, there are limitations in using survey data collection as a single source for evaluations. Therefore, simple standardised surveys should be complemented with more rich data gathering at regular periods, in terms of more extensive surveys, case studies or interviews, for example. The second main conclusion is that a “one size fits all” approach for evaluation is not sufficient for the e-Infrastructures projects. There must be differentiated approaches to take into account the differences in the specific domain, size and objectives of projects under the programme. Further actions on this field should not rely on one single data gathering and

analysis approach but aim to find the best combinations of approaches to cover all e-Infrastructures projects. The study suggests that the regular monitoring system to be embedded in yearly reporting of e-Infrastructures projects should contain the following items:

1. Change of available resources
2. Efficiency gains for users/user projects
3. Cooperation and collaboration with other projects
4. Number of user-reported innovations
5. Number of announced patents
6. Developed standards
7. Origin of users
8. Use of results in education or training
9. Number of scientific or engineering disciplines addressed
10. Training provided for participants and users.

The study cooperated with the ERINA+ and the eNventory projects, and helped to identify better impact indicators. The study also contributed to the definition of metrics for the eInfrastructure unit and indirectly helped to build the indicators for e-infrastructures projects evaluation and assessment at programme; also for future Horizon 2020 Research Infrastructures activities.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

<http://emplaps1.empl.cec:7779/scc-upl-info/65561.pdf>

**Interim Assessment of the Future Internet Public-Private Partnership**

**1) ABB activities :** 09 04

**2) Timing:** May 2012, (Period covered: January 2011 – May 2012)

**3) Budget:** EUR 90 million for projects in place (the overall programme EUR 300 million)

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The Future Internet Public Private Partnership Programme (FI-PPP) is an initiative launched under the 7th European Commission Framework Programme which consists of public-private research and development partnerships concerning the Internet of the future.

It aims to advance Europe's competitiveness in Future Internet technologies and systems and to support the emergence of Future Internet-enhanced applications of public and social relevance. It addresses the need to make public service infrastructures and business processes significantly smarter (i.e. more intelligent, more efficient, more sustainable) through tighter integration with Internet networking and computing capabilities.

The Competitiveness Council of May 2012 acknowledged that Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) are crucial for addressing European socio-economic challenges and requested a

mechanism for evaluating the long-term socio-economic impact of the PPPs and their activities and the Council and European Parliament be informed on the results of the above analysis on the progress of PPPs.

The objectives of the FI PPP Programme interim assessment were:

- to evaluate the concept developed for the FI-PPP
- to assess the overall progress achieved in the first year from the launch, including the cost-effectiveness and efficiency of the PPP's mechanisms and structures as well as the prospect for the PPP's reaching its objectives
- to come up with conclusions and recommendations to the European Commission and to the participants in the FI PPP Programme
- to bring forward proposals for how to further develop the FI-PPP
- to contribute to the preparatory work for the detailed work programmes of Horizon 2020, notably the guidelines for PPP

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation**

The Panel that performed this Interim Assessment of the FI-PPP finds that:

- the FI-PPP has been a valuable experiment in attempting to achieve impact similar to that of Joint Technology Initiatives (JTIs) but in a much shorter timescale than JTIs by using the existing instruments of the 7th Framework Programme;
- the decision to use the instruments and processes of the 7th Framework Programme to establish the programme was valid in enabling a rapid response by the EU to technological and market developments;
- the market and technological situation is such that the aims of the FI-PPP to accelerate technological development and take-up by engaging early-adopter users to identify their needs for infrastructure enabled by the future internet are still valid.

However the Panel also finds that:

- the industrial participants in the FI-PPP are not, in concert, fulfilling the role envisaged for them in a public-private partnership;
- the projects supported within the FI-PPP are, generally, making progress toward their own goals but not co-operating sufficiently so as to achieve the goals of the programme.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

<http://www.fi-ppp.eu/interim-assessment-of-the-future-internet-public-private-partnership-may-2012/>

### **Implementation of the DAE - Action of the DAE - Actions under the responsibility of member states - SMART 2011/0023 – IAV**

**1) ABB activities:** 09 02

**2) Timing:** December 2012 (Period covered by the report: December 2010-September 2012)

**3) Budget (annual):** N/A

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The Digital Agenda for Europe (DAE) is the European Commission's flagship programme to boost the economy via ICT and digital technologies and consists of seven pillars and 101 actions. Research was undertaken to identify progress of the actions for which Member States are directly responsible, highlight success factors and the main difficulties encountered in the implementation of the DAE at national level. The findings contributed to the DAE Review, an assessment that reported on progress up to December 2012; furthermore, the Review identified new actions to provide renewed impetus to the original DAE actions.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The study contributed greatly to the knowledge and understanding of DAE progress in the 27 EU Member States and three associated countries. The framework was designed to identify success factors and main difficulties occurred in the implementation of the Digital Agenda at national level. This analysis contributed to the DAE Review, which identified key policy areas and new actions to give impetus to the original DAE targets for the next two years (2013-2015), with particular reference to the achievement of the key performance targets. By creating a single, user-friendly portal, Member State representatives were able to upload the data required at their own convenience (the contractors also received automatic notification that updates had been submitted). This allowed for a simple and effective reporting process. Limitations: the data was largely self-reported by Member States, with some assessment by the contractors; in cases where data was missing or incomplete, the contractors undertook desk research. Best-practices reported by one Member State may not necessarily work in other Member States. Assessing findings and best-practices less than 24 months after DAE implementation may be premature to draw firm conclusions.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

Not yet available on Europa; currently available at  
[http://daeimplementation.eu/misc/DG\\_CONNECT\\_iDAE\\_Final\\_Report.pdf](http://daeimplementation.eu/misc/DG_CONNECT_iDAE_Final_Report.pdf)

### Study into the impact of FP6 IST

**1) ABB activities:** 09 04

**2) Timing:** July 2012, (Period covered by the report: 2002-2006)

**3) Budget (annual):** around EUR 3.9 billion over 2002-2006

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

Consultants Avedas, Logotec and CWTS carried out an independent study for the Commission on the medium to long-term impact of Framework Programme 6 (FP6) IST. The overall purpose of the study was to assess the impact of Community supported research in ICT in FP6, in view of refining the strategy and designing future policy in this field. The

study results are based on solid evidence gathered (large survey with more than 1600 returned questionnaires and 50 case studies).

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The study led to an overall positive assessment of FP6 IST. The three top-reasons for participating in FP6-IST projects, virtually recognized by all organization were the following: exploration of new scientific/technological areas, strengthening or creation of new RTD collaborations and increase in staff capabilities and expertise. As part of the programme was based on specific industrial priorities, it was successful in creating network structures around leading industrial players with the primary aim to efficiently solve specific technological/scientific challenges. In some areas (e.g. Components and Microsystems) projects integrated the key players across different parts of the value chain, leading to medium term competitive advantages and higher wider impact on innovation. Programme activities focused on longer term scientific objectives were found to be successful in creating network structures around universities and research centres. This was the case of networks formed in e.g. "knowledge & interface technologies" or FET. The study also found that FP6-IST had positively affected a large proportion of the EU R&D workforce on ICT and produced major spill-over benefits that are considered to largely exceed the direct benefits of projects to Programme participants. The important amount of the knowledge produced in FP6-IST was published in leading scientific and technical journals and was presented in high profile conferences and exhibitions. Exploitation however was found to be weak. While output at the project level was generally estimated as effective and competitive, when estimating outcome and impact of the programme after some years, the positive effects were downscaled. The main underlying mechanism that explains the drop down is the degree to which a project is crucial to the participating organizations. Most coordinators of virtually all organization types recognized SMEs as the main innovation actors in projects. In the case of commercialisation, SMEs often played the role of a catalyst or driver, driving exploitation towards marketable products and services. But very few SMEs tend to bet their company on the expected results of an FP project; the project is important but not core to their business strategy but they see it more as a complement to their activities.

The study provides a number of ideas and recommendations on how to refine our strategy for more innovation and offering a better track to exploitation:

- Enhancing the role of European SMEs as key innovation actors
- Drawing attention and focus of Programme participants on market innovation
- Reviewing the existing rules for IPR
- Strengthening international cooperation targeting world leading scientists
- Promoting a more innovation-oriented mentality at the level of programme design
- A more entrepreneurial approach towards the Innovation Union

The study results were an important input to H2020 programme preparations.

The focus on Innovation has been a primary concern in designing the future R&D&I programme for the coming programming period (2014-2020). Horizon 2020 includes not only research and innovation funding currently provided through the Framework Programmes, but also the innovation activities previously funded under the Competitiveness

and Innovation Programme (CIP). This concern is reflected also by the structure of Horizon 2020, as the emphasis given to key societal challenges is expected to bring together resources and knowledge across different sectors, technologies and scientific disciplines, in order to develop breakthrough solutions. Moreover, the programme will cover activities from research to market with a stronger focus on innovation related activities, such as piloting, demonstration, test-beds and market uptake of innovation. Finally, the proposed financial instruments are in general less risk-adverse and more open. One of the most prominent examples of influence on policy making is represented by the recognition of SMEs as innovation drivers in Horizon 2020. Concretely, this means activities more focused towards SMEs with reduced red tape and a sizeable dedicated budget, a novel scheme targeting highly innovative SMEs with the ambition to grow and internationalise, and support to SME clustering to access the technology that they can't afford alone. Another example is the follow-up of the study's recommendation for a more entrepreneurial approach, which has been translated in a stronger focus on innovation (see above). Finally, IPR concerns are addressed by Horizon 2020 by proposing, among others, a single set of participation rules, also on IPR.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa**

<http://emplaps1.empl.cec:7779/scc-upl-info/63031.pdf>

### **Assessment of the economic and social benefits of digitisation of cultural heritage - SMART 2010/0048**

**1) ABB activities:** 09 03

**2) Timing:** January 2012 (Period covered by the report: 10 months)

**3) Budget (annual):** not applicable.

#### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

The study was commissioned in the context of the i2010 strategy to provide information about the direct and indirect economic and social benefits of digitising cultural works and making them available online, focussing on benefits such as new markets for such materials, and potential new revenue streams for the right holders. It aimed at paying particular attention to the digitisation of books (especially out-of-print books), and the benefits of streamlined rights clearing mechanisms to digitalise books and making them available online.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation**

The contractor was asked to assess the direct and indirect, impact of digitisation of cultural heritage on economic, social and environmental variables. The report proposes a basic logical framework (map of casual relationships and relevant indicators) on how the digitisation of cultural heritage impacts on economy, society and the environment.

The empirical evidence collected by the contractor is mainly based on a set of case studies

of digitisation strategies and practices in eight different cultural institutions.

These case studies were selected to cover different types of cultural organisations (libraries, archives, museums and audiovisual archives) and different countries within the European Union. One case concerns the United States (US Library of Congress).

The case studies considered are:

- The British Library;
- The Hispanic Digital Library;
- The Dutch National Archive;
- The French National Audiovisual Institute;
- The Ghent University Library;
- The Parthenon Frieze;
- The Polish National Library;
- The US Library of Congress.

For each of these case studies, the contractor used interviews, as well as other data gathering techniques, including desk research and available scientific literature. Based on these sources, the study includes a rather diverse set of quantitative and qualitative evidence concerning the impact of digitisation on the 3 domains concerned. It includes also statistics concerning the usage of digitised resources at level of cultural institutions.

In several sections of the study, the contractor stresses the unavailability of solid key data and methodological limitations in the modelling as factors that make it particularly difficult to reach general quantitative conclusions about the impact of digitisation, in particular for the long term macro-economic impact.

As for the financial return at micro level (cultural institution), the study makes wide use of assumptions. In particular, the contractor stresses that the information on costs and benefits is not currently available in a form which allows for the return on investment to be calculated in an accurate manner. A Net Present Value (NPV) methodology has been applied to the cases studies considered. The conclusions indicate that the NPV of digitisation is almost always negative, and that at present only audiovisual works could offer opportunities for leveraging direct revenue for cultural institutions.

As for the return on investment at macroeconomic level, the study estimates that each Euro invested in digitisation can produce benefits in the amount of EUR 1.20-3.00, including social and education benefits. The value range proposed is quite wide, which limits its relevance. More than for the NPV methodology, the contractor points to the severe limitations on the availability of data and the rather arbitrary assumptions on which such an estimate is based.

Concerning the scenario involving a significant upgrade of the financial intervention in support to the digitisation of cultural heritage, the study suggests a linear growth of the benefits associated to digitization.

Results fed into the review of the PSI Directive and also into the Commission's Recommendation of 27 October 2011 on the digitisation and online accessibility of cultural

material and digital preservation (OJ L 283, 29.10.2011, p. 39).

**6) Availability of the report on Europa**

Not yet available

**Report on Communication and Recommendation on mobilising Information and Communication Technologies to facilitate the transition to an energy-efficient, low-carbon economy COM (2009) 111; C(2009) 7604**

**1) ABB activities:** 09 04

**2) Timing: published in February 2013, (duration of the evaluation: December 2011-September 2012)**

**3) Budget (annual):** Not applicable

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

According to Key Action 12 of the DAE the Commission was to assess whether the ICT sector has complied with the timeline to adopt common measurement methodologies for the sector's own energy performance and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and propose legal measures if appropriate. There are a myriad of standardisation initiatives worldwide on the energy/carbon footprint of the ICT sector. Those efforts are usually focused on subsectors of the industry (e.g. telecom) and it is not possible to add them up and have a complete overview of the industry's total footprint. Therefore there was a need for a consistent measurement framework.

The evaluation of methodologies to assess the environmental footprint of ICT was twofold:

1) the practical point of view of methodology usage was conducted through pilots run with the industry (<http://www.ict-footprint.com/>);

2) the analysis of methodology to check their quality and completeness was conducted through the study SMART 2011/0073 "Towards an overall measurement methodology of the carbon and energy foot prints of the ICT sector".

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The overall conclusion regarding compatibility of footprint methodologies and standards for ICT organisations, products and services is that on the one hand they are in principle compatible and can deliver the same results, but on the other hand that the methodologies leave considerable freedom to make different methodological choices, potentially leading to different outcomes. Thus two footprint practitioners using different methodologies or even the same methodology may arrive at different results as a result of the methodological changes they made. It was also noticed that the emission factors used, the databases, the calculation tool, the quality of the activity data and the person who is conducting the footprint have a larger impact on the outcome of the calculations than the choice of the methodology.

The overall conclusion regarding workability is that in principle all methodologies are



workable, but it needs to be kept in mind that foot-printing in general requires a considerable amount of resources in terms of (out of pocket) costs and/or staff. The most resource intensive part in any foot-printing study is the collection of data. The needed resources for foot printing analyses depend on:

- The complexity of the ICT organisation, product or service that is foot-printed;
- The availability of existing tools (e.g. semi-automatic treatment of LCA data) and outcomes of previous footprint studies that were developed and used in the past;
- The level of knowledge and experience from previous work available internally.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item\\_id=9689](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=9689)

**Ex-post evaluation on the implementation of the compensation regime the additional costs incurred in the marketing of certain fishery products from the outermost regions the Azores, Madeira, the Canary Islands, French Guiana and Réunion**

(Evaluation of the measures in the EU's outermost regions under Council Regulation (EC) N° 791/2007)

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 11 02

**2) Timing:** 1 August 2012 (Period covered by the report: 2007-2010)

**3) Budget:** Maximum amount: EUR 14.996 million per year, EUR 105 million for 7-year period (Art. 5.4. of Council Regulation (EC) 791/2007)

**.4) Background, scope and focus:**

Council Regulation (EC) 791/2007 introducing a scheme to compensate for additional costs incurred in the marketing of certain fishery products from certain outermost regions (the Azores, Madeira, the Canary Islands, French Guiana, and Réunion) stipulates in its Art. 8 that the Commission shall, on the basis of an independent evaluation, report to the EP, the Council and the Economic and Social Committee on the implementation of the compensation, accompanied where necessary, by legislative proposals. The evaluation aimed at measuring the performance of the scheme compared to its objectives, and to propose possible ways of improvement. This evaluation was achieved by external consultancy (Oceanic Développement (F) in association with MegaPesca (P) and the Fundación Universitaria de Las Palmas (E)). The work included an analysis of the documentation available, comprehensive visits of the regions concerned (national and regional institutions, private sector of the industry and ancillary sectors), and review with the Commission services (steering group). The approach complied with Commission's evaluation guidelines with regard to the evaluation criteria of effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence and utility, with due consideration of the administrative burden.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

The evaluation of the compensation scheme indicates that it is effective toward its specific objective of contributing to maintain the competitiveness of the fishing industry in the outermost regions and toward its general objective of contributing to the development of the fishing industry in the outermost regions.

- The compensations scheme is also effective to contribute to the EU policy for consumers but with a limited impact.
- Overall, the implementation of the scheme is evaluated as efficient. Budget envelopes granted to support the compensation scheme (ca. EUR 15 million annually) have been

implemented at a level close to 100%.

- The administrative burden for its management is considered reasonable at national and Commission levels.

**Recommendations:**

- Define and adjust the notion of additional costs to take account of the complexity of the calculation and to avoid potential over/under-compensations.
- Increase the financial envelopes granted to MS to fully meet the objective of the compensation system and compensate the totality of claims. Indeed, the evaluation shows that the quantities of products potentially eligible to the compensation mechanism, and consequently the total level of additional costs, are higher than the financial envelopes provided for in the regulation;
- Specify implementation modalities of the scheme through an implementing act to avoid legal uncertainty.
- Improve the possibility of monitoring of the scheme by the Commission to better evaluate the contribution to the objective of the scheme and more globally to the objectives of the CFP and to those of the EU strategy for the outermost regions.

It should be noted that the Regulation stipulated that this evaluation and the relevant recommendations could lead to a legislative proposal. This was the legislator's intention considering that the compensation regime could be prolonged under the form of an autonomous legal instrument. However, in the course of implementation, the Commission took the view that the compensation mechanism for outermost regions would be integrated in the future unique financial instrument: the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF)<sup>1</sup>. Accordingly, the Commission tabled the EMFF proposal, together with the corresponding impact assessment<sup>2</sup> prior to the finalisation of the evaluation, and therefore had already fulfilled this possibility to submit a legislative proposal. Still, the evaluation results were known soon enough to be impacted in the EMFF proposal if needed. The main recommendations by the external consultant were nevertheless largely consistent with the Commission's proposal made in the context of the EMFF. The only difference is that although the consultant recommends an increase in the envelopes granted to MS, the Commission proposed to maintain the amount provided in the current regulation in the EMFF on the ground that they are sufficient to ensure that the mechanism functions and at the same time respond to the general need to

---

1 COM(2011) 804 final Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund [repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006 and Council Regulation(EC) No 861/2006 and Council Regulation No XXX/2011 on integrated maritime policy

2 SEC(2011) 1416 final Commission Staff Working Paper Impact Assessment Accompanying the document Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund [repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006 and Council Regulation(EC) No 861/2006 and Council Regulation No XXX/2011 on integrated maritime policy

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/outermost-regions/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/outermost-regions/index_en.htm)

**Interim evaluation of the European Fisheries Fund (2007-2013)**

Synthesis of the 26 national evaluation reports

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 11 06

**2) Timing:** January 2012 (Period covered by the report: 2007-2010)

**3) Budget:** The European Fisheries Fund (EFF) has a budget of EUR 4.3 billion for the period 2007 to 2013.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The purpose of the synthesis is to summarise the contents of the national interim evaluation reports on the EFF (2007-2013) and to highlight the main points and recommendations that emerge. It also aims to provide a basis for the organisation of a "strategic debate" with member states to be undertaken by the end of 2011. 26 interim evaluation reports were prepared in each member state based on a common methodological framework developed by the European Commission prior to the launch of the evaluation, which addressed minimal standards and provided a common set of evaluation questions, criteria and indicators to be applied for the assessment of all participating Member States. The interim evaluations thus focus on three main objectives:

- Determining if the programmes' strategies are still relevant, taking into account changes in the common fisheries policy and socio-economic context.
- Assessing the quality and efficiency of the implementation and management in place.
- Assessing effectiveness and appraising progress made by the implemented projects towards the achievement of the Operational Programme (OP)'s set objectives.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

**Synthesis of answers to the evaluation questions on programme management**

- The partnership principle within the monitoring committees is respected to a varying degree across the different member states
- Most evaluation reports reach the conclusion that the management and control systems in place are rather satisfactory, with clear and efficient coordination between the different structures involved in programme management, despite some different evolutions and characteristics.
- Despite a general improvement compared to Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance

(FIFG) (1999-2006) emphasised in several reports, the administrative burden remains a problem in achieving an effective implementation of the programme.

- Monitoring systems as a whole work well, but the quality and definitions of indicators should be improved. The usefulness of the indicators system in terms of evaluating the programmes' results is not good.

#### **Synthesis of answers to the evaluation questions on programme effectiveness**

- From a priority axis perspective, at 31 December 2010, the commitments by axes amounted to 47% of total EFF budget (EUR 575 million) for Axis 1, 43% (EUR 518 million) for Axis 2, 40% (EUR 451 million) for Axis 3, 6% (EUR 34 million) for Axis 4 and 21% (EUR 35 million) for Axis 5. Axis 1 projects thus account for the greatest proportion of commitments, due to their shorter term nature. Axis 4 achievement rate is the lowest, indicating that whilst groups have been formed, Fisheries Local Action Group (FLAG) projects are generally still in the very early stages of implementation. The main reasons explaining delays in implementation are twofold:
  - Limited co-financing: the unfavourable economic environment and uncertainties regarding future developments have limited access to debt financing.
  - Late launch of programmes, mostly due to delays in the validation of OP and management and control system, which have adversely affected the implementation process of all measures under the OP.

Conversely, some success factors are mentioned, and include efficient administration and greater interest from the sector.

#### Priority axis 1: Measures for the adaptation of the Community fishing fleet

- There have not been any major implementation issues for measures 1.1 (permanent cessation of fishing activities) and 1.2 (temporary cessation of fishing activities) that were well known by both the administrations and the beneficiaries. Except in Germany, the obligation of implementing a Fishing Effort Adjustment Plan (FEAP) has not prevented or delayed the implementation of measures 1.1 and 1.2, but there is no evidence that it has encouraged a more strategic implementation either.
- The implementation of measures 1.3 (investments on board fishing vessels and selectivity) and 1.4 (small-scale coastal fishing) have been more mitigated for the former and rather difficult for the latter, in part because of the economic crisis and the resulting difficulty to find co financing.

#### Priority axis 2: Aquaculture, inland fishing, processing and marketing of fishery and aquaculture products

- The projects implemented in aquaculture under measure 2.1 have been dedicated primarily to productive investments. The requirement for an environmental impact assessment has hampered the implementation of aquaculture projects in a limited number of member states. The implementation of aqua environmental measures did not experience major problems. On the other hand the implementation of animal health and public health measures has been

hampered by their unsuitability.

- Inland fishing measure 2.2 has been implemented only in a few member states and did not have any noticeable impacts except in Finland (which is by far the main user of the measure).
- Measure 2.3 (fish processing and marketing) has drawn the biggest portion of the funds programmed for Axis 2. Projects implemented mostly concern increasing production capacity, improvement of production systems and improvement of hygiene and working conditions in processing facilities.

#### Priority axis 3: Measures of common interest

- Axis 3 is very diverse in nature, and is dedicated to supporting measures of common interest with a broader scope than measures normally undertaken by private enterprises. The spirit of this axis is to foster cooperation and organisation amongst stakeholders in order to contribute to an improved competitiveness and productivity of organisations as well as to the sustainability of the fisheries sector with projects that complement fisheries sector operations. Axis 3 projects to date have focused predominantly on ports infrastructure (measure 3.3), collective actions (measure 3.1) and pilot operations (measure 3.5).

#### Priority axis 4: Sustainable development of fisheries areas

- 21 member states have implemented axis 4. At the end of 2010, 10 member states have approved FLAGS and projects, in 6 member states the selection process is still on-going for the strategies and in 5 member states the selection process of the FLAGS themselves is in progress. 211 FLAGS and more than 1000 projects have been approved in 16 member states. The main positive factors in the implementation process are the strong involvement from local authorities and the LEADER (Community initiative for rural development) experience. The European Fisheries Areas Network (FARNET) is also considered as useful, nevertheless some criticism has been expressed regarding the delays in the publication of informative materials. The main challenges have been the delays in setting up procedures, access to private financing and the lack of interest from the sector. The financial crisis has hampered the good development of axis 4 implementation in Ireland, Greece and Denmark. The impacts cannot be assessed sufficiently at this stage.

#### Priority axis 5: Technical assistance

Globally, the effectiveness of priority axis 5 implementation is moderate. The achievement of member states is very heterogeneous even if it is often quite high. Nonetheless, most of the evaluation reports highlight the usefulness of the technical assistance for OP implementation and information of the beneficiaries and potential beneficiaries.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/eff\\_evaluation/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/eff_evaluation/index_en.htm)

**Ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Union and Republic of Kiribati, and ex-ante evaluation including an analysis of the impact of the future Protocol on sustainability**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 11 03

**2) Timing:** 12 June 2012 (Period covered by the report: 2006 – 2012)

**3) Budget:**

The annual financial contribution under the Protocol evaluated was EUR 478.400 per year from which 30 % was dedicated to the support of the sectoral fisheries policy in Kiribati during first year of application. The second year, this percentage increased to 40%, and to 60% the following years.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

This evaluation provides an ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the European Union and the Republic of Kiribati. It also provides an ex-ante evaluation and analysis of impacts of a potential future Protocol on sustainability. The evaluation considers the Protocol in terms of its relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

The evaluation indicates that the Protocol is of a critical importance for the EU purse seine fleet operating in Kiribati. Catches in Kiribati represent around 50 % of vessels catches in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO). The utilisation of the purse seine fishing authorisations has been 100 % for each of year of the FPA, and utilisation of catch possibilities in excess of 100 % each year of the FPA. Concerning long-liners, except for two long-line fishing authorisations which were taken in 2007, there has been no interest by the EU long-line fleet in fishing in Kiribati. The Protocol is of less importance for the EU upstream sector, and for the EU-downstream processing sub-sector. However, the Protocol generates some catches which are imported in loined form for canning in the EU. A total of EUR 6.4 million of value-added is accrued each year when considering the benefits to both the European Union and Kiribati. 75 % of this accrues to the EU and 25 % to Kiribati. EU value-added is most prominent in the catching and upstream sectors, and less marked in downstream processing. In Kiribati value-added is almost entirely focused in the upstream/input sub-sector, principally in the form of payments made to the Government for access and sectoral support, but also from vessel support services i.e. transshipment. Some small value-added is made through the employment of Kiribati crew and observers.

With respect to effectiveness, the EU fleet plays only a small role in terms of overall fleet activity in both Kiribati and Western and Central Pacific area. Its ability to impact on responsible fishing is therefore limited. The Protocol has been effective in supporting the EU catching sub-sector in particular. The Protocol has also been effective in creating some employment in both the EU and Kiribati. The employment generated by the Protocol is estimated at 98 full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs.

With respect to efficiency, the Protocol has been efficient for the EU in providing access at an affordable rate for EU vessels owners, and in generating a good benefit/cost ratio of 4.0, demonstrating that the Protocol provides good value for money with each every euro invested by the EU and ship-owners generating four euros of benefit in terms of value-added. The benefits to Kiribati were EUR 1.2 million per year on average from the EU, plus smaller benefits in the form of value-added made from port calls by EU vessels and from local crew and observers on-board EU vessels.

The Protocol has significantly contributed to the viability and sustainability of the EU purse seine catching sub-sector operating in the Pacific and its related employment, but only small contributions were made to the sustainability of the EU upstream and processing sub-sectors. The Protocol does not appear to threaten the sustainability of the Kiribati fishing sector.

It is likely that a future Protocol would generate considerable levels of value-added to both the EU and to Kiribati. It would be in the interest of both the EU and Kiribati to have a new Protocol. For the EU fleet a 'no Protocol' would cause fishing rights as a proportion of sales revenues to rise considerably, while for Kiribati a failure to sign a new Protocol would eliminate the ear-marked funds for special sectorial support provided by the EU under the Protocol.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/kiribati\\_2012/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/kiribati_2012/index_en.htm)

**Ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Union and Solomon Islands, and ex-ante evaluation including an analysis of the impact of the future Protocol on sustainability**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 11 03

**2) Timing:** 19 July 2012 (Period covered by the report: 2009 -2012)

**3) Budget:** The annual financial contribution under the Protocol evaluated was EUR 400.000 per year from which 50 % was dedicated to the support of the sectoral fisheries policy in Solomon Islands.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

This evaluation provides an ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the European Union and Solomon Islands. It also provides an ex-ante evaluation and analysis of impacts of a potential future Protocol on sustainability. The evaluation considers the Protocol in terms of its relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

The evaluations indicates that within the EU, the Protocol most strongly meets the interests and needs of the EU purse seine fleet although this is more in terms of catch possibilities. The Protocol could be described as relevant to the needs of EU consumers in that it provides some



tuna supplies to the EU market. However, the quantities are very small compared to the overall EU market, so the relevance is also small. The Protocol is also relevant to the needs of EU processors, and stakeholder consultations confirmed that some catch made under the Protocol is destined for processing in the EU, although not in significant amounts.

The Protocol has been relatively efficient for the fishing industry given that access payments per tonne of fish caught have remained constant over the period of the Protocol, while ex-vessel fish prices rose by 49% and 32% for skipjack and yellow-fin tuna respectively in the period 2009/10 to 2011/12. The EU fleet has spent little time fishing within the Solomon Islands' exclusive economic zone (EEZ). The Protocol has not been very significant in terms of the operations of the purse seine vessels authorized to fish in Solomon Islands waters. This coupled with provisional data for the 2011/12 season indicates vessels do not currently show a high dependency on catches made within the Solomon Islands EEZ.

In terms of support for responsible fisheries the Protocol helps ensure that there is active EU involvement in regional fisheries issues and provides for direct sectoral support for Solomon Islands that potentially helps ensure a positive contribution of the sector to the national economy.

The financial and economic sustainability of the catching sub-sector has contributed directly only a small amount to the employment of 15 EU crew working (per year) in the catching sub-sector. It is estimated that around 404 EU jobs are dependent on the operations of the EU purse seine fleet and that the Protocol makes a contribution to securing these jobs in its role as part of a network of FPAs in the region.

The EU purse seine fleet is only a minor operator in the Western and Central Pacific area, representing only 2% of the total purse seine fishery. The limited catches by EU vessels as a percentage of total Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) catches and the current under-utilisation of Solomon Islands vessel days mean that the fishing under the Protocol does not appear to threaten the sustainability of the Solomon Islands fishing sector.

The activities and visits of foreign vessels, including those from the EU, contribute to the sustainability of the domestic upstream sector by providing revenues and employment opportunities, i.e. for transshipment services, agents, etc.

Given the current level of benefits from the FPA, a new protocol should seek to obtain a better balance between the value of fishing rights negotiated and the likely utilisation of fishing opportunity by the purse seine fleet. At the same time, in doing so, consideration should also be given to how the Solomon Islands FPA fits within a wider network of agreements and the how the costs balance against the overall economic and social benefits as well as the strategic.

Finally, the evaluation recommends the continued active participation by the EU within the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC), so as to ensure responsible fisheries.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/solomon\\_islands\\_2012/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/solomon_islands_2012/index_en.htm)

## **Evaluation ex-post du protocole de l'accord de partenariat dans le domaine de la pêche entre l'Union européenne et la Côte-d'Ivoire**

(Ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Union and Ivory Coast)

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 11 03

**2) Timing:** 28 June 2012 (Period covered by the report: 2007 – 2012)

**3) Budget:** EUR 595,000 per year for the support to the Ivorian fisheries policy

**4) Background, scope and focus:** This evaluation provides a retrospective ex-post evaluation for the Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the EU and Ivory Coast (2007-2013) and a prospective ex-ante evaluation for the negotiation of a new protocol.

The evaluation considers the Protocol in terms of its relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

In terms of overall effectiveness, the FPA with Ivory Coast meets the EU principles of good governance. Relevance: The FPA contributes, with all FPAs in West Africa, to the supply of canneries and fish market in Ivory Coast. In other terms, the FPA is relevant for both parties. For EU ship-owners, the FPA is not very significant in terms of catches, compared to catches in high seas and other exclusive economic zones (EEZs). It however allows continuity between neighbouring EEZs and an easy access to the harbour of Abidjan, which remains central in the West Africa area, despite its deterioration.

Effectiveness: Even though it was implemented in a delicate political context, the implementation was satisfactory. Some provisions of the protocol could not be fulfilled, such as control and the boarding of observers; on the whole there is a good level of effectiveness. What needed to be done was well executed. However, the use of funds of the financial contribution for sectoral support gives uncertain results due to the dispersal of actions and therefore its limited impact.

Efficiency: The implementation of the FPA contributes to the creation of economic wealth and employment, both for the EU and Ivory Coast, even if only 50% of the reference tonnage is caught. Hence, each euro of the financial compensation generates almost three euros of gross added value, of which around 80% in EU and 20% in Ivory Coast. It is even more important for Ivory Coast who receives 215 EUR/tonnes, i.e. more of the double of what constitutes the financial basis of the financial compensation and of ship-owners fees (100 EUR/tonnes). For ship-owners, real administrative costs of each tonne is around 45 EUR/tonnes, a number close to the profitability, estimated to be at 50 EUR/tonnes.

Sustainability: By respecting good governance and responsible fisheries principles, the FPA participates to the effort of the European Commission and International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) and other relevant regional fisheries management organisations (RFMOs) to act for a sustainable use of tuna stocks in the Atlantic ocean. Indeed, the FPA does not result in excess fishing capacities, either in Ivorian waters or in

those managed by ICCAT. Fleets should however continue their efforts to reduce their catches of juveniles under fish aggregating devices (FADs). The contribution of purse seiners to the onshore processing industry and domestic market supply remains tangible.

Nevertheless, by the income generated and the employments related to the activities in the harbour of Abidjan, and in canneries, the FPA, and more generally, the presence of EU vessels during the period, contributes to the process of poverty reduction and globally, to the sustainable development by fitting engaged actions and effects within long term perspectives. Coherence: Global coherence of FPAs is satisfactory, at the EU level (external coherence, relations with ACP countries (African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States), development policies, external policies, etc.) and at Ivory Coast level (sectorial policy and national development policy). Recommendations made are both general and technical. On general perspectives, some indications related to the FPA itself are made, related to fishing authorizations, the exclusivity clause and the use of funds of the financial compensation and others linked to it such as the refecton of the harbour of Abidjan, the fisheries policy in Ivory Coast and the monitoring of tuna FPAs. On technical issues, recommendations are made regarding the delimitation of the EEZ of Ivory coast and on all the aspects regarding monitoring and control of vessels.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/cote\\_ivoire\\_2012/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/cote_ivoire_2012/index_en.htm)

### **Interim evaluation of marine knowledge-related preparatory actions and pilot projects. (internal evaluation)**

- 1) ABB activities concerned:** 11 09
- 2) Timing:** 29 August 2012 (Period covered by the report: 2008-2012)
- 3) Budget:** The budget was EUR 6,450,000
- 4) Background, scope and focus:** The aim of the European Marine Observation and Data Network (EMODnet) is to improve access to marine data and so reduce costs to users, stimulate innovation and reduce uncertainty in our understanding of the behaviour of the seas and oceans. To test how this could be done a number of preparatory actions were started in the period 2008-2010. Consortia of marine data organisations, selected through calls for tender and implemented through procurement contracts, set up portals that provide access to marine data, metadata and data products for six themes for whole sea-basins. 53 different organisations participated in the projects; largely public bodies responsible for managing marine data on a national scale but supported by some small private companies with expertise in managing distributed data. All the metadata and data products and most of the data are made available to users free of charge and free of restriction of use. On 29 August 2012, the commission adopted a Green Paper on marine knowledge<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> COM(2012) 473 final Marine Knowledge 2020: from seabed mapping to ocean forecasting, to which this evaluation was annexed.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

Impact assessment suggests potentially over EUR500 million of benefits per year to EU maritime economy in long run. Initiative would not have happened without EU.

Independent assessment concluded that basic architecture chosen was appropriate and that information system was fit for purpose. Project costs were comparable to analogous EU initiatives and management overhead was low. As a result of the evaluation a secretariat has been set up to better monitor the final phase of the projects and the beginning of the next phase. Experience led to many modifications in terms of reference of follow-up projects under Financial Regulation of Integrated Maritime Policy.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa: SWD(2012) 250 final**

<http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52012SC0250:EN:NOT>

**Ex post evaluation of projects co-financed by ERDF and Cohesion Fund in the period 1994-1999**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 13 03

**2) Timing:** November 2012

**3) Budget:** EUR 4.8 billion.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The objective of this study was to evaluate the type, magnitude and timing of the long-term effects of ten major projects implemented during the 1994-1999 programming

period, and the mechanisms explaining the project outcomes. The investment projects analysed were in the transport (road, rail, seaports) and environment (water supply, waste water treatment, waste management) sectors, across five Member States: Greece, Ireland, Italy, Portugal and Spain, with a total value over EUR 50 million per project. By putting together the case study evidence, the evaluator has proposed some key ideas for policy learning and recommendations for maximising long-term effects of investments.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

- The evaluation demonstrates that the EU financing produced positive overall effects along the different dimensions explored. Uncontroversial direct contributions are found to economic growth and quality of life, while the strength of each type of effect differs by sector (transport or environment) or project.
- The majority of effects detected have stabilised, either in the short-medium (i.e. from 1 to 5 years after project completion) or in the long run (more than 6 years after project completion). However there are also significant factors which are not yet stabilised, mainly direct growth effects.
- The infrastructural sector matters in particular as far as project design is concerned, with positive scores recorded on average for transport projects and negative scores for environmental ones. Project design is a weak point of environment projects, which was adversely affected by time constraints (deadlines imposed by EC Regulations), forecasting mistakes as well as social pressure (municipalities of the Northern Lisbon sub-region

pushed for spreading the solid waste treatment facilities around different areas, with negative economic and environmental consequences). Transport projects are generally characterised by more efficient and flexible designs, reflecting the strategic vision underpinning them.

- Generally, the evidence collected shows how the outcomes of development projects are the result of a mixture and interaction between incidental environmental, socio-economic, institutional and cultural circumstances and the managerial responses produced by the project.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/9499\\_final\\_report\\_091112.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/9499_final_report_091112.pdf)

**Ex post evaluation of the Cohesion Fund (Incl. former ISPA) 2000 - 2006**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 13 04

**2) Timing:** July 2012

**3) Budget:** EUR 36.2 billion.

**4) Background, scope and focus:** The main overall objective of the Cohesion Fund (including former ISPA) ex post evaluation was to assess the contribution of the Cohesion Fund and ISPA to the development of the EU transport system, to achieving the EU acquis in the field of environment and the effect of ISPA as a preparation for Structural Fund and Cohesion Fund programmes in 16 countries. A total of EUR 36.2 billion was made available from the Cohesion Fund and ISPA to the countries eligible for support. The evaluation was made up of five work packages:

- WPA – the contribution to EU transport and environmental policies
- WPB – cost-benefit analysis of selected transport projects
- WPC – cost-benefit analysis of selected environmental infrastructure projects
- WPD – the management and implementation of funding
- WPE - Synthesis report and expert review

This fiche concerns WPE – the synthesis of all the previous work packages.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

- The evaluation demonstrates that projects co-financed by the Cohesion Fund and ISPA for the 2000-2006 period had a marked effect in extending and improving the transport

network and environmental infrastructure in the countries receiving support. In the transport sector, 1,286 km of new motorway were constructed in the 16 countries receiving support, 3,013 km of roads on the TENs were improved in the EU12 countries, 3,675 km of railway line in the EU12 were upgraded etc. In the environment sector, 5.6 million people were connected to main water supply in Spain, 570,000 people were connected to main drainage in Portugal and around 1.1 million in Greece, 40% of non-compliant landfill sites was closed in Hungary and of around 60% in Lithuania, an additional 77,500 tonnes of waste a year were recovered in Slovenia etc.

- Transport projects generated major improvements in many of the transit routes crossing the countries concerned and, accordingly, in the transport links with neighbouring countries. Equally, it simultaneously reduced journey times internally between centres of economic activity and population and, in many cases, took traffic away from city centres so relieving congestion and curbing pollution.
  - There is more uncertainty about the extent to which environmental projects generated benefits which exceeded the costs of undertaking them, but there is no question that the investment co-financed contributed significantly to the efforts of the countries concerned to comply with EU Directives on water supply, wastewater treatment and solid waste management. They had an equally significant effect in furthering the protection of the environment and reducing pollution, so improving both the sustainability of economic development and the quality of life across many parts of the countries receiving support.
  - It is difficult to assess the effects on ultimate policy objectives – on economic development and cohesion – which the funding provided is intended to help achieve. This is partly because of the difficulties of disentangling the effects from other forces at work but it also because of the imprecise nature of the objectives concerned, especially those relating to cohesion and with respect to environmental projects in particular.
  - Given the long-term nature of the investment carried out, for both transport and environment, the actual effect is likely to take some time to become apparent, especially since it is likely to depend both on future investment in other parts of the network and on the policies implemented in other areas.
  - It is even more problematic to see the actual effect in the case of environmental projects since the link between such investment and economic development is more tenuous. There is little evidence, that investing in environmental infrastructure will either stimulate economic growth or create the conditions for this to occur. It might help to strengthen social and territorial cohesion by improving the quality of life in the areas where the investment takes place and by reducing disparities in living conditions across the EU, though this is extremely difficult to observe and measure.
  - The evaluation finds significant delays in implementing projects, especially environmental projects. The delays occurred at all stages of the project implementation process: strategic planning and the choice of projects to be undertaken, designing and developing projects, consultation, procurement and the work involved in the construction of the project itself.
  - There is a need to give serious consideration to ways in which closure procedures

can be significantly speeded by both the managing authorities and the European Commission.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/information/evaluations/archives\\_2000\\_2006\\_en.cfm#5](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information/evaluations/archives_2000_2006_en.cfm#5)



## Country reports on the performance of Cohesion Policy 2007 - 2013

1) **ABB activities concerned** : 13 04

2) **Timing**: January 2013

3) **Budget**: EUR 270.1 billion

4) **Background, scope and focus**:

- 27 country reports and a synthesis report were delivered by the network of experts on progress in implementing the programmes co-financed by the ERDF and the Cohesion Fund over the 2007 – 2013 and their outcome up to the end of 2011. The reports look at the socio-economic context, changes in region disparities across the EU during the crisis, the scale of support from the ERDF and CF for the present period, the pace of implementing programmes, the achievements and analyses evidence coming from evaluations undertaken in the Member States.
- **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation** The rate of implementation of programmes in many countries remains slow; this is especially the case in Romania, Bulgaria and the Czech Republic in the EU12 and in Italy, France and Austria in the EU15.
- The amount of funding still to be absorbed over the remainder of the programming period is even larger than it appears since in some cases resources have been invested in financial engineering schemes and are yet to transfer to enterprises.
- Government expenditure on capital formation has been hit disproportionately hard by fiscal consolidation measures taken across the EU and has declined in most Member States over the past 2-3 years, in many cases substantially.
- Reductions in government spending on capital formation have been facilitated in a number of cases by increases in EU co-financing rates on Cohesion policy programmes, which have been reduced in size as a result.
- The on-going crisis has led to a widespread tendency for growth and jobs to become a priority of national governments across the EU ahead of reducing regional disparities.
- The focus of Cohesion policy appears to be shifting away from supporting the development of weaker regions at a time when this seems to be more necessary.
- Despite the delays in the implementation of programmes, there is increasing evidence of the positive effects of the projects which have been carried out; this is particularly the case in respect of enterprise support, transport and environmental infrastructure.
- Assessing the outcome of programmes and the achievements from EU support is, made difficult by the continuing deficiency of the information published in Annual Implementation Reports; this applies to the quantitative indicators, which too often bear little relationship to the aims of the intervention concerned and are not consistent across programmes; it applies equally to the qualitative information, which in most cases does not enable the quantitative outcome to be meaningfully interpreted in relation to policy objectives.

- There is a clear and urgent need for a major improvement in the indicators monitored and their link to policy objectives.
- A move towards a results-oriented policy equally requires a step change in the number, nature and quality of evaluations carried out on EU co-financed programmes in order better to be able to assess their effects on the pursuit of policy goals and, accordingly, to help select the measures likely to be most effective in this regard.
- There is need for a common acceptance on the part of Member States that evaluations are an important part of formulating effective development policies and making the most productive use of Cohesion policy funding rather than simply a formal obligation of receiving the funding concerned.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/information/evaluations/index\\_en.cfm#1](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information/evaluations/index_en.cfm#1)

**Jaspers Evaluation**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 13 03

**2) Timing:** December 2012

**3) Budget:** EUR 167 million.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The study evaluates the JASPERS initiative from its inception until the end of June 2011. Its main focus is to establish the impact of JASPERS on the quality and timeliness of the preparation, submission, approval and implementation of major projects, in the countries which joined the European Union in 2004 and 2007. These include Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation**

- The JASPERS initiative has been of substantial value to Member States in the development of projects for funding and there continues to be strong demand for its services. There is sound statistical evidence confirming that JASPERS support significantly reduces the duration of the Commission's approval process, as well as the time taken to develop projects by the Member States.
- The greatest potential to improve project quality is when JASPERS is involved at the strategic stage, and where JASPERS support helps Member States to develop their project planning capacity.
- JASPERS should have an explicit objective to develop the project planning capacity of

Member States and there should be an increased focus in its work on this objective. A three year work plan, agreed between Jaspers and each Member State, is proposed. The work plans would be tailored to the needs and strengths of each Member State.

- JASPERS intervention should come as early as possible in the project design process, providing technical or specialist advice from the earliest stages of planning.
- Working arrangements between JASPERS, the Commission and the Member States should be more formalised. This should clarify roles and responsibilities between the Commission, Member States, and Jaspers.
- JASPERS advice should be routinely available to Member States for the development of sectoral strategies. JASPERS involvement would be advisory in nature, and take place at the invitation of Member States.
  - A more strategic approach is required to improve the capacity of Member States to select and develop high quality projects. Based on an analysis of individual Member States' project planning capacities, JASPERS could focus on specific activities that would have the greatest impact on project planning and project quality.
  - The evidence from the evaluation confirms the need for and the importance of improving knowledge transfer. JASPERS should put in place a system to highlight technical issues that have been addressed and resolved in individual projects where they are considered to be of more general relevance. Action by Member States is also required – for example by considering what structures are in place, and what actions are needed, to ensure that knowledge transfer happens effectively.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/jaspers\\_evaluation/final\\_report\\_131212.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/jaspers_evaluation/final_report_131212.pdf)

### **The use of the ERDF to support Financial engineering instruments (FEIs)**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 13 03

**2) Timing:** July 2012

**3) Budget:** EUR 11.6 billion

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

27 policy papers delivered by the experts present an informed overview of the use of the ERDF to co-finance FEIs, the rationale for Member States adopting this means of investment support and the way that the schemes set up are operating in practice. The experts were asked to examine and report on these issues in their own countries on the basis of published information and interviews with Managing Authorities in April-May

2012.

## 5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation

- In most countries, the use of the ERDF to finance FEIs is relatively recent and limited in size; the share going to FEIs is larger in the EU15 than EU12 and in Competitiveness than Convergence regions and takes the form more of support for loans and guarantees than VC funds.
- There was a very small overall increase across the EU in the share of the ERDF planned to go to FEIs over the programming period combined with a shift from VC funds to loans and guarantees.
- The variation in use is broadly in line with expectations, given that FEIs require expertise to set up and operate and VC funds sufficient innovative high growth firms to be viable.
- There is a strong case for public support of loans and guarantees in many countries given the limited access of SMEs to finance and the large amount of collateral often demanded by banks. This applies particularly to countries where borrowing from banks is most problematic and where the support to businesses they provide is most limited, such as Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania in the EU12 and Greece and Spain in the EU15.
- The case for support of VC funds is weaker and there are only a limited number of areas across the EU which has a sufficient concentration of small high-growth firms to justify public support of them.
- The main reasons for the use of FEIs according to Member States are closely in line with Commission statements, that they fill a gap in the financial market between the demand for funding from SMEs and the available supply in a ‘revolving’ way which means that more firms can be supported.
  - While the use of the ERDF to support FEIs may be justifiable, there is not enough evidence to determine whether the scale of support matches the size of the gaps in the market for loans and equity finance and how far the sums allocated have reduced these gaps.
  - It is questionable whether the size of many of the VC funds set up with ERDF support is large enough for them to be viable given the high fixed costs and the high degree of uncertainty attached to investments which makes it important to spread the risk.
  - The complexity of FEIs and the time and resources needed to set them up have reduced their use, along with the limited extent of demand for them perceived by Managing Authorities and the preference for grants for many investments where the policy objectives extend beyond making a financial return.
  - Very little data exist on the cost of setting up and operating FEIs relative to non-repayable grants but there is a widespread perception that they are higher and the period needed to set them up longer.
  - Many of the financial engineering schemes set up with ERDF financing to support businesses operate in much the same way as privately-financed ones, except that they are

limited to SMEs, particular sectors and firm located in the region; many, however, also have wider objectives, in line with the aims of Cohesion policy, and impose additional conditions on recipients of funding over and above purely financial ones.

- The main problems of using the ERDF to co-finance FEIs stem from the complexity of the regulations and the uncertainty surrounding their interpretation because of their lack of clarity, which add to costs and time taken to set up schemes; this was especially so in the early part of the period but problems remain even after Commission attempts to clear up ambiguities, which deter the authorities from using FEIs.
- Very few evaluations have been carried out on ERDF-financed FEIs or publically-funded schemes generally; those that have been undertaken generally indicate positive effects on the performance of the firms supported, but there is limited evidence on the achievement of wider objectives – on the competitiveness of the business sector and regional development.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/expert\\_innovation/2012\\_evalnet\\_fei\\_synthesis\\_final.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/pdf/eval2007/expert_innovation/2012_evalnet_fei_synthesis_final.pdf)

**Interim evaluation of Erasmus Mundus II (2009 – 2013)**

**1) ABB activities:** 15 02

**2) Timing:** March 2012 (Period covered by the report: 2009 – 2011)

**3) Budget :** Overall budget of the evaluated Programme: EUR 963,690,000

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

This interim evaluation was launched in accordance with Article 13 of the Erasmus Mundus Decision. The findings should provide inputs for the Commission's Interim Evaluation Report on the results achieved, and on the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the implementation of the programme.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

EU Added Value: Generally, international academic and mobility cooperation entail transnational aspects which by reason of their nature, scale or effects can be dealt with better at EU level. The implementation of European Joint Masters and Doctoral programmes (with a common Erasmus Mundus branding) and mobility activities, involving higher education institutions from all over the world, can be much better managed and monitored at EU level by the Commission, which can put in place and effectively run the necessary management structures and delivery methods. The EU can also more efficiently address, notably through dialogue on higher education policies, global issues such as obstacles to international mobility, recognition of degrees, attractiveness, brain drain or capacity building measures.

The visibility of European higher education in the world can be better achieved through a coherent EU promotion strategy, involving all interested Member States. EU initiatives also act as a laboratory to test innovative ideas or set quality standards which then inspire the national level. EU achievements in the field (quality assurance, qualification frameworks, European Credit Transfer System, key competences, tuning of higher-education structures, etc.) also gain in being promoted in a visible and coherent manner at EU level, and in the wider world as collective EU achievements. The objectives and actions of Erasmus Mundus II were defined on this basis and the current evaluation provides evidence to support this logic and prove the programme's effectiveness.

Specifically, EM II provides strong support and makes an important contribution to the internationalisation process of the European Higher Education Area. Furthermore, the joint masters and doctoral programmes funded by Action 1 had considerable added value by facilitating the success of graduates when looking for work and/or further research positions. International experiences and intercultural competence could be regarded as the most important assets that distinguished Erasmus Mundus students from other graduates. Inclusion of doctoral and post-doctoral co-operation within Erasmus Mundus II has been one of the most successful innovations of phase II, attracting many very prestigious higher

education institutions to participate.

**Effectiveness:** Action 1 joint courses produced ambitious graduates, satisfied with their experience and strongly identifying with the Erasmus Mundus brand. Action 2 participants internationalised their teaching, and improved their institutional capacities. These partnerships were very responsive to development needs. Action 3 results were known to policy-makers and the National Structures.

Although the programme was successful in increasing the involvement of European students, the introduction of scholarships for European students under Action 1 did not attract as much attention as expected. According to the results of a comparative analysis, the stipend and other scholarship benefits of category B scholarships were lower than those offered by other scholarship schemes. As a result, scholarships for European students were not competitive enough and did not encourage their active participation in the programme.

**Efficiency:** The evaluation found that the programme was being implemented efficiently. First, most of the planned outputs of the programme were likely to be achieved by 2013 with lower costs than initially anticipated. Second, outputs of the programme were being produced with analogous or even lower costs than those of scholarship schemes pursuing the same goal (particularly German Academic Exchange Service and Fulbright). Third, relevant instruments ensuring low administrative costs, such as large size consortia and partnerships or calculation of incurred costs on the basis of lump sum amounts, were in place. Fourth, a significant number of institutional beneficiaries of the programme reported that their participation in Erasmus Mundus was a financial burden. Therefore, achievement of the same results with less funding would hardly have been possible.

**Management aspects:** The monitoring of individual beneficiary selection and participation was carried out to some extent, with the universities collecting information about applicants, drop-outs and beneficiaries. However, it could be standardised and more aligned with graduate tracking. Comparable information on candidate nationality, gender, ranking in pre-selection and selection, mobility track and duration, and results achieved (if applicable) would be useful for gathering data about the programme in the future.

The programme beneficiaries assessed the preparation and implementation of Erasmus Mundus projects positively, except for the extensive administrative workload. Although the number of activity reports was reduced during the programme implementation, further simplifications were possible, including replacement of the annual reapplication approach. Although project monitoring and evaluation was primarily quantitative, one could exploit the potential of the Erasmus Mundus Quality Assessment project to better assess the quality of joint programmes with the involvement of field experts.

**Inputs to decision making:** The evaluation results have been used to support the negotiations of the 2014 – 2020 Erasmus for All programme, e.g. on aspects of strengthening the links to related programmes, and to further promote employability.

**Limitations to the evaluation:** Due to the fact that the programme started up only in 2009 this interim evaluation could not be organised at an earlier point in time. Thus, the evaluation results arrived only after the Commission's proposal for the successor programme was launched, which limited the possibilities of the evaluation to feed into the design of the successor programme.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education\\_culture/evalreports/education/2012/mundus\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/evalreports/education/2012/mundus_en.pdf)

**FP7 Marie Curie Life-long Training and Career Development Evaluation:  
Individual Fellowships and Co-funding Mechanism**

**1) ABB activities:** 15 07

**2) Timing:** February 2012

**3) Budget (annual):**

The indicative budget for the period 2007-2010 in respect of Activity 2 'Life-long Training and Career Development' was EUR448 million for the Individual Fellowships (IF) and EUR215 million for the Co-funding Mechanism (COFUND). In addition, the two international fellowship programmes within Activity 4 'International Dimension' had an indicative budget of EUR210 million.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The scope was 1) the two implementation modes of Activity 2 "Life-long Training and Career Development" in the FP7 People Specific Programme: Individual Fellowships and Co-funding; and 2) Activity 4 "International Dimension".

The evaluation focused on relevance (including coherence and added value), effectiveness and efficiency

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

EU ADDED VALUE

Overall there is strong Added Value to the EU carrying out Marie Curie Actions (MCA) - Individual Fellowships and COFUND- compared with Member States alone: this derives in particular from the cost effectiveness and economies of scale delivered by having a common strategic approach and management system and from the scheme's openness in terms of research fields. In addition, the level of visibility and profile that MCA has is more likely to be achieved at a European scale. Measures to address fragmentation, in line with the development of European Research Area, are best implemented through a Europe-wide scheme rather than via an equivalent series of national schemes.

EFFECTIVENESS

Both COFUND and Individual Fellowship Actions are achieving their objectives and are strengthening the research capacity of the EU through an increase in the quality and quantity of researchers. COFUND Fellowships are contributing both quantitatively and qualitatively to the reinforcement of the human resource potential of the ERA; the main impact on host organisations is to expand research capacity and give institutions access to high-quality researchers, leading to stronger institutional research outputs; COFUND is having a modest positive impact on the operational and administrative procedures of host institutions; and COFUND or Individual Fellowships have contributed to the development



of researchers' careers.

## EFFICIENCY

Overall, the budget appears appropriate – the quantity and quality of outputs and results, and success rates for Individual Fellowships appear satisfactory. On average, remuneration for Individual Fellowships is slightly higher than for COFUND fellowships and employment conditions of Individual Fellows are also slightly better. Administrative costs for COFUND programme beneficiaries can be significant, but are justified by the benefits. The average duration between call deadlines and contract signature for COFUND projects needs to be reduced.

The following are some examples of actions that have been or will be taken as a response to the results of the evaluation:

- Both COFUND and Individual Fellowships have been maintained as modalities of the People Programme, and will be maintained in Horizon 2020.
- COFUND's visibility is being increased through conferences and workshops.
- The quality standards of Individual Fellowships will be strengthened by streamlining the design and by raising their visibility outside Europe via international events, conferences and dissemination activities
- The number of MCA will be reduced in Horizon 2020, and current labels will be regrouped.
- Procedures regarding information requirements and budget negotiations will be simplified in Horizon 2020.
- COFUND will be opened to commercial bodies in Horizon 2020.

The main limitation of the evaluation has to do with the fact that, for COFUND, it is too early to consider long-term impacts so the evaluation had to focus mainly on shorter-term results. However, an assessment of demand, motivations and expected impacts provides key insights into potential longer-term impacts, which are particularly relevant to considering the contribution of Marie Curie Actions (MCA) to the ERA for example.

### **6) Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://www.era.gv.at/attach/MarieCurieCOFUNDEvaluationFinalReport\\_Feb2012.pdf](http://www.era.gv.at/attach/MarieCurieCOFUNDEvaluationFinalReport_Feb2012.pdf)

## **Ex-post Evaluation of 2011 European Capitals of Culture**

**1) ABB activities:** 15.04

**2) Timing:** August 2012

**3) Budget:** EUR 3 million

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The general objectives of the European Capital of Culture (ECOC) are to: "highlight the richness and diversity of European cultures and the features they share, as well as to promote greater mutual acquaintance between European citizens". The current evaluation covers two European Capitals of Culture in 2011: Tallinn and Turku.

The evaluation looked at the ECoC discretely and considered how they performed against the requirements of the Decision and their own objectives. It also considered the ECoC Action as a whole, e.g. programme mechanisms operated by the European Commission.

The methodology, combining a review of secondary data supplied by the ECoC as well as the collation of primary data (e.g. through interviews, site visits and project survey), allowed the evaluation to achieve the requested results.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The evaluators' overall conclusions are the following: Relevance: ECoC remains of key importance and thus of significant relevance for the Treaty through contributing to the flowering of the Member States cultures, highlighting common cultural heritage and increasing cultural co-operation between Member States and internationally. The ECoC concept continues to be of relevance to the objectives of the EU and of local stakeholders, in particular in promoting the European dimension of culture; in the development of the range and diversity of cities' cultural offerings; in strengthening the capacity and governance of cities cultural sectors; in enhancing social development and citizenship; in promoting the international profile and economic development of cities. It remains complementary to other EU initiatives and programmes. Efficiency: The current monitoring arrangements show a significant improvement to the previous years. However, they do not ensure that all cities fulfil all their commitments made at application, first monitoring stage and second monitoring stage (thus also in respect to the award of the Melina Mercouri Prize). At national and local level, the governance and management of ECoC is often challenging and political influences remain very significant.

At European level, the ECoC Action continues to be very cost-effective when compared to other EU policy instruments and mechanisms. However, the share of the Melina Mercouri Prize within the overall budget of the ECoC programme varied widely between the two cities and thus also its significance. For example, in Turku the Prize was relatively small in relation to the overall budget and was thus primarily of symbolic importance, i.e. providing recognition that the city had progressed significantly in its preparations to host the ECoC title. In contrast, the Prize represented more than 10% of the overall funding of

Tallinn and was thus more significant in terms of increasing the size and scale of the cultural programme. However, in neither city were the benefits of the Prize made particularly visible to cultural actors and audiences.

**Effectiveness:** The 2011 ECoC both succeeded in implementing cultural programmes that were more extensive, innovative and international (e.g. in terms of themes, artists/performers and audiences) than the usual cultural offering in each city. They explored new themes, highlighted the richness and diversity of each city's cultural offering and used new or unusual venues. At the same time, it must be highlighted that the cultural programme of Turku was much larger in scope and scale than that of Tallinn; indeed, Tallinn 2011 was one of the least-extensive ECoC of recent years.

**European added-value:** The European dimension of the cultural programme of both ECoC mostly related to the efforts to support transnational cultural co-operation and to internationalise the cities' cultural sectors. Whilst European themes were present in both ECoC, these tended to relate to specific projects rather than permeating the entire cultural programme. Whilst both cities presented very strong local narratives, those narratives can be seen as containing common themes that are essentially European in nature. For example, the cultural programme of both cities highlighted their common histories related to the role of Russia, the Baltic Sea and as well as the contemporary characteristic of being multicultural societies. The experience of 2011 demonstrates, therefore, that all "local" narratives if well explained can be considered as European in essence. Both ECoC strongly supported citizens' active participation and targeted people who traditionally tend to participate less in cultural activities. In Tallinn, significant attention was given to involvement of Russian community in the ECoC programme and separate projects were devoted to it. In Turku, the Swedish-speaking community was encouraged to take part in the cultural activities through ensuring that all activities and materials were accessible, i.e. translated into the Swedish language. However, the experience of both ECoC highlights the fact that very different (typically more intensive) approaches are required to widening the participation of citizens as creators or performers, as opposed to merely widening their participation as audiences. The evaluation delivered a set of recommendations, which will be the subject of an Action Plan to be elaborated in the coming months.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education\\_culture/evalreports/culture/2012/ecocreport\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/evalreports/culture/2012/ecocreport_en.pdf)

### **Ex-post evaluation of the Preparatory Action Media International 2008-2010**

**1) ABB activities :** 15.04

**2) Timing:** April 2012

**3) Budget (annual):** EUR 8 million between 2008 and 2010

**4) Background, scope and focus**

MEDIA International was a preparatory action adopted and launched by the European

Parliament to strengthen cooperation between the audio-visual industries of the Member States of the European Union and those of third countries, and to encourage the circulation of cinematographic works between them.

The objectives were to reinforce artistic and industrial cooperation between professionals of the audio-visual markets of the European Union and those of third countries; to reinforce the exchange of information, the level of knowledge on foreign audio-visual markets, and the international competencies of audio-visual professionals; and to improve the visibility and circulation of third-country audio-visual works on European markets, as well as European audio-visual works in those third countries.

The actions implemented were to benefit the participants and works of European countries and those of third countries in a balanced way. In accordance with the rules of international trade and specifically WTO regulations ("most favoured nation" principle), MEDIA International did not target any particular country; everyone had access, without discrimination.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The evaluators' main conclusions are the following:

**Relevance:** The purpose of the preparatory action to promote the dissemination of European works in third countries appropriately addresses the challenge to open new outlets for the European audio-visual industry.

**Efficiency and effectiveness:** The choice of the preparatory action to target cinemas, rather than other channels such as television, reduced the capability of MEDIA International to increase the circulation of works, especially in less structured markets.

MEDIA International has shown that it is possible to massively involve organizations from third countries in a European programme. This is evidenced in the wide coverage of the programme (beneficiaries were from 48 countries, 31 of which were third countries).

Even though it was on an insufficiently large scale to really change the markets, the preparatory action enabled the beneficiaries to improve their international competencies and to form networks.

The ETF was effective in providing and disseminating information and building capacity, but proved most effective in networking and knowledge transfer.

**European added value:** The funded training and promotion actions enabled the participants to acquire knowledge of markets in foreign countries, and to establish contacts in those countries. The beneficiaries were also able to strengthen their professional networks.

MEDIA International had the greatest added value for organizations and participants from third countries where national support for training and export was less developed.

Recommendations are quite general and focus more on the condition of the future preparatory actions and the modalities of an international Media Programme, given the fact that the moment when the evaluation has been finalised the Media Mundus Programme has been already approved.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education\\_culture/evalreports/culture/2012/media\\_fr.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/evalreports/culture/2012/media_fr.pdf)

## External evaluation of the European Training Foundation (ETF)

**1) ABB activities:** 15 02

**2) Timing:** 8 February 2012

**3) Budget:** Annual budget of about EUR 19 million

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

This evaluation addresses the activities of the ETF from 2006 to 2010, and focuses on its relevance, coherence, effectiveness and efficiency.

This is the 4th external evaluation of the ETF; previous evaluations were carried out in 1998, 2002 and 2006. The next evaluation is planned for 2015.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

Overall, the ETF performs very well given its wide mandate and limited resources. There has been significant effort over the last five years to improve ETF governance and operations, and this is already becoming evident in its actions and results. Despite its vast mandate, large geographical area and modest budget, ETF actions were relevant thematically and procedurally to beneficiaries and the ETF was flexible in addressing their needs. Regional activities were highly valued and should continue to be developed. ETF actions were coherent internally and with broader EU objectives. The ETF was effective in providing and disseminating information and building capacity, but proved most effective in networking and knowledge transfer. However, a clear hierarchy between strategic and operational ETF objectives was not explicitly developed in mid-term perspectives and annual work plans, and performance measurement of ETF lacked result-level indicators.

The main actions proposed for improvement are the following:

1. Information, communication and networking: The ETF should be proactive in clarifying further its role, goals and ways in providing support to its partner country beneficiaries. New approaches developed by the ETF such as regional and thematic networks should be strengthened and expanded to other areas. This will help to harness the potential of both ETF to beneficiary and beneficiary to beneficiary communication and policy learning. In addition, these networks should include short-term feedback mechanisms to improve further day-to-day contact between the ETF and stakeholders.

2. Clear hierarchy of objectives and performance measurement: Annual work programmes and country plans should demonstrate a clearer link between actions, operational and strategic objectives of the ETF. ETF performance indicators should measure not only immediate outputs, but results as well. This would help to identify more accurately ETF progress towards the achievement of its objectives.

3. Sufficient resources and long-term engagement by the ETF at the partner country level are absolutely essential in ensuring impact and added value of ETF actions. Broadly, this means that the ETF should maintain presence in all partner countries – and be given adequate resources to do so – even if this does not yield quick results or impacts. The EU

should consider increasing ETF budget allocation to support EU priority partner countries when specific opportunities for increased impact are presented (such as democratic reforms and transition in the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean).

An Action Plan has been established to address the above issues.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education\\_culture/evalreports/training/2012/etf\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/evalreports/training/2012/etf_en.pdf)

### **Evaluation of the European year of volunteering 2011**

**1) ABB activities:** 16.05

**2) Timing:** 25/05/2012

**3) Budget (2010+2011):** EUR 10.662 million

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The Council of the European Union designated 2011 as the European Year of Volunteering (EYV) in order to encourage and support the efforts of the Community, the Member States, local and regional authorities to create the conditions for civil society conducive to volunteering in the European Union (EU) and to increase the visibility of voluntary activities in the EU. The evaluation both formative and summative assisted in the implementation of the European Year and resulted in a final report on its impact and added value and drafted lessons that would be of use in future European Years.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The evaluation report showed that overall the European Year of Volunteering (EYV) has had a positive impact on the world of volunteering, both at European and at national level. The objectives and activities of the Year were relevant, and the targeted, results-oriented approach was successful in reaching the objectives in all Member States, even though the impact varied according to specific national situations.

The European Year created and catalysed changes in the volunteering environment at European and national level and led to the adoption or modification of volunteering strategies and legislation in some Member States. It empowered organisers to improve quality, including by focusing more attention on areas such as corporate volunteering and volunteering as a non-formal learning experience. It increased the recognition of volunteering through a wide range of initiatives and raised awareness of volunteering and its value to society through the media and the European communication campaign. The national activities had a valuable multiplier effect for these EU-level activities.

The European Year contributed above all to the development of networks and new initiatives. It complemented existing activities by providing additional resources that would not otherwise have been brought to bear, and it highlighted the European dimension of volunteering.

The EYV 2011 left a legacy in the continuation of activities and structures which were put in place during 2011 and in the adoption of good practices that will bring changes in the years to come.

Politically, EYV 2011 achieved sustainability through the adoption of five EU policy documents dealing with volunteering in the European Union, i.e. a Commission Communication, two sets of Council Conclusions, an Opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee and a Report of the European Parliament.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/pdf/eyv\\_final\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/pdf/eyv_final_report_en.pdf)

**Mid-term evaluation of Europe direct information centres (2009-2012)**

**1) ABB activities:** 16.03

**2) Timing:** 27/01/2012

**3) Budget (annual):** EUR 11.4 million

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

A mid-term external evaluation was launched in June 2011. The aim of this evaluation was to examine the overall performance of the second generation of Europe Direct Information Centres (EDICs), following the adjustments of the mission and management system implemented in 2009. In this sense the evaluation has provided operational conclusions and practical recommendations to be used as reference point for the network's future development.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The evaluation report showed that the network overall complies with its mission of promoting an informed and active citizenship. However the network remains very heterogeneous, which has its strengths: maximises outputs with given inputs (at EU level) and allows tailoring of activities to host structures' interests (at local level), and weaknesses: medium to low levels of control (at EU level) and no assurance of the same service across the EU (at local level).

Overall EDIC events have contributed significantly to an informed debate on EU issues: Nearly all EDICs (92%) have organised or participated in events (9.600 in 2010; 8.300 at the end of 2012). The four types of main events were: schools (EU lectures and opportunities), conferences and debates; Europe days and participation to fairs. Education and training were by far the most frequent topics. Also media activities have – at least to some extent – contributed to promoting an informed debate.

The organisation and management of the EDIC network, as implemented since 2009, had contributed to a more efficient and effective implementation of the network: Organisation of the network is adequate; Guidance and assistance are provided at appropriate levels; Management is decentralised to a sufficient degree; Most management structures – the grant scheme, the module system, and the reporting system – demonstrate improvements if compared to the previous generation. However, formal monitoring practices were in decline (both by Representations and DG COMM).

Requirements as defined in the Management guidelines, Framework and Specific agreements are adequate and useful in guiding the implementation of the EDIC network. However the monitoring guidelines were little known, although when known and used – found very useful. The steering and coordination by Headquarters and Representations was



perceived as adequate and the division of tasks optimal.

Grant scheme based on lump sum contracts as implemented since 2009 has overall increase the efficiency of the network. It has significantly reduced the administrative burden. Despite some limitations, the module system was perceived as superior to the previous system of global budget for the implementation of activities. It shifted the focus from administration of costs to implementation of activities. It also encourages forward planning of activities, proactive activities, provides better structured implementation and allows better financial planning and predictability.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-europedirect-infocentres2009-2012\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-europedirect-infocentres2009-2012_en.pdf)

### **Interim evaluation of PressEurop**

**1) ABB activities:** 16 02

**2) Timing:** 13/11/2012

**3) Budget (annual) :** EUR 3 million

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

A mid-term external evaluation was launch in February 2012. The main goal of this study was to assess the impact and the use of *PressEurop* in order to improve it further and to assess the project's potential for the future.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The evaluation report showed that *PressEurop* provided value for the money invested. It was particular perceived as relevant to its objective as well as to the needs of its target audience. Its "quality journalism" content and distribution measures have been deemed to "contribute to the development of the European affairs coverage". However this project contributing to the building of a European public space could also be further improved as regards in particular the layout of the web portal and some communication measures of its language regime.

Relevance: Regarding the quality of the coverage – both in terms of sources and countries – as well as the translation in 10 languages are relevant to the needs of the readers. The portal is functional and the current *PressEurop* users prefer to access the web portal via the Internet and/or receive the newsletter rather than using mobile devices and smart/social features (i.e. Facebook, Twitter, etc.). However the situation is always evolving. This project is complying with its contractual requirements and has gone beyond them in a number of way: more content than required (at least 7 articles per day instead 3 as required in the contract); production of own content (such as blog and in brief which not required); development of an original integrated comment system in 10 languages (contractor's initiative); use of social media (contractor's initiative).

Effectiveness: *PressEurop* contributes to improving the access to information on EU affairs thanks to the translation of quality articles from newspapers in 10 languages and various distribution and communication measures. These measures consist in displaying the content on different platforms (web portal, newsletter and mobile devices applications, social media), publication on partners' websites / publications and participation in radio and TV programs. Nevertheless, the evaluators point out that the improvements in the layout of the web portal and standardizing the partnerships regime could help to increase the audience of the project.

Efficiency: the evaluation highlighted both strong assets and margins of improvement.

- The scheme in terms of selection/translation clearly maximises the efficiency, ensuring the selection of quality articles along a common editorial approach within limited costs. The wide range of articles and viewpoints is appreciated and reflects the editorial independence foreseen in the contract.

- The current 10 languages regime covers more than 87% of the EU population. The costs of translation, which amount to 25% of the *PressEurop* budget, appear proportionate to the potential impact.

- Both the social media and the mobile applications 'audience could improve their cost-efficiency. Indeed, it was innovative to offer such features (which were not required by the service contract) and it has nowadays become a clear necessity. However the investment realized could reach more people and hence maximizes the cost-efficiency of the all project.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-interim-evaluation-presseurop\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-interim-evaluation-presseurop_en.pdf)

### **Evaluation of the management partnership's actions within the scope of the 2008-2010 communication plans in Italy**

**1) ABB activities:** 16 03

**2) Timing:** May 2012

**3) Budget (annual):** EUR 850,000

#### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation of Management Partnerships (MP) was envisaged in the Commission Communication COM (2004)196 and Commission Decision C (2004)4841. Guidelines for the evaluation of MP set the evaluation goal to assess:

- its effectiveness in terms of increased impact of the Commission's communication priorities at Member State level and achieved goals in reaching the intended public and yielding the desired results;

- its added value and its efficiency in bringing about synergies and an increased coordination between the Member State and the Commission as well as in its mechanisms

and procedures functioning.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

Efficiency: In evaluating governance and managing procedures of the Partnership some weaknesses have emerged. Specific and relevant weaknesses have been encountered in analysing the monitoring process and system. A further element and weak point that affected the execution of the evaluation consisted in the several changes and modifications of the Information and Communication Plans during their execution. In order to solve such critic points the evaluator has proposed some actions that the new Intermediary body is putting in place.

Effectiveness: The Partnership distinguished for its effectiveness in stimulating productive coordination (previously absent) between national and European institutions ensuring a good level of synergy between them within a context of positive collaboration between the parties. The Partnership has "stimulated" the institutions to act and work according to a different approach and "forcing" them in setting up overall governance, previously absent. The main contribution and added value of the Management Partnership has been that of creating a common framework on the basis of precise communication themes which could be "tailored" according to the specific characteristics of the national context and of the targets selected.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-italy2008-2010\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-italy2008-2010_en.pdf)

**Evaluation of the management partnership's actions within the scope of the 2009-2012 communication plans in Sweden**

**1) ABB activities:** 16 03

**2) Timing:** June 2012

**3) Budget (annual):** EUR 350,000

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation of Management Partnerships (MP) was envisaged in the Commission Communication COM (2004)196 and Commission Decision C (2004)4841. Guidelines for the evaluation of MP set the evaluation goal to assess: its effectiveness in terms of increased impact of the Commission's communication priorities at Member State level and achieved goals in reaching the intended public and yielding the desired results; its added value and its efficiency in bringing about synergies and an increased coordination between the Member State and the Commission as well as in its mechanisms and procedures functioning.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The organisation in the form of a Management Partnership has yield significant gains. The active parties all have the incentive to participate, and synergy effects have had a decisive impact on the project's processes. The project management has been efficient and contributed to the positive result. All planned educational activities have been carried

through. The quantitative targets have been achieved. Assessments and focus interviews showed that training activities had resulted in increased knowledge of the EU among the participating teachers and school heads. The management partnership has also resulted in the creation of new structures which, in turn, might contribute to permanent effects even after the end of the management partnership. This has been achieved through the training school ambassadors, involving school leaders and creating proper educational tools. The effectiveness of the Management Partnership has been judged relatively high. It has achieved a number of positive results when compare to its objectives. The effectiveness should be judged against the fact that school system is often seen as important for the achievement of social change. During the period the management partnership has been active, major reforms have taken place within the Swedish school system with particular focus on upper secondary schools – the target group for the Swedish management partnership. It resources have allowed school, individual teachers and school heads to prioritise teaching about the EU in parallel within on-going internal developments and changes.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-ep-sweden\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-ep-sweden_en.pdf)

**Evaluation of the management partnership's actions within the scope of the 2009-2012 communication plans in Finland**

**1) ABB activities:** 16 03

**2) Timing:** July 2012

**3) Budget (annual):** EUR 350,000

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation of Management Partnerships (MP) was envisaged in the Commission Communication COM (2004)196 and Commission Decision C (2004)4841. Guidelines for the evaluation of MP set the evaluation goal to assess:

- its effectiveness in terms of increased impact of the Commission's communication priorities at Member State level and achieved goals in reaching the intended public and yielding the desired results;
- its added value and its efficiency in bringing about synergies and an increased coordination between the Member State and the Commission as well as in its mechanisms and procedures functioning.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation**

In Finland, the 'School in Europe – Europe in School' programme has been evaluated. Most of the goals of this programme were achieved either with good or fair success.

The most prominent additional value the Management Partnership has created for the Commission's communications is the ability to more effectively reach two important target groups - teachers and pupils – improving geographical coverage and the ability to operate

directly in terms of these two target groups.

The most substantial synergy benefit of the programme has been utilising a "reserve" of foreign Erasmus students residing in Finland in the service of the comprehensive and upper secondary schools.

The programme has strengthened the collaboration between the Centre for International Mobility (CIMO) – which is responsible for several other EU programmes as well – and the European Commission, European Parliament, European Information, and the Finnish National Board of Education.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-finland\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-finland_en.pdf)

**Evaluation of the management partnership's actions within the scope of the 2009-2011 communication plans in Malta**

**1) ABB activities:** 16 03

**2) Timing:** August 2012

**3) Budget (annual):** EUR 250,000

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation of Management Partnerships (MP) was envisaged in the Commission Communication COM (2004)196 and Commission Decision C (2004)4841. Guidelines for the evaluation of MP set the evaluation goal to assess: its effectiveness in terms of increased impact of the Commission's communication priorities at Member State level and achieved goals in reaching the intended public and yielding the desired results; its added value and its efficiency in bringing about synergies and an increased coordination between the Member State and the Commission as well as in its mechanisms and procedures functioning.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The Management Partnership has increase the impact of the Communication's communication objectives. Impact: The Management Partnership has engaged in innovative communication activities which are relevant and effective in delivering the core messages to target audiences in Malta. On the whole, the operations which were carried out are considered effective and score an average of 3.6 (out of a maximum 5 points) in a multi-criteria analysis exercise that was carried out to analyse the 20 operations under evaluation.

Efficiency and cost-effectiveness of operations: In evaluating the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of operations, the multi-criteria analysis undertaken in respect of all communication operations resulted in a score of 3.7 (out of a maximum 5) for 2009, 3.2 for 2010 and 3.8 for 2011. This scoring would indicate that the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of operations are generally positive, although there is certainly room for

further improvement.

**Added value:** The introduction of the Management Partnership has led to additional administrative capacity and an increase level of communication activities aimed at different target sectors of the local population.

**Synergies:** The Management Partnership provides a structural environment for synergy and coordination between the different partner institutions, which can now channel shared communication objectives through a central organisation.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-malta\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-malta_en.pdf)

**Evaluation of the management partnership's actions within the scope of the 2009-2012 communication plans in Greece**

**1) ABB activities:** 16 03

**2) Timing:** August 2012

**3) Budget (annual):** EUR 350,000

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation of Management Partnerships (MP) was envisaged in the Commission Communication COM (2004)196 and Commission Decision C (2004)4841. Guidelines for the evaluation of MP set the evaluation goal to assess:

- its effectiveness in terms of increased impact of the Commission's communication priorities at Member State level and achieved goals in reaching the intended public and yielding the desired results;
- its added value and its efficiency in bringing about synergies and an increased coordination between the Member State and the Commission as well as in its mechanisms and procedures functioning.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

**Effectiveness:** the annual communication plans appeared exceptionally ambitious compared to the final result. It should, however, be acknowledged that since late 2010, there was in Greek society an extremely negative political conjuncture, which undoubtedly affected the implementation of the planned activities of the Partnership.

**Efficiency:** The realisation of the Program was influenced by structural reshuffles at Minister level. As a result, the whole construction of the communication field between the two parts of the Program had to restart each time a new political person undertook the position of the Minister, and thus, there was some delay both in the planning and the realisation of the Program.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-greece2009-2010\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-greece2009-2010_en.pdf)

### **Evaluation of the management partnership's actions within the scope of the 2009-2012 communication plans in Lithuania**

**1) ABB activities:** 16 03

**2) Timing:** September 2012

**3) Budget (annual):** EUR 250,000

#### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation of Management Partnerships (MP) was envisaged in the Commission Communication COM (2004)196 and Commission Decision C(2004)4841. Guidelines for the evaluation of MP set the evaluation goal to assess:

- its effectiveness in terms of increased impact of the Commission's communication priorities at Member State level and achieved goals in reaching the intended public and yielding the desired results;
- its added value and its efficiency in bringing about synergies and an increased coordination between the Member State and the Commission as well as in its mechanisms and procedures functioning.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The Management Partnership has been very positively evaluated by contractors.

Numerous campaigns have been executed in Lithuania, which significantly contributed to effective implementation of EC communication priorities, reaching foreseen objectives and wide target audiences. Management Partnership program made significant impact on ability to communicate EU policies priorities and initiatives.

The Management Partnership contributed an added value (number and quality) to the communication activities undertaken by the partners. Management Partnership contributed to geographical extension of EU policies communication, as well to the content and quality of communication. Campaigns became larger, number of campaigns was extended, and more topics were covered.

The highest level of synergy has been achieved within the Management Partnership.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-lithuania\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-lithuania_en.pdf)

## **Evaluation of the management partnership's actions within the scope of the 2008-2010 communication plans in Belgium**

- 1) ABB activities:** 16 03
- 2) Timing:** September 2012
- 3) Budget (annual):** EUR 350,000
- 4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation of Management Partnerships (MP) was envisaged in the Commission Communication COM (2004)196 and Commission Decision C(2004)4841. Guidelines for the evaluation of MP set the evaluation goal to assess:

- its effectiveness in terms of increased impact of the Commission's communication priorities at Member State level and achieved goals in reaching the intended public and yielding the desired results;
- its added value and its efficiency in bringing about synergies and an increased coordination between the Member State and the Commission as well as in its mechanisms and procedures functioning.

### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

Sur la période évaluée, le Partenariat de gestion belge a réalisé 7 actions.

De manière globale, les priorités des actions développées dans ce cadre correspondaient aux priorités européennes annuelles de communication et aux objectifs stratégiques à plus long terme de la coopération entre l'Union européenne et les Etats membres.

De manière globale, les actions furent bien adaptées à leur public. Ce fut notamment le cas des actions éducatives en direction des jeunes.

L'impact tant qualitatif que quantitatif des actions réalisées a été difficile à mesurer en raison de l'anonymat relatif de leur public et du manque de données recueillies.

### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-belgium2008-2010\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-belgium2008-2010_en.pdf)

## **Evaluation des opérations de communication menées dans le cadre du partenariat de gestion 2008-2010 en France**

- 1) ABB activities:** 16 03
- 2) Timing:** October 2012
- 3) Budget (annual):** EUR 850,000



#### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation of Management Partnerships (MP) was envisaged in the Commission Communication COM (2004)196 and Commission Decision C (2004)4841. Guidelines for the evaluation of MP set the evaluation goal to assess:

- its effectiveness in terms of increased impact of the Commission's communication priorities at Member State level and achieved goals in reaching the intended public and yielding the desired results;
- its added value and its efficiency in bringing about synergies and an increased coordination between the Member State and the Commission as well as in its mechanisms and procedures functioning.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

Les résultats de l'évaluation montrent que le partenariat de gestion 2008-2010 en France a atteint des résultats positifs.

L'efficience: le partenariat de gestion a bien été créateur de synergie et de coordination entre la Commission européenne et le Gouvernement français dans la définition et la réalisation des actions. Les opérations menées ont bien servi les priorités de communication dégagées par la Commission européenne et la France en ce qui concerne les thématiques exploitées et les cibles visées. La structure organisationnelle du partenariat a bien impliqué l'ensemble des acteurs concernés, permis une communication facile entre eux et fonctionné selon un rythme adapté aux exigences de la réalisation opérationnelle. Les mécanismes et procédures se sont avérés efficaces et ont permis un usage plus efficace des fonds européens. Ils ont bénéficié du coefficient multiplicateur des cofinancements qui seuls ont permis d'obtenir de forts impacts sur les campagnes majeures. L'investissement du partenariat a bénéficié d'un levier de coefficient 5 par rapport aux sommes dépensées.

L'efficacité: le partenariat a permis d'améliorer l'impact des priorités de communication de la Commission européenne en France grâce à l'effet de levier susmentionné. Les actions menées ont bien atteint les publics prioritairement visés. Cependant, la trace laissée dans la durée est probablement faible, comme l'absence de souvenir, même des campagnes majeures parmi les interviewés non directement concernés l'a révélé.

La plus-value qualitative du partenariat sur les opérations de communication de

l'Union européenne réside dans la qualité des prestations réalisées par les partenaires retenus comme le montre par exemple le très bon impact sur la perception de l'Union européenne du film diffusé pour l'élection au Parlement européen de 2009.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-france2008-2010\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-france2008-2010_en.pdf)

## **Evaluation of the management partnership's actions within the scope of the 2009-2012 communication plans in Poland**

**1) ABB activities:** 16 03

**2) Timing:** December 2012

**3) Budget (annual):** EUR 600,000

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation of Management Partnerships (MP) was envisaged in the Commission Communication COM (2004)196 and Commission Decision C (2004)4841. Guidelines for the evaluation of MP set the evaluation goal to assess:

- its effectiveness in terms of increased impact of the Commission's communication priorities at Member State level and achieved goals in reaching the intended public and yielding the desired results;
- its added value and its efficiency in bringing about synergies and an increased coordination between the Member State and the Commission as well as in its mechanisms and procedures functioning.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The evaluation report emphasised that the projects selected for financing and orders fulfilled were in line with the Communication Priorities and at the same time contributed to their popularisation.

The adopted formula of execution of tasks broken down into tender projects and subsidy projects has been deemed correct. Each of them aimed at achieving different goals - tender projects were to reach the society or information disseminators, whereas subsidy projects were to go local.

The evaluators found difficult to assess effectiveness of projects undertaken due to high diversity of actions undertaken on the one hand, and on the other, due to insufficient manner of measurement of results of projects (in particular in the case of competitions for subsidies).

The analysis of cost effectiveness proved that it was worth supporting projects which used the internet as information carrier - that pertains in particular to publications/information brochures.

Considering the Management partnership the evaluation report, based on the fact that all representatives of the institutions voiced the need to increase a partner approach to the execution of assumptions of the Delegation Agreement signed by et between the Commission and the then Office of the Committee for European Integration (later Ministry of Foreign Affairs), stressed to increase the role of the Coordination Team.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-poland\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/communication/about/evaluation/documents/2012-partnership-ec-poland_en.pdf)

**Assessment of the added value of the EU alcohol strategy and its implementation to enhancing action, cooperation and coordination to reduce alcohol related harm**

6) **ABB activities concerned:** 17 03

7) **Timing:** December 2012, (Period covered by the report: 2006-2011)

8) **Budget:**

No spending programme is directly linked to the EU alcohol strategy, however since 2007, the EU Health Programme has supported alcohol related projects with approximately EUR 9 million, and the EU Research Framework Programmes provided approximately EUR 49 million for studies on alcohol and health.

9) **Background, scope and focus**

The evaluation was carried out in the context of the EU strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol-related harm that was adopted in October 2006.

The purpose of the assignment was to assess the added value of the EU alcohol strategy and its implementation at European and national level. Specific attention was given to the main implementing instruments of the strategy: the Committee on National Alcohol Policy and Action (CNAPA), which main objective is the coordination and support to Member States, and the European Alcohol and Health Forum (EAHF), with special attention to stakeholders' commitments to action.

27 Member States and all representatives of EAHF which comprises 65 member organisations were consulted for this exercise.

10) **Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:**

EU value added, effectiveness and efficiency:

The evaluation concluded that the EU alcohol strategy's outputs support Member States policy development and that the strategy has provided an EU-wide foundation for action on alcohol-related harm. It considers that without it, a common approach across the EU would not have developed and EU work on a common knowledge base would likely have been significantly reduced. National efforts to address cross-policy aspects would have been less strong without an EU-wide exchange of information. Dialogue and cooperation across a broad range of stakeholders at EU level would have been unlikely to take place to a comparable extent in the absence of an EU strategy.

The information gathered in the report indicates that costs of the EU alcohol strategy, connected mainly with organisation of the CNAPA and EAHF meetings, appear reasonable compared with its value added as a foundation and catalyst for EU-wide action on alcohol-related harm.

Proposed modification in the management of the programmes to improve their final impacts:

The evaluation report concluded that the CNAPA work can be enhanced through greater political

visibility by continuing with setting up high-level meetings and establishing links to the EU Presidency agendas. Also enhancing current work on cross-policy issues through greater interaction with other policy areas, including both Commission services and national governments would be beneficial.

Moreover, the evaluation suggested that the consistency and continuity of CNAPA's work could be strengthened by (1) adoption a multi-annual work plan and monitoring its implementation through brief annual reports; (2) drawing on synergies with work on other risk factors for chronic non-communicable diseases.

As to the EAHF the evaluation suggested that further effort to bring in members in under-represented areas, such as alcohol retailers and health and social insurers, could strengthen the EAHF's effectiveness. Also the report advised strengthening membership in sectors where the EAHF has provided a major stimulus for action, such as the media sector, including digital media and exploring ways to involve further sectors, such as law enforcement and local and regional government. Moreover the need to increase participation of stakeholders from new Member States was underlined.

The evaluation also proposed strengthening synergies between CNAPA and EAHF by providing CNAPA members with a yearly overview at national level of EAHF commitments to action and encouraging Member States' active participation in EAHF meetings.

Limitations of the report:

The overall conclusions on the EU Alcohol Strategy are positive and well reflect the general stakeholders' appreciation of the process, but it needs to be underlined here that the evaluation report does not completely fulfil the required Commission evaluation standards. Main limitations of the evaluation report include lack of rigour in data collection, low response rate and misleading reporting of findings. What is more, there is insufficient level of analysis and assessment and in this respect some of the offered conclusions do hardly reach beyond the summary of results.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

The report is not yet available on the Europa website.

**External evaluation of the Consumer Protection Cooperation Regulation**

11) **ABB activities concerned:** 17 02

12) **Timing:** 17 December 2012, (Period covered by the report: 2007 – 2011)

13) **Budget:** not applicable

14) **Background, scope and focus:**

At the end of 2010 the Commission initiated an assessment of the enforcement coordination mechanisms established by the CPC Regulation. This process was inserted as a new review clause in the CPC Regulation in the framework of an amendment to the legal text (Regulation (EU) No. 954/2011). The evaluation was part of this process. The main focus was put on the CPC Regulation,

its implementation in the Member States and the infrastructural and budgetary support for it. The evaluation addressed both (1) the cooperation arrangements in the framework of the CPC Network established by the CPC Regulation in the context of the enforcement of the legislation listed in the Annex to the Regulation and (2) the broader forms of cooperation established by the CPC Regulation under its Chapter IV.

**15) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study:  
Relevance of the CPC Regulation:**

The report concluded that the rationale for intervention is as valid and appropriate today as it was when the CPC Regulation was introduced in 2004. It may even be said that the CPC Regulation framework is even more needed than before given developments in technology and consumption patterns of households (i.e. in digital and online purchasing) and the complexity of trader activity in aspects such as advertising, bundling of products and trading internationally have reinforced the need to provide tools to deter rogue traders and to enforce the law. Even though, the current objectives of the CPC Regulation are appropriate and relevant, none of the specific objectives of the CPC Regulation have been fully achieved. Therefore it would be appropriate to improve the clarity of the text within the CPC Regulation in order to ensure more uniform understanding among national actors.

**Scope of the CPC Regulation:** The analysis concluded that the current scope of the CPC Regulation annex is broadly correct in terms of the sensitivity of the legislation to public enforcement dimension, collective consumer interest, cross-border relevance and consistency. To maintain consistency in consumer protection the evaluation report suggested the possible inclusion of the Rail Passengers' Rights Regulation, the Roaming Regulation and the Mortgage Credit Directive in the scope of the CPC Regulation. Also it was recommended to examine further the possible inclusion of some specific provisions within certain legislative acts, such as the Air Services Regulation.

**Legal barriers to cooperation under the CPC Regulation**

Applicable substantive law

The CPC Regulation does not regulate which applicable substantive law applies in mutual assistance requests. This issue has been raised as a source of difficulties hindering the effectiveness of cross-border enforcement cooperation. The evaluation offered following recommendations to alleviate constraints arising due to differences in substantive law:

- Provide guidance on applicable law in relation to the handling of mutual assistance requests under the CPC Regulation in order to promote better awareness and compliance with EU consumer legislation;
- Foster a common understanding in relation to the application of EU consumer law, inter alia through guidance, on-line legal resources, and interactive forums to also facilitate greater knowledge exchange;
- Monitor the handling of CPC mutual assistance requests to determine the nature of legal issues;
- Consider formalising an approach through ad hoc rules reflecting the logic of the CPC Regulation and catering for the specific situations of real conflict between applicable rules in case the instances of such situations increase;
- Consideration should be given to the establishment of an 'Outsourced legal helpdesk'.

Procedural laws and powers: Another type of legal barrier that stands in the way of effective

cross-border enforcement arises from differences in national procedural rules used to stop the infringement. In most cases they are not designed or applied in practice to take account of the needs for cross-border cooperation. Recommendations to alleviate constraints arising due to differences in procedural law and enforcement powers:

- Provide guidance and foster best-practice to improve the quality of mutual assistance requests under the CPC Regulation.
- Investigate possible gaps in the implementation of minimum powers and assess the need for action in this respect.
- Examine options to revise the CPC Regulation to include minimum procedural standards.
- Examine options to revise the CPC Regulation to expand the minimum investigative (e.g. broader spot check powers on companies' premises) and enforcement powers (e.g. including redress powers) of national competent authorities in order to overcome certain difficulties reported for the efficiency of cooperation and to address a potential deterrent gap stemming from national fragmentation.

The four cooperation mechanisms of the CPC Network: The CPC Regulation establishes following cooperation mechanisms and common activities among Member State authorities and with the Commission: mutual assistance requests; coordinated surveillance activities; common activities to foster a common approach to enforcement; general reporting and Committee meetings. The use of the mutual assistance requests varies considerably across the Member States. A strong downward trend in the number of alerts is observed. Regarding the common activities each year one or two projects have been financed involving sometimes a large number of countries, but there has only been a limited take up of co-funding for exchanges of officials. The biennial assessments of the CPC Regulation pointed further to possible barriers to cooperation due to resources constraints at the level of Member State authorities, divergence in participation to the CPC network and a possible need to review the Commission's role in the CPC framework. Recommendations in relation to functioning of the CPC Network and common actions:

- The Commission should continue developing guidance clarifying the functioning of the tools of the CPC Regulation and the obligations placed on Member States.
- The text of the CPC Regulation could be revised in order to increase the clarity of the objectives, the obligations and the understanding of current provisions.
- Consideration should be given to whether the Commission could make greater use of its powers to introduce infringement proceedings against the Member States that do not fulfil their obligations under the CPC Regulation.
- Where several Member States seek enforcement against the same trader, guidance should be provided to help coordinate enforcement actions.
- Consideration should be given to providing a legal base for a European body: to arbitrate in Member State conflicts hindering enforcement, to facilitate case handling coordination and to enforce EU law in a trans-national context.
- Consider and develop possibilities to cooperate and learn from other systems (such as IMI, RAPEX, and RASFF).
- A common national reporting protocol should be adopted in terms of its format and the information to be reported so that market monitoring intelligence gathered can be used

systematically and ‘Joint’ EU level reports that both reflect on the achievements of CPC and anticipate future challenges can be produced.

- Consideration should be given to the establishment of an ‘Observatory’ that would use the experience and information collected under the CPC Regulation (and information from other sources) on the extent of infringements and challenges and successes of enforcement to generate material that would increase awareness amongst national authorities and consumer representative organisations, and ultimately EU citizens.
- Given the wide variations in resources committed to CPC activities at the national level the Commission should encourage Member States committing relatively low and relatively high levels of resources to compare and to ‘peer review’ their practices with Member States committing average (pro rata) levels of resources and acting effectively under the CPC Regulation.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/enforcement/docs/cpc\\_regulation\\_inception\\_report\\_revised290212\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/enforcement/docs/cpc_regulation_inception_report_revised290212_en.pdf)

**Evaluation of the EU rapid response network, crisis management and communication capacity regarding certain transmissible animal diseases**

- 6) **ABB activities concerned:** 17 04
- 7) **Timing:** 1 August 2012 (duration of the evaluation 09.2012-07.2012, Period covered by the report: 1998 – 2009)
- 8) **Budget:** At the EU level the activity has no directly allocated budget. The relevant activities of the Member States (MS) are covered by national arrangements. Following outbreaks of certain diseases on the territory of MS, specific costs directly related to the emergency measures taken by them (e.g. compensating to owners for the slaughter, destruction of animals, costs incurred for the cleaning, disinfection of holdings and equipment, cost of supply of the vaccine etc.) are met by financial contributions met by the EU, adopted as Commission Decisions in application of Council Decision 2009/470/EC.
- 9) **Background, scope and focus:** The evaluation was carried out in the context of the Animal Health Strategy for the European Union "Prevention is better than cure" (Commission Communication from September 2007 COM(2007)539 final) and was required by the afferent Action Plan (Commission Communication from September 2008-COM (2008) 545 final). The focus was put on assessing the current legislative and non-legislative environment as regards the state of preparedness and the capacity of the EU rapid response network, where the latter encompasses the Commission Services, MS (especially the veterinary Competent Authorities) and stakeholders, such as private sector veterinarians and the economic operators concerned. During its work, the contractor involved all Member States and major stakeholders.
- 10) **Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related**



**study:** Effectiveness, efficiency and added value of the EU rapid response network:

The EU rapid response system is considered generally to work effectively and efficiently and to have improved very significantly over the last decade. The availability of well developed, tested and up to date Contingency Plans (CPs) as an indicator of preparedness can help prevent an emergency from becoming a crisis. The effectiveness of the response also relies on good cooperation and coordination within the overall rapid response network, including between the Commission and MS, regular and timely exchange of information (including scientific knowledge and advice) between laboratories and with stakeholders, and the building and maintenance of confidence and trust between all parties. The evolution of the EU animal health co-financing indicates a decrease in the amount of EU co-funding for emergency veterinary measures from some EUR65 million in 2000 to EUR30 million in 2011. Over the last five years EU co-financing has averaged EUR37 million, well below the average over the whole period (EUR91 million, 2000-2011 in terms of outturn payments, i.e. the sum of credits generated by a MS in a specific year). This points to the more efficient use of funds to achieve longer term objectives such as the reinstating of disease free status for major diseases in the EU. The comprehensive set of legislation now in place (including Contingency Plans and the EU emergency network in all its components) can be considered as a valuable shield against traditional contagious animal diseases and appears to be quite effective in terms of triggering the relevant steps and control measures to fight against emerging diseases or new "profiles" of known diseases. As a result of this, over the evaluation period, out of a significant number of outbreaks, relatively few have developed into a crisis. On the basis of the criteria of financial cost and economic impact, the following crises were identified: Classical Swine Fever (1997 DE); Avian Influenza-AI (1999/2000 IT); AI (2003 NL); H5N1 Influenza (2005-06); Foot and Mouth Disease (2001, UK); Bovine Tuberculosis (2007/08, DE/FR/NL/BE). In the last 4 years the EU has not experienced an animal health crisis, and in particular the potential of an African Swine Fever crisis due to the risk of re-introduction of this disease from the Caucasus region was reduced to nil. The extent of the economic and social impacts for the affected sectors and the wider economy, of major animal health emergencies/crises that have occurred in the EU27 during the last two decades is however very significant. On the basis of existing studies, impacts can extend from several million EUR in direct losses, to hundreds of millions EUR or even several billion EUR if the indirect losses to the affected sector and the wider economy are also included. In recent years, due to improved preparedness, effective use of the lessons learnt from the management of outbreaks and development of networks of the actors involved in the EU rapid response system the EU 27 has no longer suffered from such extensive levels of losses.

Recommendations as to the modification in the management to improve the final impacts:

The most important in terms of economic and social impacts is to prevent an animal health emergency from becoming a crisis and for this MS' implementation of Contingency Plans(CP) is crucial. Room for improvement has been identified, such as enhanced collaboration between neighbouring MS, clearer minimum requirements for a "generic" (not disease specific) CPs and sufficient flexibility for the disease specific parts, guidance documents to be provided by the Commission for the drafting of the plans as well as increased stakeholder involvement in the drafting process. In addition contingency planning should better address possibly future emerging diseases. While the current Commission's approval of the plans via comitology procedure is not deemed the most useful, the role of the Food and Veterinary Office in auditing the plans is felt very effective and expandable. The adoption of containment measures in relation to disease outbreaks by the Commission in the framework of the Standing Committee on the Food Chain

and Animal Health is considered a very powerful tool in emergency response. Those Committee meetings also serve as an excellent platform for information exchange. Only minor suggestions are made on making better use of modern technicalities and communication tools (telephone/videoconferencing, a CIRCA platform for uploading of meeting documents) also in view of cost savings.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/strategy/pillars/docs/23\\_final\\_report\\_eu\\_rapid\\_response.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/strategy/pillars/docs/23_final_report_eu_rapid_response.pdf)

**Evaluation on the European Union Crime Prevention Network**

**1) ABB activities:** 15 05

**2) Timing:** 30.11.2012 (Period covered mid-2009-2012)

**3) Budget (2010+2011):** The EUCPN benefits from financial support from the ISEC Programme through a grant of EUR 845,000 covering the period mid 2011-mid 2014.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

According article 9 of the Council Decision 2009/902/JHA, the Commission had to present a report on the activities of the EU Crime Prevention Network with a special focus on the efficiency of the Network and its secretariat, taking due account of the interaction between the Network and other relevant stakeholders. Furthermore, the European Council invited the Commission to submit a proposal to setting up an ‘Observatory for the Prevention of Crime’ (OPC), "the tasks of which will be to collect, analyse and disseminate knowledge on crime, including organised crime (including statistics) and crime prevention, to support and promote Member States and EU institutions when they take preventive measures and to exchange best practice. The evaluation done provided recommendations as regards the future, including considering the feasibility of establishing a Crime Prevention Observatory.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The evaluation, done on the basis of an independent external study, addressed several aspects of the EUCPN, including its performance, organisation and governance. It demonstrated that overall the network is functioning relatively well and has made good progress in relation to the objectives set out in the 2009 Council Decision and the 2010-2015 Multiannual Strategy (be a point of reference for the EUCPN target groups; disseminate knowledge on crime prevention; support crime prevention at national and local levels; develop EU policy and strategies with regard to crime prevention). Compared to the situation when the previous evaluation was conducted (2008-2009), many shortcomings have been addressed allowing for the Network activities to be more targeted and the quality and quantity of its outputs improved. Together research projects (18 since 2009), initiatives such as producing thematic papers, setting up a stakeholder database, redesigning the newsletter or launching a stakeholder feedback survey have all contributed to better cooperation, contact exchanges of information and experience between actors in the field of crime prevention

However, there are still a number of weaknesses which would need to be addressed to increase EUCPN's performance, impact and added value such as a more systematic alignment of the Network with agreed EU priorities, a strengthened role in making inputs to EU and Member State policymaking, a more strategic approach to determining activities, supported by the development, in the longer term, of an observatory-type monitoring function, further collaboration with Eurostat, CEPOL and EUROPOL. Even if overall the evaluation confirmed that the EUCPN Secretariat was performing well despite

its limited capacity, some recommendations were made on the EUCPN organisation and governance; the effectiveness and capacity of the rotating EUCPN Presidencies should be improved as well as the role of the National Representatives in the Board. The role of the Board observers should also be clarified, and the role of the EUCPN's contact points better defined.

On the basis of this evaluation, the Commission considered that the EUCPN is an increasingly useful instrument to support policymakers at EU and national levels, with considerable potential to create added value at local level. The positive development of the Network over the past two years makes the establishment of a Crime Prevention Observatory neither corresponding to a pressing need nor politically or financially desirable in the short term. The Commission rather recommended enhancing the EUCPN, notably by a better resourced Secretariat, to concentrate on consolidating progress made so far and further improving the functioning of the Network on the basis of the recommendations made during the evaluation.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/organized-crime-and-human-trafficking/crime-prevention/docs/20121130\\_eucpn\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/organized-crime-and-human-trafficking/crime-prevention/docs/20121130_eucpn_report_en.pdf)

### Evaluation of the EU cooperation with Colombia

**1) ABB activities:** 19 09:

**2) Timing:** October 2012, (period covered by the report: 2002-2011)

**3) Budget :**Disbursements over the evaluation period: EUR196.61 million

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation provides an overall independent assessment of the Commission's past and current cooperation with Colombia over the period 2002-2011 and identifies key lessons in order to improve the current and future strategies and programmes of the Commission, particularly considering the new development policy set in the "Agenda for Change".

The evaluation focuses on the following areas of investigation: Peace, Stability and Socio-economic Development; Rule of Law and Justice; Human Rights and Victims of the Armed Conflict; Good Governance; Productivity and Competitiveness; Environmental Sustainability and the Linkage between Relief, Rehabilitation and Development. It also analyses the instruments and aid modalities made available by the Commission, as well as the coherence, coordination and complementarity ("3Cs") of EU cooperation and the European added value.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation**

The EU cooperation strategy with Colombia from 2002 to 2010 is characterized by the core objective of peace building. In general terms, the EU strategy was coherent with the Colombian policies in relation to peace-building by contributing to address the root causes for conflict.

Key conclusions:

- Although the EU strategy has supported transition from relief to rehabilitation in a highly sensitive conflict situation, it did not sufficiently succeed to link the long term objective of development to these medium term objectives. Determining factors were the lack of a comprehensive and structured strategic framework to mainstream good governance principles as well as a non-adaptive capacity development scheme, notably as regards the territorial development. Weaknesses have also been identified as regards coordination and complementarity with other donors. The distinctive policy strategies of active EU Member States hampered visibility of EU added value.
- Conflict prevention and resolution: The EU contributed in strengthening civil society, creating social networks and promoting productive alternatives and reactivation in zones most affected by conflict. However, sustainability remains a major concern.
- Rule of law, justice and human rights: By supporting the new Penal Oral Accusatory System, the EU has helped to improve the application of the Justice and Peace Law. It has provided political and technical support for the protection of victims' rights and the promotion of human rights. However, impunity in relation to human rights violations

remains a key problem and specific improvements can not conclusively be attributed to EU actions.

- **Trade and competitiveness:** By supporting the Local Economic Development approach, the EU has contributed to create the basis for development and competitiveness notably in rural areas. The next step needs to facilitate participation in national and international markets.
- **Environmental sustainability:** Albeit not being a priority in its strategy and not being coordinated with the responsible ministry, the EU succeeded in improving the environmental sustainability.

Key recommendations:

- Conduct impact evaluations in order to inform future decision making policy and strategy which should take into account the political dimension and reinforce the political dialogue at all levels. Fine tune and consolidate the LRRD strategy. Review the Backbone Strategy and its EuropeAid toolkit for improving adaptability of capacity development, notably for territorialized interventions.
- Maintain support to and ensure sustainability of civil organizations and the platforms for dialogue in the zones most affected by conflict.
- Create a new cooperation strategy in this area based on inclusive political and policy dialogue with all stakeholders concerned. Use the dialogue as catalyst for developing and implementing an effective human rights policy.
- Use the recently signed EU-Colombia Trade Agreement to effectively continue promoting local economic development working towards a multiplication effect in the national economy.
- Formulate the environmental strategy with the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development and implement it in coordination with the national policy. The conclusions and recommendations of this country level evaluation will be taken into account in the current programming exercise to be finalised in 2014. In this regards, some information on the contribution of the evaluation to the design of the next country programme may be available in 2013.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2013/1315\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2013/1315_docs_en.htm)

### **Evaluation of the EU cooperation with Ecuador**

**1) ABB activities:** 19 09

**2) Timing:** September 2012; (Period covered by the report : 2003-2010)

**3) Budget:** Disbursements over the evaluation period: EUR 204.8M.

#### **4) Background, scope and focus :**

The evaluation aims at providing an overall independent assessment of the entire EC cooperation strategy and support in the country and to draw out key lessons to help improve current and future EC strategies and programmes.

The evaluation covers the EC's cooperation programme with Ecuador over the 1996-2010 period. The thematic focus covered (i) social services (education and health), (ii) trade and economic development, (iii) natural resources management; (iv) sustainable rural development, and (v) governance and democracy.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

EU cooperation was well aligned to the Government's priorities and to the population needs, particularly in the Health and Education sectors, allowing for positive results and ensuring sustainability. The non-financial input in the context of Budget Support improved alignment to national policies and established dialogue with the Government as well as the adoption of national systems for programme design, managing, monitoring and reporting. Coherence was good at a strategic level, but limited in implementation.

Key conclusions:

- Strong alignment to Government of Ecuador priorities and responsiveness to population needs. The two main interventions in the social sectors (Health and Education) contributed to the implementation of significant reforms. In the environment sector, the Commission has succeeded in strengthening decentralised management and a strong ownership at local level shows support responded well to population needs. In the areas of trade and economic development, Commission's activities aimed at enhancing efficiency and competitiveness of the MSME, which absorbs the majority of the country's workforce. Commission's support to rural development responded to the needs of poor regions while giving rise to sector policies both at central and local level.
- Main EU added value was in the use of BS modality, which allowed enhancing alignment to national policies and establishing a privileged dialogue with the Government of Ecuador and the adoption of national systems for programme design, managing, monitoring and reporting.
- Good coherence at strategic level but limited at implementation level, despite converging objectives few synergies have been found; particularly between thematic and bilateral cooperation and between national, sub-regional and regional interventions.
- Adequate choice of aid modalities in the light of country context. The Commission has implemented successfully a project approach, with influence on policies and good sustainability; the subsequent shift towards budget support has further increased ownership and alignment. As regards Budget support operations it is recognised the relevance of non-financial inputs; furthermore, the role played by CSOs in reporting has impacted and raised their profile.

Key recommendations:

The uncertainty on the continuity of bilateral co-operation with Ecuador did not allow for very specific and tailor-made recommendations.

- Ensure continuity of support to the environment sector through sub-regional co-operation and thematic budget lines;
- Ensure continuity of support to trade and economic development through regional co-operation in support of both the private and the public sectors;
- Ensure continuity of support to adult education in order to strengthen the Government capacity;
- Strategies should be elaborated in order to ensure smooth exit from sectors of intervention, where relevant;
- Improve quality of investments and quality of indicators in the on-going SBS programmes.

The conclusions and recommendations of this country level evaluation will be taken into account in the current programming exercise to be finalised in 2014. In this regard, some information on the contribution of the evaluation to the design of the next country programme may be available in 2013.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2012/1312\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2012/1312_docs_en.htm)

**Evaluation of the EU cooperation with Honduras**

**1) ABB activities:** 19 09

**2) Timing:** April 2012, (period covered by the report: 2002-2009)

**3) Budget:** Disbursements over the evaluation period: EUR 234 million.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation aims at providing an overall independent assessment of the entire EC cooperation strategy and support in the country and to draw out key lessons to help improve current and future EC strategies and programmes.

During the evaluation period (2002-2009), cooperation with Honduras focused on combating poverty and raising standards of living of the poorest groups in the country. This included support for food security, local development and management of natural resources, education and health sectors along with the support to the decentralisation reform. More recently the EU has engaged in supporting the Legal and Judicial sector in the country; however it is still too early to assess its results.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The EU strategy had positive results, though implementation was difficult. The EU programme was aligned with the Government's policies, yet these changed over time, undermining implementation and the sustainability of some actions. Co-operation was suspended following the political crisis of 2009. In order to ensure results and to offset weaknesses in capacity, continued support through technical assistance, and strengthening



the involvement of civil society is necessary.

Key conclusions:

- The EU concentrated its cooperation in sectors addressing well the needs of the population. Support was aligned with Government's priorities, though these have changed over time, which impacted implementation and results. Three sectors, natural resources management, food security and decentralisation, were strongly intertwined but synergies were not fully exploited.
- Positive results were obtained in reconstruction, rehabilitation, food security and vocational training subsectors, where the EC proved to have an added value. Furthermore the EC has been very active and effective in promoting donor co-ordination and division of labour.
- The aid modalities proved to be adequate with the exception of sector budget support towards decentralisation, mainly because of the discontinuity of the country's commitment to public sector reforms.
- The EC has provided international technical assistance and has involved Civil society in order to ensure cooperation results and to compensate for weak capacity in government institutions, affected by high turnover within its staff.
- The linkages between the relief operation (following hurricane Mitch) and rehabilitation were not very effective and delays occurred.
- The overall approach recently designed to strengthen public security is positively assessed, except for the insufficient involvement of Civil society organisations in the process, to promote reforms and to monitor implementation.

Key recommendations:

- The difficult context requires the EU to do a thorough analysis in order to identify the most appropriate sectors of intervention and aid delivery modalities. Analysis should include political consensus and commitment with relation to specific sectoral policies, national capacity and risk analysis.
- Despite difficulties in mapping the complexity (and conflicting interests) among Civil society organisations it is important to involve them in monitoring the reform processes, while ensuring this does not hamper the dialogue with the Government.
- Continuity and sustainability of achievements, particularly in food security and vocational training sectors, should be improved.
- The EC has been successful in a dialogue on natural resources management at micro level but needs to address the topic at macro level, on a government-wide basis.
- Support provided to food security and natural resources management impact the decentralised level of government: the EC should fully exploit these synergies.
- International technical assistance should be maintained if BS operations are to be continued. It is also suggested to embed and maintain a system of incentives within a conditionality framework.

The conclusions and recommendations of this country level evaluation will be taken into account in the current programming exercise to be finalised in 2014. In this regards, some

information on the contribution of the evaluation to the design of the next country programme may be available in 2013.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2012/1304\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2012/1304_docs_en.htm)

## **Evaluation of the EU cooperation with Nepal**

**1) ABB activities:** 19 10

**2) Timing:** March 2012; (Period covered by the report : 2002-2010)

**3) Budget:** Disbursements over the evaluation period : EUR 58 million

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation aims at providing an overall independent assessment of the entire EC cooperation strategy and support in the country over the 2002-2010 period and to draw out key lessons to help improve current and future EC strategies and programmes.

Political instability has been a major issue throughout the whole period. Important delays in the formulation and implementation of EC-funded interventions reduced significantly their effectiveness. The complex set-up with two EU Delegations involved in the formulation and implementation of the EC strategy in Nepal increased transaction costs.

Thematic focus: (i) Education, (ii) Rural Development, (iii) Renewable Energy and Environment, (iv) Peace Building and Consolidation of Democracy, and (v) Trade facilitation and integration in the international economy.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation**

The Commission helped to keep the poverty reduction strategy on track but the direct contribution to increased production, employment and incomes remained limited. The mix of instruments and aid modalities was good. Synergies with other Development Partners and donor co-ordination were rather good overall but limited in others. The role of the Commission in sector policy dialogue, notably in the areas of trade, rule of law and democracy was modest, in line with the size of its support.

Key conclusions:

- By staying engaged with the Government of Nepal in fighting poverty, the EC has helped to keep the poverty reduction strategy on track in achieving the Millennium Development Goals. The EC interventions improved conditions for further poverty reduction. However, the direct contribution to increased production, employment and incomes remained rather limited as few and only small interventions were implemented in productive sectors.
- The EC has actively participated in the policy dialogue with the Government of Nepal in line with the size of its support (the EC is a relatively small Development Partner), but more could have been done in several sectors of cooperation (e.g. trade, the rule of law and

democracy).

- The EC portfolio is characterised by a suitable mix of instruments and aid modalities. Despite the relatively weak institutional environment and the unstable political context, the move towards budget support was justified and has led to some tangible results. However, exclusively relying on budget support in Nepal is insufficient to improve the quality of the overall environment in which development takes place, as well as the quality of sector management.
- Although important improvements were made in recent years in the process of establishing a fully-fledged Delegation in Nepal, human resources in the two EU Delegations involved were constrained during most of the period. In addition, during most of the evaluation period, the ownership and accountability of the Government of Nepal was low due to the unstable and rapidly changing political conditions.

Key recommendations:

- The EC should focus on key areas where it is recognised as having extensive experience and where it can provide added value. Potential key areas are: trade, environment and disaster preparedness. Moreover, the EC needs to leverage its assets, which consist in large part of the relationships of trust that have been built up with national partners (including Government of Nepal) and other Development Partners. It also needs to build on and strengthen the professional expertise which it has in-country in the areas of democracy (elections), human rights, public financial management, peace and stability, and education.
- The EC should increase the support to productive sectors, particularly in rural areas so as to strengthen the economic impact of the EC interventions.
- The EC needs to engage more confidently in policy dialogue with national stakeholders, including both the Government of Nepal and Non State Actors.
- Synergies between the various EC aid modalities and financing instruments as well as the role of Non State Actors in the implementation of the strategy should be further strengthened.
- The EC, and particularly the EUD, should align its own capacity with the objectives set in its strategy, and continue to consolidate them. As soon as the political conditions improve and Nepal benefits from a stable and fully endorsed and accountable government, the EC should also give a greater role to national stakeholders in the design and implementation of its co-operation strategy. The conclusions and recommendations of this country level evaluation will be taken into account in the current programming exercise to be finalised in 2014. In this regards, some information on the contribution of the evaluation to the design of the next country programme may be available in 2013.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2012/1302\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2012/1302_docs_en.htm)

## Thematic evaluation of EC support to Decentralisation processes

- 1) **ABB activities:** 19 11
- 2) **Timing:** February 2012; (Period covered by the report: 2000-2009)
- 3) **Budget:** Disbursements over the evaluation period : EUR 640 million (only direct activities)
- 4) **Background, scope and focus:** European Commission support to decentralisation processes over the period 2000-2009, worldwide, including both direct and indirect activities (indirect e.g. support to sectors at a decentralised level). If including both direct and indirect support, during this period budget allocations rose from nil to EUR 100 million per year, 74% being implemented in Africa. The EU has developed a Policy framework over this period, responding to a demand from partner countries and the emergency of local authorities as actors in development.
- 5) **Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:** EU support has been most effective in contexts at relative early stages of reform, in strengthening local governments' management and administrative capacities, in promoting greater transparency in funds' allocation from central to local level and improving access to service delivery. Substantial challenges remain, such as addressing central government through effective policy dialogue, raising participation of civil society, and improving the quality of service delivery. Continued support is important in poor and fragile contexts.

### Key conclusions:

- The EU has developed a comprehensive policy framework for direct and indirect support to decentralisation processes, particularly supportive of the role of local governments as stakeholders for i) improving governance and ii) service delivery, responding to a demand from partners' countries reform agenda and the emergency of local authorities as actors in development.
- Substantial challenges remain and continued support is of utmost relevance, particularly in poor and fragile contexts.
- The EC has focused its assistance in strengthening local governments' management and administrative capacities, in promoting greater transparency in governments systems for allocation of funds from central to local level, in improving access to service delivery and, to a certain extent, in development of decentralisation policies.
- EC support has been most effective in countries with relative early stages of reform and less in more mature decentralised contexts.
- The EC was less successful in addressing the central governmental level, lacking capacity for establishing an effective policy dialogue for comprehensive institutional arrangements, for supporting legal reforms and human resources management.
- The EC has had little impact in upraising the participative profile of civil society and the quality aspects of service delivery.
- The main constraint towards stronger EU engagement at policy level has been the

lack of dedicated human resources both in HQ and delegations, along with insufficient dissemination of documents and training events.

- EC programming has been increasingly aligned with partners countries' contexts and demand, namely with the nationally owned development strategies, poverty reduction plans and decentralisation reforms.
- In terms of impact and effectiveness the use of different aid modalities has not proved to be a decisive factor; but efficiency has improved through increasing EC engagement in working with other donors through joint aid modalities and the introduction of new aid modalities. The EC has been proactive and leader in organising donors' co-ordination.
- To ensure sustainability of interventions, it is necessary to align with partners' countries owned priorities. All interventions have to be anchored to the political framework and to sectoral policies; the latter would also drastically increase coherence.

Key recommendations:

- The EU should exploit its potential added value and acknowledge decentralisation as part of Public sector reform. Addressing public reforms shall require the strengthening of an informed policy dialogue with a wide range of stakeholder (central and local), while recognising the need to embed support into the broader political context and of developing capacity to provide realistic assessment of the nationally owned strategies and context variables.
- EU should develop clear intervention strategies to adapt to different contexts and maturity of reforms.
- EU should give priority to strengthening partner countries' monitoring and evaluation of the reforms;
- EU should build upon its know-how on selected aspect of local fiscal reforms and exploit it further.
- EU shall develop more sectoral capacity in terms of dedicated Human resources, develop operational guidelines, disseminate information and organise appropriate training. Furthermore, EU should strengthen its internal capacity of internal knowledge management to ensure systemic internal sharing of results.

Uptake of the evaluation recommendations:

Recommendations were on the overall agreed by EC services. Some concrete actions are already underway, namely:

- A “Communication on Local authorities in development” is being prepared in order to improve the policy framework of local governments’ role towards improved governance;
- Efforts are consecrated to respond to the recommendations calling for improved sectoral capacity and selected aspects of reform; specific guidance is being elaborated, particularly: a) Guidance on project modality to support decentralisation and Local governance; b) “Practical guidance on fiscal decentralisation”.

## **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2012/1300\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2012/1300_docs_en.htm)

## **Thematic evaluation of the European Commission support to respect of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (including solidarity with victims of repression)**

**1) ABB activities:** 19 04

**2) Timing:** December 2011, (Period covered by the report : 2000-2010)

**3) Budget (annual):** Disbursements over the evaluation period : EUR 4.036 million

### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation provides an independent assessment of the Commission's human rights work in non-member countries. The evaluation concerns both the funds contracted by the European Commission over the period covered and the so-called 'non-financial activities', notably the political and policy dialogues that are central to the EU approach to human right promotion in third countries.

This study assessed how the EC advanced the human rights agenda in different political and institutional environments. It examined to what extent and how the EC managed to: (i) use its political clout to leverage change; (ii) strategically combine various instruments; (iii) mobilise the various actors (states, civil society, regional organisations, UN); (iv) pro-actively promote the mainstreaming of human rights; (v) foster the application of the 3Cs' in the field of human rights and (vi) achieve results and impact. In the process, it took stock of the dilemmas encountered, the innovative practices employed and the lessons learnt.

### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

In many countries, the EC has made relevant contributions to promoting the Human Rights agenda at various levels through the use of funding and non-funding instruments. Evidence of results and positive impacts has been identified in relation to both the promotion and protection of human rights. However, a deficit in the EC/EU political commitment towards implementing an effective and coherent human rights policy and a lack of related knowledge, capacities and incentives have been highlighted. As a consequence, the political status of human rights in the EC/EU external action should be upgraded so as to ensure coherent action and increase impact.

Key conclusions:

- At a macro level, the sheer presence of the EU as a global player promoting a human rights agenda has helped to protect and eventually enlarge the space to address human rights issues;
- In several settings (including highly restrictive environments) the EC has been able to intelligently mobilise the different instruments at its disposal with a view to pushing for legal changes or effective application of ratified conventions;
  - EU political demarches have helped to prevent a deterioration of human rights situation (e.g. when contributing to halt legislative reforms that would re-introduce the death penalty);

- The EC support to human rights defenders and civil society organisations has repeatedly been described as a ‘lifeline’ for the actors involved;
- Several EC-supported programmes have contributed to promoting joint action between state and non-state actors on human rights;
- EC support to justice sector reforms and the fight against impunity have contributed to improving the overall environment for the protection of human rights;
- Though poorly documented, there is evidence of impact achieved with capacity building initiatives (which consume a large share of EC aid for human rights).

#### Key recommendations:

The political status of human rights in the EC/EU external action should be upgraded so as to ensure coherent action and increase impact. Bold decisions are needed to ensure that human rights can leave the ‘ghetto’ in which they have all too often been relegated. The EC/EU needs to clarify ‘upstream’ how much weight it wants to give to human rights and how it can better reconcile values and interests in this critical area of its external action. It needs to build stronger bridges between human rights and other domains of EU external action.

- Clarify the political agenda of the EU with regard to human rights and translate this in common implementation strategies;
- Develop a comprehensive strategy to localise human rights;
- Revitalize the political dialogue on human rights by clarifying its objectives while ensuring an inclusive, iterative and result-oriented approach;
- Overcome the divide between human rights and development through smart forms of mainstreaming and direct support to human rights;
- Better use the added value of the EC to support systemic reforms that help realising rights;
- Deepen the strategic engagement with citizens, civil society political actors and regional organisations;
- Create an enabling institutional environment for effective delivery of a coherent EC/EU action on human rights.

#### Uptake of the evaluation recommendations:

The Commission has accepted all 7 recommendations (one overall policy recommendation and 6 specific recommendations) formulated by the evaluators and there has been already a good follow up on them.

#### Actions already taken in accordance with the recommendations:

In accordance with the overall policy recommendation of the evaluation to upgrade the political status of human rights in the EC/EU external action so as to ensure coherent action and increased impact and with the recommendation to create an enabling institutional environment for effective delivery of a coherent EC/EU action on human

rights an EU Strategic Framework for Human Rights and Democracy and a related Action Plan were endorsed by the European Council on 25th June 2012. Moreover, an EU Special Representative (EUSR) on Human Rights has been appointed on 26th July 2012 in order to enhance the effectiveness and visibility of the EU's HR policy and ensure implementation of the Action Plan.

In response to the recommendation to clarify the political agenda of the EU with regard to human rights and translate it in common implementation strategies, the two strategic documents provide benchmarks and objectives of a clear political agenda for human rights and democracy involving the Commission, EEAS and Member States. This is the first time that the European Union has a unified Strategic Framework for human rights with a wide-ranging plan of action for its implementation.

In response to the recommendation to overcome the divide between human rights and development through smart forms of mainstreaming and direct support to human rights, for the next programming period the human rights dimension is integrated in EU supported programmes related to economic governance, domestic accountability and other key sectors such as health and education.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2011/1298\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2011/1298_docs_en.htm)

**Evaluation of Visibility of EU external action**

**1) ABB activities:** 19 11

**2) Timing:** June 2012, (Period covered by the report : 2005-2010)

**3) Budget (annual):** Not applicable

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

This evaluation assesses the visibility of the EU's external action over the period 2005-2010. The basis of the evaluation is the work carried out by the Commission largely prior to the reorganisation of the EU's external services, but the recommendations are set in the current Post-Lisbon context.

The evaluation was structured in different phases and makes good use of evaluation questions, judgment criteria and indicators. In addition to documentary evidence and reports consulted, the tools used are: 6 in-country thematic studies, media coverage analysis (over 1000 media reports were reviewed), web-based attitudinal surveys (around 220 people responded), interviews (some 260) with three categories of actors in Brussels (NGOs & Think Tanks, EU officials, journalists), analysis of Eurobarometer reports, 3 cases studies of specific events and partnerships. The criteria for assessment were the five DAC criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability) along with EU specific criteria of coherence and added value.

Thematic focus: Visibility, Communication, Outreach

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**



Key conclusions:

- The image of EU external action is in line with pre-Lisbon official priorities. Stakeholders are however often critical of the quality of the EU's image and feel there is often a gap between rhetoric and reality.
- Communication on EU external action lacks overall direction and leadership, notably since the post-Lisbon Treaty reorganisation. While there are some efforts to re-establish internal coordination (ERIC) and on communication strategy there is still no strong sense of central leadership or of a new overall EU external action communication strategy emerging.
- Working in partnership with others is essential but there is a trade-off in lower EU visibility. This remains a source of tension and too much insistence being put on EU visibility can undermine the effectiveness of the cooperation and the sense of ownership felt by partners.
- The image of EU external action varies both geographically and by constituency.

While certain high profile features of the EU (e.g. the EUR) are known around the world, the image of the EU's external action varies from place to place and among stakeholders. Some of the EU's closest and best-informed observers are the most critical.

- The nature of the EU imposes constraints that impact on its visibility. For instance problems of internal competition for visibility between EU actors continue, a lack of cooperation and coordination between the EU and the Member States in external action remains a key problem and policy coherence is a more of an issue for informed external observers than officials often seem to think.
- The resources for promoting the visibility of EU external action have been adequate.

On the other hand the distribution of resources, particularly at the country level, does raise some concerns, with EU Delegations seemingly have too few resources in some cases and not all implementing agencies using the funds they are given well.

Key recommendations:

- Reaffirm, renew and strengthen the established visibility strategy of EU external action by improving its quality and, particularly by communicating more on results and by avoiding raising unrealistic expectations.
- Provide stronger central direction and leadership for communication work on EU external action. A single overall communication strategy for EU external action with complementary sectoral strategies is needed. Ensure regular close coordination on communication between services, establish an urgent action cooperation mechanism and coordinate EU external action communication messages with Member States.
- Agree that 'working in partnership' is an intrinsic part of the image of EU external action and a key message for communication. One of the key features of the way the EU works in international affairs is its continuing effort to work in partnership with other actors. Build the external action communication strategy around this principle. Accept that some reduction of visibility is a by-product of such partnerships that can even be positive. EU senior management should provide clear leadership on the balance to take.
- The EU needs to manage sensitively the geographic and constituency variations in the

visibility of EU external action. The EU's world-wide network of Delegations is a major asset in this respect. In Europe, communication with informed and critical audiences closest to home needs to be tackled with particular care and attention.

- Pay special attention to the impact on visibility of the EU's specific nature. All EU external action staff needs to be very aware of the importance of projecting a single EU image. Promoting a well-coordinated EU image with Member States should be a key objective for all and particularly those in leadership positions. Close attention should be paid to policy coherence both in practical terms and in terms of external images and messages.
- Review the distribution of resources for communication work particularly at the country level. EU Delegations may consider examining their need to perhaps have more resources with adequate expertise. The funding of communication and information work in EUDs should also be reviewed in the light of their new political functions under the Lisbon Treaty.

Uptake of the evaluation recommendations:

The Commission has accepted all 6 key recommendations formulated by the evaluators.

For instance, as to the recommendation on a strengthened visibility strategy, DG DEVCO has already produced an ambitious communication strategy in 2011. DG DEVCO, EEAS and FPI collaborate with the view to create synergy and to have a consistent approach in all aspects of cooperation. This led to the dissemination of a "Communication Handbook for EU Delegations". Collaboration with MS is strongly encouraged at the Delegation's level and Headquarters foresee increasing collaboration with the MS development agencies communicators from 2013 onwards.

As to resources, for EU Delegations with relevant management capabilities pooling projects' budgets could be one way to improve substantially the visibility of the EU Development cooperation work.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2012/1307\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2012/1307_docs_en.htm)

**Evaluation of the economic impact of the trade pillar  
of the EU-Chile association agreement**

**1) ABB activities:** 20 02 01

**2) Timing:** March 2012, (period covered 2003- 2009)

**3) Budget (2010+2011):** EUR DG Trade's overall operational budget for the seven years of the present MFF is EUR 96.3 million at the level of commitments; or roughly EUR 13.8 million per annum.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

An agreement to establish an association between the European Community and its member states and the Republic of Chile was signed in November 2002. The trade pillar was implemented from the beginning of 2003, and the association agreement came fully into force in March 2005.

The objectives of the study were to:

1. To identify and evaluate the actual effects and overall economic impact of the EU–Chile FTA more than six years after its entry into force, distinguishing carefully between immediate measurable trade effects, and to identify, at least at a preliminary stage, consequential economic, social and environmental impacts of the FTA.
2. To pave the way for future systematic ex post evaluation of the EU's FTAs and to identify useful lessons that may be learnt with respect to future (ex ante and ex post) impact assessments of similar agreements.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

T (1) Trade in goods The EU's market share in Chilean imports tended to decline following the agreement – but this was a period in which EU exports were seriously outpaced by exports from economically more dynamic regions, and several other agreements were being phased in by Chile. Overall the agreement is likely to have prevented the EU's market shares from falling substantially further.

Econometric simulations suggest that the EU's tariff cuts had a significant impact on the level of EU imports from Chile, compared to other suppliers, raising them by as much as a quarter. Wines and fruits are the sectors that benefited most. These simulations also suggest that the EU's exports to Chile are at least two-thirds higher than they would be in a counterfactual scenario that does not include the EU-Chile agreement.

Computable general equilibrium (CGE) modelling enables the most heavily impacted sectors to be identified. On the Chilean side, the main winners include fruit growing, wine making, fisheries and fish processing. On the EU side, the main winners are machinery, transport equipment and the chemicals industries. At an aggregate level, the CGE model suggests that Chile's exports to the EU are up by about 20%, and the EU's exports to Chile by more than 60%, when compared to a counterfactual that excludes the EU-Chile agreement.

The results suggest that the EU-Chile FTA has protected the EU's exporters from the significant diversions effects that might have resulting from Chile's competing trade agreements. In other words, the enforcement of several of Chile's other FTAs – including with the USA – could have significantly crowded out European exporters from the Chilean market, and to a lesser extent diverted Chilean exporters from the EU market.

(2) Trade in services and foreign direct investment (FDI) Analysis must begin with the EU's high level of commitments under GATS, and a relatively low level for Chile. The additional commitments made under the FTA result in a very high level of commitments by the EU (outside health-related, cultural, recreational, and transport services). For Chile, commitments remain limited in several sectors (construction, educational, environmental, and health-related), and intermediate in communications and financial services. However, there are significant new commitments in distribution, recreational, tourism, business, and transport services.

Analysing the extent to which liberalisation is correlated to trade performance across service sectors shows that the EU's services exports tended to increase more, following the FTA, in those sectors where commitments brought a higher level of liberalisation. However, the link is not necessarily causal. Taking into account trends that are not specific to the EU-Chile bilateral relationship suggests that the correlation may also reflect the fact that priority was given in the FTA to commitments in service sectors that were expected to have the highest trade potential.

An analysis of Chile's services exports to the EU fails to find any relationship with the EU's commitments in the FTA. However, taking into account exogenous trends suggests that those commitments may nevertheless have actually spurred Chilean exports. Certainly, Chile's services exports to the EU performed relatively well in several sectors where the EU's FTA commitments significantly improved on those made in the GATS.

For both EU FDI in Chile and Chilean FDI in Europe, investment decisions seem to be strictly related to business opportunities; and recent changes probably have more to do with the economic dynamism of investing countries than with the FTA. The agreement did not significantly change the legal framework or the guarantees offered to European investors. Its benefit lies in the additional security derived from having consolidated the conditions for investment prevailing before the agreement. Such benefits are not negligible, especially in the long run.

(3) Institutional and regulatory aspects The agreement provisions regarding sanitary and phyto-sanitary (SPS) measures, technical standards, and wines and spirits required substantial adjustment on the Chilean side, given the stringency of EU requirements in these areas. The institutional structure set up by the agreement was implemented effectively, apparently to the satisfaction of both parties. Many technical issues have been raised, but all have been solved through dialogue.

The practical consequences are far-reaching. The improvement of SPS standards in Chile's agriculture is widely recognized, and is at least partly attributable to the FTA. The requirements – initially viewed in Chile as constraints – are now seen as having spurred an upgrade in production practices, and has having eased access to a wider range of foreign markets. The same is true for the disciplines imposed by the FTA on the use of geographical designations.

(4) Environmental impact Focus on particular sectors using input/output analysis shows

that the growth in economic activity stimulated by the FTA, in particular through exports to the EU, has had only a very marginal impact on Chilean energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. The impact on water quality is harder to quantify, given the very uneven distribution of the resource in Chile.

The FTA has had a limited impact on the growth of the sectors that pollute most. The EU's imports from Chile that generate the most pollution are from the ores and minerals sectors. Most of these already entered the EU duty free, and the agreement liberalised trade in rather marginal products.

Chilean exports to the EU of wood products, salmon products, fish, wine, fruits and vegetables grew significantly, at least partly as a result of the agreement. Given their production externalities, these are the sectors where the FTA is likely to have had some negative environmental impact.

The agreement has played a significant role in the growth of Chile's agricultural exports. Input decomposition analysis shows that the FTA has contributed to a limited but noticeable increase in the use of fertilizers. Larger exports of fruit and wine may have also led to an increase in pesticide use; but the EU's strict standards – and the fact that the shift towards agricultural exports tends to reduce the intensity of pesticide use – suggest that the FTA has had little overall impact in this area.

Statistics show a significant increase in trade in the environmental goods that were liberalised as part of the FTA. This supports the idea – widespread among stakeholders consulted – that the FTA has contributed to the adoption of greener technology and stricter domestic environmental standards. However, the agreement has also led to an increase in goods transported by air – especially seafood products and to a more limited extent, fruit.

(5) Social impacts The adjustment brought about by the agreement is mainly characterised, for medium- and lower-skilled workers, by an increased demand in several agricultural sectors and in fisheries; together with reduced demand in some industrial sectors, notably machinery. Nevertheless, the adjustments are small when compared to the rapid structural change that the Chilean economy has undergone since entry into force of the FTA.

In agriculture, the export increase spurred by the agreement is substantial, and it is far from being neutral in terms of the size and type of farms involved. Small and subsistence farmers are less likely to have benefited from the new opportunities, while large, consolidated farms will have been able to reap the full benefit.

This may be reflected in increasing inequality within the agricultural sector, but also by an increase in average agricultural incomes, resulting in lower inequality between agriculture and other sectors. The analysis suggests that although small farmers may have lost out relative to larger, more commercial farm businesses, they will still have benefited overall from the changes brought about by the FTA, when the consequences for both incomes and consumption prices are taken into account.

In the fruit, wine, aquaculture and mollusc sectors, the FTA has led to higher incomes, with visible positive consequences (canning, salmon industry, wine). The agreement has also contributed to a significant increase in the employment of women in agriculture, even though the jobs are often seasonal.

## **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

## **Evaluation of the EU's trade defence instruments (TDIs)**

**1) ABB activities:** 20 02 01

**2) Timing:** February 2012, (period covered 2005-2010)

**3) Budget (annual):** DG Trade's overall operational budget for the seven years of the present MFF is EUR 96.3 million at the level of commitments; or roughly EUR 13.8 million per annum.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The rules-based international trading system provides remedies against unfair trade practices. Anti-dumping (AD) measures may be imposed in case of goods imported and sold at less than fair market value; and anti-subsidy (AS) measures in the case of imported goods that have benefited from subsidies provided by foreign governments; provided that the dumped or subsidised imports cause or threaten to cause injury to domestic industry in the importing country.

The evaluation examined the EU's procedures for, and use of, these two TDIs. The EU's third TDI – safeguard measures – was not included as part of the project. The objectives of the study were to provide:

- 1) A concise description of the EU's TDIs and of its current practice in this area;
- 2) A balanced economic analysis of the fundamental arguments for and against the use of TDI, and of their use in the context of the current international legal framework and economic realities;
- 3) An evaluation of the performance, methods, utilisation and effectiveness of the present TDI scheme in achieving its trade policy objectives;
- 4) An evaluation of the effectiveness of the existing and potential policy decisions of the EU in comparison with selected peer countries: Australia, Canada, China, India, New Zealand, South Africa, United States;
- 5) An examination of the basic AD and AS regulations in light of the administrative practice of the EU institutions, the judgments of European courts and the recommendations of the WTO Dispute Settlement Body (DSB).

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The study's main conclusions are:

(1) The economic analysis confirmed that the stated rationale for EU TDI – countering unfair trading practices and market-distorting subsidies – cannot be sustained on the basis of the actual pattern of use. Nonetheless, the analysis identified a number of considerations that greatly mitigate the perceived negative economic effects of TDI. In fact, given the main de facto purpose that TDI serves, the study argues that its use has been welfare improving for the EU.

(2) Moreover, the study makes clear that the actual (international) construction of trade defence (TD) law is inappropriate for its de facto role, resulting in lack of clarity for trading firms and opening the system up to the possibility of protectionist abuse. The economic analysis further confirmed that the construction of trade defence law is increasingly out of step with the modern trading environment. The report therefore recommends using the flexibility within the system to apply it in ways that minimise the risks of adverse outcomes for the EU, while working at the WTO towards a system of trade remedies constructed in a way better suited to the actual tasks they perform.

(3) The analysis of EU court cases and WTO disputes showed that the number of litigations related to the EU's implementation of TDI is low. It also confirmed a high degree of compliance, as evidenced by a high share of claims against the EU institutions rejected by the EU courts. EU TDIs are also rarely challenged before the WTO DSB. However, the EU's success rate at the WTO DSB is lower, with about half of the claims being granted. Nevertheless, the number of amendments to the two basic Regulations required in response to either EU court or WTO DSB decisions is limited.

(4) The international comparison highlighted that EU TD practice stands out in a number of ways. Notably, regular application of the public interest test and frequent reduction of duties through application of the lesser duty rule distinguish EU practice from that in most other countries. This leaves the EU better placed than the other countries reviewed in dealing with the evolution of globalised production systems and the heterogeneity of firms in international trade.

(5) The study analyses the options for improving accessibility to AD/AS instruments by amending initiation policies – such as the right for workers to file complaints or greater use of ex officio initiation of investigations – and ensuring cooperation. Furthermore, it highlights two areas where EU TD practice may benefit from drawing on peer countries' experience: namely the transparency, and the duration, of investigations. Finally, the international comparison showed that the EU TDI system is not more prone to politicisation than most other countries' systems.

(6) The evaluation of EU TD practice validated most of the methodologies and procedures. The overall finding therefore is that EU TD policies and practice are sound. A number of specific issues were identified. With regard to substantive issues, these relate to certain aspects in the dumping and subsidy analysis, injury and causation analysis, the Union interest test and the calculation of the non-injurious price. Concerning procedural issues, the study found that, in general, the Commission's practice with regard to the participation of interested parties in proceedings is more inclusive than what would be required by the two basic regulations. Transparency of proceedings has improved, but could still be improved further. Also, the relatively long period required from injury to measures was noted. Last but not least, the Hearing Officer's role was evaluated positively.

(7) The evaluation team developed recommendations in respect of the following aspects of EU TDI policy: Mission statement and intervention logic; initiation of investigations and treatment of non-cooperation; shortening the process for provisional determinations; changes in the Union interest test; duration of measures and dynamic impacts of TDI; consolidated statement of administrative practice; access to confidential information. In addition, the evaluation team recommended a number of changes to the two basic regulations, as well as suggesting changes to a number of specific issues related to the

EU's implementation of TDI.

Limitations in the design or execution of the evaluation in meeting the study aims and objectives.

The lack of officially adopted intervention logic for TDI posed a challenge for the formulation of the evaluation questions. Furthermore, confidentiality issues prevented an in-depth analysis of many methodologies and tools which the Commission applies in AD and AS investigations. Also, for two of the peer countries, China and India, only limited primary information could be obtained. Therefore, for these two countries secondary sources have been used extensively. Finally, due to time and resource constraints, a firm level analysis of the effects of TDI could not be undertaken.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/march/tradoc\\_149236.pdf](http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/march/tradoc_149236.pdf)

## **Evaluation of the Market Access Partnership (MAP)**

**1) ABB activities:** 20 02 01

**2) Timing:** October 2012, (period covered 2007-2012)

**3) Budget (annual) :** DG Trade's overall operational budget for the seven years of the present MFF is EUR 96.3 million at the level of commitments; or roughly EUR 13.8 million per annum.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The EU's Market Access Strategy (MAS) was launched in 1996 to enforce multilateral and bilateral trade deals and open third country markets to EU exports. The strategy was based on two pillars: 1) providing EU businesses with information on market access conditions and 2) creating a framework within which the barriers to trade in goods and services, intellectual property and investment are tackled.

The first pillar took the form of the Market Access Database (MADB), which provides information on tariff and non-tariff issues per country for companies wishing to export to third countries. It was the subject of a separate evaluation in 2011.

The second pillar emerged as the Market Access Partnership (MAP), which was introduced in 2007 to remove barriers for European businesses exporting and investing in third country markets. It consists of a partnership between the European Commission, the member states and EU businesses.

The purpose of this evaluation was to assess the relevance, impact, effectiveness and efficiency of the MAP, as well as to suggest improvements in its structure and scope.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation**

The MAP was found to be relevant because it focuses on market access for EU businesses in accordance with the objectives of Trade, Growth and World Affairs. The MAP has been working on key barriers in a systematic way while also devoting time to address many



other barriers in third countries.

The MAP was considered to be generally efficient when looking to its input-output relation. However, it could be made more efficient by organising the Market Access Advisory Committee (MAAC) meetings in a different way. It also needs better internal communication, so as to be able to confront systematic industry lobbying to tackle and address barriers that have been previously analysed, and found to offer very little prospect of success.

Regarding the effectiveness of the MAP, many potential barriers could be addressed before they become entrenched in law. On the other hand, most of the existing market access barriers are unsolved. The effectiveness of the MAP seems to stem not just from joint action, but maybe more importantly from a common voice of the three MAP partners.

Having achieved limited results, the quantifiable impact of the MAP is low as well, although some barriers have been avoided via “early warning” follow-up actions. Given the long time it requires to tackle complex market access barriers, it may also be too early to assess the overall impact of the MAP.

Positive aspects of the MAP include:

- It creates a clear window for market access issues;
- It works on actual problems and finding solutions;
- It creates more leverage for smaller member states; and
- It allows companies to take a European route rather than a bilateral one, which is often a preferred option because this creates more anonymity (the bilateral route means a complaint can be more easily traced back to a specific company).

Problems for the MAP include:

- The larger member states sometimes prefer to act unilaterally, which limits the possibilities for joint and coordinated action;
- The MAP may become a victim of its own success because the number of cases is increasing but resources within the EC and the MSs are limited;
- It has a limited set of instruments if the third countries are not willing to co-operate to solve the problem: not all market issues can be challenged in the WTO, and dispute settlement can only be used in a limited number of cases.

Recommendations

Relevance:

- a. Stakeholders do not support Commission proposal to prioritise fewer barriers or fewer countries. In a period of economic crisis, the work of the MAP is increasingly important to them.
- b. Clarify the difference in the treatment of key and non-key barriers in the MAP.
- c. Raise awareness on the function of the MAP with the local market access teams (MATs).

Efficiency:

- d. Improve the distribution of analytical work by delegating more of that work to the member states.
  - e. If business brings up a barrier, it should also provide relevant supporting evidence on what action can be taken.
  - f. Ensure good preparation of information sent to participants in advance of the MAAC meetings.
  - g. More direct communication lines at a technical level between the market access working groups (MAWGs) in Brussels and the MAT working groups in key markets.

Effectiveness:

- h. Work together with like-minded non-EU actors for the MAP.
- i. Consider technical assistance in combination with gentle persuasion to overcome barriers.
- j. Make processes and procedures clearer and more transparent without losing flexibility.
- k. Create better institutional memory by documenting more of what has been done.
- l. Share experiences from different MATs and MAWGs on the approach, process and procedures for dealing with market access barriers.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/april/tradoc\\_150847.pdf](http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/april/tradoc_150847.pdf)

### **Trade sustainability impact assessment (Trade SIA) in support of EU negotiations for deep and comprehensive free trade agreements (DCFTAs) with Georgia and the Republic of Moldova**

**1) ABB activities:** 20 02 01

**2) Timing:** October 2012

**3) Budget (annual):** DG Trade's overall operational budget for the seven years of the present MFF is EUR 96.3 million at the level of commitments; or roughly EUR 13.8 million per annum.

#### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

The EU is negotiating association agreements (AAs) – comprising deep and comprehensive free trade agreements (DCFTAs) with both Georgia and the Republic of Moldova.

Trade SIAs support those negotiations by analysing how the trade and trade-related provisions in the proposed DCFTAs will affect economic, social, and environmental developments in the EU and (respectively) Georgia and Moldova.

A trade SIA combines quantitative and qualitative research with an extensive programme of stakeholder consultation.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

(1) Economic effects for the EU of an agreement with either Georgia or Moldova are found to be negligible. For Georgia, the study forecasts a sizeable long run increase in national income (4.3% growth in GDP) as a result of a deal with the EU. For Moldova, a deal with the EU might be worth as much as 5.4% in terms of long run increase in GDP.

Georgian exports are forecast to increase by 12% following an agreement, and imports by 7.5%. In the case of Moldova, exports might increase by 16% and imports by 8%.

Average wages in Georgia are projected to increase by 3.6% in the long run, while the consumer price index (CPI) might fall by about 0.6%. For Moldova, the equivalent figures are 4.8% for average wages, and a fall of about 1.3% for the CPI.

The effects on third countries are very limited. In the case of an EU-Georgia DCFTA, Russia and Azerbaijan are expected to benefit to a small extent. An EU-Moldova DCFTA might deliver some modest benefits for Russia and Ukraine.

Following an EU-Georgia agreement, the study suggests that chemicals, rubber and plastic, other machinery and equipment, and primary metals will be the sectors that enjoy the largest increases in output. The largest falls in output are expected to arise in the livestock and meat products, other processed food, electronics and computers, and other manufacturing sectors. The largest gains in output following an EU-Moldova agreement are expected in the sugar, textiles and clothing, and air transport sectors. Livestock and meat products, motor vehicles, electronics and computing, and other manufacturing are the sectors where the largest falls in output may occur.

(2) Social impacts: for both Georgia and Moldova, the main drivers of overall social impact are expected to derive from effects related to employment and wages.

The study suggests that following an agreement with the EU, about 4% of the Georgian work force might need to change employment sector, and about 5% in the case of Moldova. The extent of this reallocation would be slightly higher for lower-skilled workers than for the higher-skilled.

As stated, wages are expected to increase and consumer prices to fall. Nevertheless the poorer strata in the population appear to benefit less from a DCFTA than those on average or above-average incomes. This is because the poor are affected disproportionately by changes in food prices; and food prices are expected to rise slightly even within an overall fall in the CPI.

There is thus a risk of a rise in certain poverty indicators, especially for those at the bottom of the income distribution. A DCFTA may also exacerbate inequality (and slightly worsen relevant indicators such as relative poverty or the Gini coefficient).

The overall effect of a DCFTA (for either partner country) on labour rights is expected to be positive.

A DCFTA with the EU might indirectly have a positive effect on equality to the extent that increasing living standards begin to support gradual changes in societal preferences on

equality issues. More immediately however, the sectoral reallocations that will occur following a DCFTA may disproportionately affect the weakest groups in the workforce: those with low educational and skill levels. The extent of inequality currently observed might therefore be exacerbated.

(3) Environmental effects expected from a DCFTA – for either Georgia or Moldova – are mixed. This is against a backdrop (baseline situation) for Georgia which includes problems related to air and water pollution, improper waste management and use of land, as well as marine and coastal contamination. Moldova faces several environmental problems related to air, water, and soil pollution. Inadequate urban waste management, unsustainable agricultural practices, and improper forest management lead to significant land degradation and damage to biodiversity. The country's worsening social situation and high incidence of poverty contribute to environmentally damaging activities such as illegal logging, use of obsolete technologies, poor energy efficiency and underinvestment in basic infrastructure such as water, sanitation, roads, and energy.

The estimated effects in Georgia of a DCFTA, in terms of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and land use intensity, are expected to be very small. Air emissions of other pollutants are expected to rise by about 3% in the long run. The equivalent estimates for Moldova are very similar.

For either country, a DCFTA is expected to have a weak but positive effect on the environment by encouraging more effective implementation of international environmental agreements. This should gradually contribute to solving some of the outstanding environmental challenges. This mechanism may prove important in greening economic growth in the two countries, and in limiting the environmental burden from the boost to economic development provided by a DCFTA.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/november/tradoc\\_150105.pdf](http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/november/tradoc_150105.pdf)

## **ABB 21 – Development and Relations with African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States**

### **Evaluation of the Commission' cooperation with the Council of Europe (focused on the joint programmes)**

**1) ABB activities:** 21 07

**2) Timing:** September 2012, (Period covered by the report : 2000 – 2010)

**3) Budget (annual):** EUR 90 million disbursed

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

This evaluation covers the cooperation of the European Union (EU) with the Council of Europe and mainly the implementation of the joint-programmes over the period 2000-2010. The objectives of this study are to provide an independent assessment and to identify key lessons learned in order to improve future cooperation.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

Political and strategic relations between the EU and CoE experienced a marked improvement over the evaluation period.

The CoE comparative advantage is in its expertise particularly in the sectors of rule of law, human rights and democracy, its legal and moral authority and its unique combination of roles whereas its comparative disadvantage is its weakness as an implementing agency.

It is to be noted that the recent large-scale institutional reform of the CoE has been addressing many of the implementation weaknesses identified notably in this evaluation.

Key conclusions:

- Political and strategic relations between the EU and CoE experienced a market improvement over the evaluation period.
- Inside the EU, DG DEVCO and the EEAS (European External Action Service) appear to have differing perspectives on the role of the CoE as a partner.
- The CoE's comparative disadvantage is widely recognised to be its weakness as an implementation agency.
- Impacts of EC-CoE cooperation at country level are mixed.
- There is need to provide a stronger foundation for the evident presupposition that training, capacity building, and awareness rising are the keys to institutional development and change.

Key recommendations:

- Encourage the CoE to adopt institution-wide approach to delivering assistance in line with international best practices.
- Strengthen strategic joint priority setting at country level.
- Insist on and support stronger project-cycle management in EU co-financed programme.

- Ensure stability, predictability and reasonable flexibility of the funding for the EC-CoE joint programme.
- Strengthen the foundation for capacity building activities and establish their links to results.

Uptake of the evaluation recommendations:

Out of 9 key recommendations formulated by the evaluators, the Commission and the EEAS have fully accepted 7 recommendations, the other 2 being only partially accepted.

Example:

Encourage the CoE to adopt an institution-wide approach to the delivery of assistance in line with international best practices.

Answer: The Evaluation Unit in DG DEVCO has already commenced a fruitful cooperation with the evaluation group at the CoE HQs. If the newly created Audit and Oversight Directorate in the CoE coordinates with DEVCO on the development of a proper evaluation methodology, the newly created Directorate for Programming should be the counterpart to identify appropriate guidelines for project management to then be applied by all the CoE services.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2012/1311\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2012/1311_docs_en.htm)

### **Evaluation of the EU cooperation with the Caribbean Region**

**1) ABB activities:** 21 06:

**2) Timing:** August 2012 (Period covered by the report: 2003-2010)

**3) Budget :** Disbursements over the evaluation period : EUR108.9 million

#### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation was carried out to provide meaningful feedback to decision makers and to the general public on the results achieved by the Commission's co-operation strategies and their implementation for the period 2003-2010 at regional level of the Caribbean Region. It covered the Regional Strategy Papers for the European Development Fund (EDF9; 2003-2007 and EDF10 2008-2013), but also took into consideration activities during the evaluation period that had been financed with resources from EDF8. Thematically, the focus was on regional economic and political integration but also private sector development, human resources development, natural disaster prevention and mitigation, and reduction of drug related crime.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The EU strategy was relevant and made good use of the increased resources channelled to the region, critical for the EPA negotiations and a model for donor coordination. However results in other sectors could be improved by more suitable aid modalities, better selection

of implementing partners, more effective complementarity between regional and national programmes, and strengthening of the EU Delegation in charge of the regional programme.

Key conclusions :

- The regional strategies of the EDF9 and EDF10 were highly responsive to the priorities of CARIFORUM, thanks to an increased political dialogue. Nevertheless, regarding regional integration, the effectiveness of the international efforts to enhance it has been significantly reduced by the lack of a donor coordination framework.
- Important efficiency issues are the limited capacity at the national level to implement policies decided at the regional level and the weakness of the CARICOM Secretariat (CCS).
- Effectiveness and impact of the regional EU support is limited by the fact that regional integration has lost some political momentum notably in the CARICOM member states.
- In most sectors reviewed during the evaluation, the results of EU interventions were modest, with the positive exception of the support to the EPA negotiations and the growth of some exports like rum for the entire region and bananas for DR.

Key recommendations :

- The EU should continue to support the regional strategies by the development and adoption of a comprehensive and efficient donor coordination system that was due to be presented by CCS already in June 2011. This will help design an EDF 11 regional programme more focused and therefore easier to implement.
- In application of new programming guidelines, complementarity should be enhanced by drafting the Regional strategy before the National Strategies and by making it a frame of reference for the bilateral Cooperation of EU Member States with the region.
- Continue support to the completion of both the Caribbean Single Market and the Caribbean Single Economy, while also addressing the main obstacles to competitiveness and investment in each country.
- The EDF should allocate more funds to the competitiveness issues of the Caribbean region notably through support to productive development policies, business climate reforms, clustering initiatives and small and medium size enterprise development. Regarding EPA implementation, the EDF 10 programme should include indicators.

The conclusions and recommendations of this regional evaluation will be taken into account in the programming process which will start in 2013 and be finalised in 2014.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2012/1309\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2012/1309_docs_en.htm)

## **Evaluation of the EU cooperation with the Republic of Congo**

**1) ABB activities: 21 06**

**2) Timing:** March 2012, (period covered by the report : 2000 – 2009)

**3) Budget :** Disbursements over the evaluation period: EUR160 million

#### **4) Background, scope and focus**

Le rapport présente les résultats de l'évaluation de la stratégie de l'Union européenne avec la République du Congo pour la période 2000-2009. Les principaux objectifs poursuivis sont de fournir aux services de l'UE et à un public plus large une évaluation indépendante et globale des relations passées et présentes de la coopération avec la RC et d'identifier les leçons clefs afin d'améliorer les stratégies et les programmes actuels et futurs de l'UE dans ce pays. Thematic focus: transport infrastructure, institutional development, macro-economic sector; thematic budget lines: natural resource management, post-conflict; water and energy facilities; business climate.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation**

La stratégie de coopération de l'UE avec la République du Congo au cours de la période d'évaluation est jugée pertinente. Elle a montré une forte adaptation à l'évolution du contexte de la RC, notamment le passage d'une situation de post-conflit à une problématique de croissance durable et moins dépendante du seul secteur pétrolier. L'impact des interventions financées a néanmoins été fortement hypothéqué par les faiblesses structurelles et le dysfonctionnement qui caractérisent la conduite de l'action publique en RC. Ces difficultés ont été accentuées du fait du faible poids que représente l'aide dans les agrégats macroéconomiques de la RC. En ce qui concerne la mise en œuvre, la mobilisation d'une gamme diversifiée d'instruments et l'intervention dans un large éventail de domaines ont favorisé l'adaptation de la stratégie de coopération à l'évolution du contexte du pays.

Principales conclusions:

- La pertinence de la stratégie de coopération UE-RC est élevée au cours de la période d'évaluation. Elle présente une forte adaptation à l'évolution du contexte de la RC, notamment le passage d'une situation de post-conflit à une problématique de croissance durable et moins dépendante du seul secteur pétrolier. Néanmoins, les impacts des interventions financées par l'UE ont été fortement hypothéqués par les faiblesses structurelles qui caractérisent la conduite de l'action publique en RC.
- La priorité donnée à la gouvernance de l'action publique est très pertinente, mais n'a pas encore produit tous les effets escomptés, en particulier en matière de finances publiques et dans les secteurs des transports, de la gestion des ressources naturelles et de la santé. Dans ces domaines, les appuis de l'UE ont abouti à des réformes importantes (adoption de textes, création d'institutions). En revanche, dans chacun de ces domaines, il apparaît des carences importantes dans l'application concrète de ces réformes, ce qui hypothèque lourdement la viabilité de celles-ci.
  - Au cours de la période d'évaluation, la coopération UE – RC a été marquée par une utilisation judicieuse des instruments disponibles, avec en particulier une bonne complémentarité entre les actions financées par le FED et celles relevant des lignes budgétaires.

Principales recommandations:

- Il est suggéré de structurer la future stratégie autour des 2 axes suivants : La



Gouvernance de l'action publique dans le domaine économique et la Consolidation de l'Etat de Droit. En plus, dans le hors concentration : poursuivre la reconstruction sociale dans les zones qui ont été les plus touchées par les conflits civils; poursuivre des actions de renforcement des acteurs non étatiques; appuyer de façon ciblée le secteur de la santé et soutenir les démarches de capitalisation des actions entreprises.

- Pour ce qui est des 4 principaux secteurs de coopération:
  - Finances publiques: mettre l'accent sur la transparence des recettes et l'efficacité de la chaîne des dépenses.
  - Transports: considérer l'amélioration de la gouvernance comme un préalable au redéploiement d'appuis financiers plus conséquents.
  - Gestion des ressources naturelles: préserver les acquis et poursuivre les appuis à une meilleure gouvernance des ressources forestières et de la biodiversité.
  - Acteurs non étatiques: poursuivre les actions de renforcement des capacités en les inscrivant dans un cadre stratégique.
- Sélectionner les procédures et les processus afin d'améliorer l'efficacité de l'aide (cofinancements, études sectorielles préalables, sélection des assistants techniques, ...).

The conclusions and recommendations of this country level evaluation will be taken into account in the current programming exercise to be finalised in 2014. In this regards, some information on the contribution of the evaluation to the design of the next country programme may be available in 2013.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2012/1303\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2012/1303_docs_en.htm)

### **Evaluation of the EU cooperation with Djibouti**

**1) ABB activities:** 21 06

**2) Timing:** June 2012, (Period covered by the report : 1996-2012)

**3) Budget:** Disbursements over the evaluation period: EUR 60.7 million.

#### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation aims at providing an overall independent assessment of the entire EC cooperation strategy and support in the country and to draw out key lessons to help improve current and future EC strategies and programmes.

The EC's cooperation programme with Djibouti was problematic throughout the 1996-2010 period. The strategic objectives established between the government and the EC for the cooperation programme have not been achieved to the level at which they were initially planned. The thematic focus covered road and rail infrastructure, macroeconomic support, access to water and sanitation, objectives related to decentralization and the NSAs

and development of the transportation industry cluster in the country.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

Due to a lack of prioritisation in the government's policies focussing on a sectorial approach for national or regional development was impossible. Cooperation was limited to a series of interventions not embedded in a strategic vision. The EC did not address governance or the strengthening of civil society, nor establish itself as a strategic partner of government and civil society. The recent establishment of an EU Delegation in Djibouti may improve cooperation.

Key conclusions:

- Bien que les interventions de la CE aient généralement répondu aux besoins économiques et sociaux du pays, le gouvernement de Djibouti n'a pas établi des priorités pouvant être directement appuyées. Dès lors, le niveau d'alignement aux stratégies nationales est un concept non pertinent dans le cas de cette coopération.
- Les concepts et stratégies qui ont été explicités dans les Documents de Stratégie- Pays (DSP) ont été réduits à une série d'interventions simples et linéaires, sans référence à une approche sectorielle de développement national ou régional.
- La CE n'a pas réussi à se faire valoir comme partenaire stratégique vis-à-vis du Gouvernement de Djibouti ou de la Société Civile. Le dialogue politique a été relativement inefficace et les programmes d'aide n'ont pas été développés pour renforcer ni la gouvernance ni la société civile.
- Bien que la stabilité post-conflit ait été un des piliers de la stratégie de coopération de la CE avec Djibouti, la CE n'a pas eu d'impact perceptible sur la stabilité post-conflit du pays.

Key recommendations:

- Dans le but de réduire la pauvreté et de créer des emplois permanents, collaborer avec le Gouvernement de Djibouti, le secteur privé, la société civile et les autres bailleurs de fonds pour développer une stratégie de développement économique, industriel et commercial pour le pays.
- S'assurer que toute la planification et la programmation de la coopération de la CE avec Djibouti soient faites selon une approche sectorielle ou programmatique, en intégrant tous les éléments nécessaires pour l'atteinte des objectifs stratégiques pour le développement d'un secteur ciblé.
- Etant donné que le développement futur de Djibouti est directement lié à son rôle géostratégique dans la « corne de l'Afrique » et que ses stratégies de développement dépendent des relations politiques entre plusieurs autres pays de la région, la CE devrait s'assurer que ses stratégies reflètent cette vision « régionale ».
- Appuyer les instances djiboutiennes afin de créer une stratégie de développement des Acteurs Non Etatiques qui permettrait à la société civile et aux diverses associations de devenir des partenaires proactifs dans le développement du pays.

The conclusions and recommendations of this country level evaluation will be taken into account in the current programming exercise to be finalised in 2014. In this regards, some

information on the contribution of the evaluation to the design of the next country programme may be available in 2013.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2012/1306\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2012/1306_docs_en.htm)

### **Evaluation of the EU cooperation with Ethiopia**

**1) ABB activities:** 21 06

**2) Timing:** January 2012, (period covered by the report : 2004-2008)

**3) Budget:** Disbursements over the evaluation period: EUR 1.259 million

#### **4) Background, scope and focus :**

The evaluation aims at providing an overall independent assessment of the entire EC cooperation strategy and support in the country and to draw out key lessons to help improve current and future EC strategies and programmes.

The evaluation covered the period of economic recovery which followed the war with Eritrea and it also included the 2005 post-election violence and the subsequent cooling of Ethiopia-donor relations. The evaluation focuses on the EU's assistance during implementation of the CSP and 9th EDF NIP (2002-2007) (including a variety of instruments), and on the choices made for planning aid disbursements under the 10th EDF (2008-2013).

The thematic focus covered i) education, health and the related social accountability component, ii) transport infrastructure, iii) food security and agriculture, iv) Civil Society empowerment and v) conflict prevention.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation :**

EU support was relevant to the country's needs. The alignment with Government's policies and programmes through budget support was particularly effective in fighting poverty, strengthening ownership and ensuring sustainability. However cooperation had less impact on democratic governance and related capacity building. Support to food security was too dominant in comparison to agricultural development. Programmes were too ambitious, ignoring the limitations of specific instruments and particularly staff capacity of the Delegation.

Main conclusions:

- In general, by aligning most of its support on government policies and programmes through various types of budget support (global, sectoral, targeted), the EU was particularly effective in fighting poverty. This approach contributed also to reinforcing an already strong degree of ownership, thus ensuring sustainability.
- But those gains were not equally matched in areas such as democratic governance and decentralisation which are fundamental to the long-term development prospects of Ethiopia.
- The performance evaluation framework agreed with the government for the bulk of

EU budget support was too aligned on five-year sectoral programming documents to be a true incentive for policy reform or even significant operational restructuring.

- Local government capacity shortcomings remained out of EU reach, either directly (PSCAP) or indirectly (PBS, Road SPSP, PSNP). They impeded the effectiveness and impact of EU-supported programmes, particularly in emerging regions.
- The effectiveness and inclusiveness of policy dialogue have been limited even in EU focal sectors.
- The balance between EU support to food security and agricultural development, although improved, still predominantly leans towards food security.
- EU-sponsored innovative approaches in PBS and PSNP implementation (essentially social accountability and CSOs involvement) were adopted by the government, even though it provided only a limited financial contribution.

Main recommendations:

- Prescribe the policy dialogue organisation best suited to EU objectives and instruments.
- Modify the allocation structure within sectors to strengthen EU advocacy capacity and involvement in regional integration and sectoral institutional reforms.
- Adjust the strategic framework and the content of policy dialogue to overcome limits currently faced in promoting institutional reform and democratic governance.
- Reconsider the overall balance in EU financial support between food security and agricultural development by focusing progressively on the graduation process and on the subsequent phases of households' accumulation of agricultural assets.
- Prepare for the resumption of GBS while reducing its lack of predictability by defining a fixed tranche that is both more robust in the face of politically-induced uncertainties and also more closely linked to development outcomes. The conclusions and recommendations of this country level evaluation will be taken into account in the current programming exercise to be finalised in 2014. In this regards, some information on the contribution of the evaluation to the design of the next country programme may be available in 2013.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2012/1301\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2012/1301_docs_en.htm)

### **Evaluation of the EU cooperation with Jamaica**

**1) ABB activities:** 21 06

**2) Timing:** September 2012, (period covered by the report: 2002-2009)

**3) Budget:** Disbursements over the evaluation period: EUR 467million

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation aims at providing an overall independent assessment of the entire EC

cooperation strategy and support in the country and to draw out key lessons to help improve current and future EC strategies and programmes.

The evaluation covers co-operation strategies and implementation including a mix of all activities and modalities during the period 2002-2009, although it has also taken into account of subsequent developments. It covers two EDF periods, the 9th EDF (2002-2007) and the 10th EDF (2008-2013). In addition, it covers support to the sugar and banana sectors, mainly provided through instruments outside the EDF.

Thematic focus: Governance, Mix of instruments, Macro-economic support, Support to civil society organisations, Transport, Security and Justice, Trade, Private sector development.

## **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The EU strategy in Jamaica was positive, notably with the more recent interventions. EU support has proved more effective focussed on high priority needs and using Budget Support. Support for the Security and Justice sector was appropriate and the evaluation recommends drawing on additional sources of expertise and instruments, e.g. those used in EU Neighbourhood countries. The use of process indicators for budget support worked well, and helped to catalyse actions by Government stakeholders. The Delegation used Technical Assistance effectively to support budget support operations.

Key conclusions:

- The effectiveness of EU support has improved over the evaluation period as a consequence of focusing on high priority needs. The mid-term evaluation of the 9th EDF flagged up that security and justice were the highest priority of the population, with support to the transport and private sector development focal sectors being replaced by support to the security and justice sector.
- The efficiency and effectiveness of support provided by the EU has increased due to the use of budget support as the preferred aid modality. Where project modalities have been used they were typically subject to significant delays, and these often related to the recruitment of technical assistance and oversight mechanisms. Early budget support operations suffered from delays but these have subsequently been reduced due to improved programme design and focus, the use of clearly and broadly owned indicators, together with provision of technical assistance to assist with preparation of budget support payment dossiers. However performance varies: sector budget support for transport did not fulfil its objectives.
- Macro-economic and PMF risks remain considerable in fragile circumstances. As a small, open economy with a high debt overhang and no access to HIPC-type debt relief, Jamaica remains vulnerable to adverse international and domestic events. The EU and other 3 development partners mitigate against risks through effective monitoring with a matrix with key milestones.
- The impact and longer term sustainability of EU support is difficult to quantify. At the macroeconomic level growth rates remain low at less than 1%. EU support has helped to promote macro-economic stability and adjustment to new circumstances during an extremely challenging period.

Key recommendations:

- The broad approach in terms of focal sectors and aid instruments is appropriate and should be continued. They are consistent with the Paris Declaration objectives, and the use of budget support is helping to create fiscal space for the Government. The mix of General Budget Support and Sector Budget Support works well, and helps to achieve a positive policy dialogue in key areas.
- The EU should refine its instruments to facilitate working more effectively in complex, process-orientated areas such as 1) macro-economic management and 2) security and justice. With their formal three year structure and onerous process of riders to modify agreements, the EC's budget support instruments are not flexible enough. This has been a problem in Jamaica in terms of GBS, where the decision to move to accrual accounting was reversed, and SBS, where security and justice sector needs have evolved during programme implementation. Considering the examples of the WP and the IDB, a solution could be to maintain the existing setup with multiannual policy matrices but consider greater flexibility in adapting them when changes in context and/or IDP coordination so require.
- Support to the security and justice sectors through the SSRP should continue and be consolidated. Future planning should strengthen synergies between JSIF, MNS, CSJP and SDC by detailing expected responsibilities, expectations and expected outputs added by each organisation in the design of the programme. Identify realistic specific targets and revise conditions that are no longer priorities for the national strategy and/or cannot be fulfilled during the implementation period of the financing agreement for SRRP. Maintain the focus of the intervention on the key reform areas while applying some degree of flexibility on the specific wording of the conditions. The European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) instrument has considerable value in Jamaica and could be expanded. The scope could include governance issues such as for example the monitoring of social spending, anticorruption and transparency, etc. These interventions would have a high degree of complementarity with budget support programmes and other projects.
- Strengthen EUD capability in specialist areas, in particular related to security and justice. Consideration should be given to using existing EU tools such as Twinning, Sigma, Taiex, which are used in the ENP countries where the EU has a longer cooperation history in the field of security and justice.

The conclusions and recommendations of this country level evaluation will be taken into account in the current programming exercise to be finalised in 2014. In this regards, some information on the contribution of the evaluation to the design of the next country programme may be available in 2013.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2013/1314\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2013/1314_docs_en.htm)

## Evaluation of the EU Co-operation with Zambia

**1) ABB activities:** 21 06

**2) Timing:** September 2012, (Period covered by the report: 2001 – 2010)

**3) Budget:** Disbursements over the evaluation period : EUR 475 million

### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

This evaluation assesses the European Commission's support to the Zambia during the period 2001-2010.

The EU interventions were focused on economic transition through infrastructure (road sector) development, regional integration, Public Finance Management and support for private sector development.

The purpose of the evaluation was to provide an overall independent assessment of the EU's past and current cooperation relations with Zambia and to identify key lessons in order to improve the current and future strategies.

### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The EU support to Zambia from 2001 to 2010 has been found well-focused on the needs of the population, especially in the first part half of the evaluation period. The EDF10 response strategy underestimated the speed of evolution of the macro-economic situation in Zambia. The EU contribution in dialogue on public financial management issues was a driver of reforms in this area. However, the administrative set-up for PFM demonstrated only limited regulatory autonomy.

Key conclusions:

- The EU response strategy has been in line with the policy priorities of the Government of Zambia. It was relatively well-focused on the needs of the population in the first half of the period under review (mostly covered by EDF9). The EDF10 response strategy, though comprehensive and well-articulated, underestimated the speed of evolution of the emerging macro-economic situation (Zambia is now a lower middle income country).
- The EU contribution in dialogue on public financial management issues was a driver of reforms in this area. However, the whole new administrative set-up, both PFM and indeed sector-wise, remained extremely susceptible to external political pressure and demonstrated only limited regulatory autonomy, if indeed any at all, as promoted by the EU.
- While some progress has been made in the strengthening and expansion of the Auditor General Office, there remains only weak domestic accountability by government for the budgetary process, all the more so given the absence of concrete involvement of Parliament and CSOs during the first three years of MDG-Contract implementation.

Key recommendations:

Engage in accelerated adjustment of EU strategy in response to the steady decrease in the

leverage capacity of EU financial inputs.

- Increase further the focus of EU cooperation and free up more leverage capacity by gradually moving away from the infrastructure sector; the EU exit strategy from the road sector will be balanced by the multiplicity of alternative funding opportunities with far lower transaction costs and policy reform requirements.
- Reinforce EU support for drivers of sustainable economic growth (Vision 2030) typical of lower-middle and middle income countries, such as trade liberalisation (through Regional Economic Communities followed by harmonization at national level) and SME development, with progressive widening to include social security system development, higher education and research.
- Pursue a comprehensive and integrated capacity strengthening programme with demand-driven, customised services for the different main types of CSO, appropriately clustered.
- Engage in supporting economic regulation, that is to say separating the government's policymaking and regulatory roles by establishing independent regulatory mechanisms.

The conclusions and recommendations of this country level evaluation will be taken into account in the current programming exercise to be finalised in 2014. In this regards, some information on the contribution of the evaluation to the design of the next country programme may be available in 2013.

#### 6) Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2013/1316\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2013/1316_docs_en.htm)

### Thematic global evaluation of the EC support to Agricultural Commodities in ACP Countries

1) **ABB activities:** 21 08

2) **Timing:** April 2012; (Period covered by the report: 2000 – 2009)

3) **Budget (annual):** Contracted amount: EUR 2.1billion (Stabex, EDF, budget lines food security/sugar/bananas, etc.)

4) **Background, scope and focus:** This evaluation covers EC support to agricultural commodities in all ACP countries over the period 2000-2009 in the context of the policies and approaches laid down in two communications: Communication (2004)89: Agricultural Commodity Chains, Dependency and Poverty – A proposal for an EU Action Plan, and Communication (2004)87: proposal for an EU-Africa Partnership on support of cotton sector development accompanied by the Action Plan for Cotton. The objective is to provide an overall independent assessment of the EC past and current cooperation support to agricultural commodities at a general level and to identify key lessons learnt in order to improve the current and future EC strategies and programmes.

5) **Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:** The communications were implemented at international and all ACP levels and through sugar and bananas budget lines but the operations conducted locally through EDF and Stabex resources were



unaffected by the communications. The most notable value added and the showcase of the communications is the achievement in establishing a functional EU-Africa Partnership on Cotton. The flexibility of the Stabex instrument allowed offering a flexible response to unforeseen demands for support. When support was important, the effects on competitiveness were significant. When punctual interventions were financed, it had rarely an impact on competitiveness but it improved the beneficiaries' situation.

Key conclusions:

- The Communications were implemented at international and all ACP levels and through the sugar and banana budget lines. However, the design and implementation of support to agricultural commodities funded by the EDF and Stabex resources remained unaffected by the Communications.
- The most notable value added and the showcase of the Communications is the achievement in establishing a functional EU-Africa Partnership on Cotton.
- Whilst the rigidity of procedures often represented a constraint for projects, the flexibility of the Stabex instrument allowed Delegations to offer a flexible response to unforeseen demands for support.
- The Commission's sector-wide interventions have had significant effects on competitiveness when support was important. On the other hand, support to agricultural commodities through punctual interventions contributed to an improvement of beneficiaries' situation but this was often temporary, on a small scale and not capitalized upon; sector competitiveness was rarely improved.
- The Communications and the Commission's support to the competitiveness of agricultural commodity sectors considered exit strategies from the sector only for the support to the banana and sugar producing countries.
- At headquarter level efforts are made to ensure coherence between different EU policies including in the way they affect particular sectors. However timeliness and administrative issues have at times hampered their effectiveness at field level.

Key recommendations:

- Based on analyses of competitiveness and livelihood possibilities, decide whether to support competitiveness or to exit from a sector and provide means to do so.
- Place the value chain approach in a comprehensive framework in line with an overall agricultural support policy.
- Implement the current Communication by focusing available resources on specific sectors that have long term prospects.
- Deepen focus and research on possibilities to prevent the impact of agricultural commodity price volatility on farmers, including the poorest.
- Allocate resources for the implementation of policy level Communications.
- Adapt implementation mechanisms and financing modalities to capacities and systems in place.

Uptake of the evaluation recommendations:

Out of 10 key recommendations formulated by the evaluators, the Commission has fully

accepted 5 recommendations, the other 5 being only partially accepted. Example : Build complementarities and synergies within EU support between projects, programmes and non-financial support

Answer: The mechanics of designing, implementing and reporting on commodity programmes should be those mentioned in the national programmes, aid effectiveness principles, internal instructions etc. Improved coherence between EU programmes in a given country will be sought also through closer interaction with aid instruments such as budget support or joint programming.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2012/1305\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2012/1305_docs_en.htm)

### Final evaluation of the EU Food Facility

**1) ABB activities:** 21 02

**2) Timing: Date of the report:** December 2012; (Period covered by the report: 2008 - 2011)

**3) Budget:** The total allocation for the EU Food Facility is EUR 1000 million; The entire amount has been disbursed by 2011

**4) Background, scope and focus:** The volatility of food prices and agricultural inputs in 2007 and 2008 put numerous developing countries and their populations in a dramatic situation. The rising prices have resulted in riots, unrest and instability in several countries, jeopardising the achievements of years of political development and peacekeeping investments. On 16 December 2008, the European Parliament and the Council adopted the Regulation, establishing a “facility for rapid response to soaring food prices in developing countries” (this became the European Union Food Facility). The evaluation assesses the European Union Food Facility as an instrument and the European Commission’s cooperation activities under this instrument over the period 2008 to 2011. The geographical scope includes all 49 countries where Food Facility funded activities were undertaken.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:** The EU, through its decision to support the coordinated international response to the Food Price Crisis, has brought food security and rural development at the forefront of its own development cooperation agenda and of the international development agenda. In addition, the EU has gained significant visibility through the implementation of the EU FF, thus strengthening its leading role in the international response.

Key conclusions:

- The Commission’s political decision to create a new financing instrument as articulated in the Regulation 1337/2008 was relevant, although the implementation period foreseen for the instrument was very short;
- EU Food Facility (EU FF) interventions were effective in mitigating the effects of the Food Price Crisis, but activities were implemented at least one year after the peak in global

food prices and only reached a limited share of the vulnerable population in target countries;

- The EU FF instrument had a high flexibility for intervention and was intended to benefit a high number of partner countries. However, the dispersion of interventions in 49 countries and 232 interventions reduced the impact at country level;
- There was little evidence of the major effects of the EU FF on food prices or food security beyond direct beneficiaries. Positive effects have been limited to direct beneficiaries.

Key recommendations:

- The EU should consider converting the EU FF into a permanent “Stand-by” instrument, in order to respond rapidly to upcoming and sudden Food Price Crisis, and mitigate impacts on food insecurity situations. In the case of permanent, recurrent, or cyclical food insecurity situations, the instrument could mainly be used for mitigating the effects that have “deepened” existing food insecurity situations;
- The design of future specific instruments should be more focused, so that expected results can be achieved in the initially foreseen time-frame and resources. In this respect and as advocated in the “Agenda for Change”, the EU should concentrate its support to the most affected countries and strategic beneficiaries to ensure resources are allocated where maximum impact can be achieved;
- Prior to the creation of any instrument, it is recommended to carry out a problem analysis and adopt a single primary objective tackling specific issues and clearly defined beneficiaries;
- The EU (under its programmed cooperation) should continue to play an active role in policy dialogue at the country level and help the governments of partner countries realise the importance and multi-sector dimension of food security.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/development-policies/intervention-areas/ruraldev/documents/euff-final\\_report-en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/development-policies/intervention-areas/ruraldev/documents/euff-final_report-en.pdf)

### **Evaluation of the EU Support to the Health sector**

**1) ABB activities:** 21 05

**2) Timing:** August 2012, (Period covered by the report : 2002-2010)

**3) Budget:** During the evaluation period, the EU supported the health sector with direct support amounting to EUR 4.1 billion. This represents 6% of total EU support to all sectors during the period

**4) Background, scope and focus:** The evaluation provides an independent assessment of the European Commission’s past and current support to the health sector by looking at the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the EU support provided. It also assesses the coherence of EU health support with other European Union and donor

policies and activities, as well as the specific EU added value within the health sector. The evaluation covers EU aid delivery over the period 2002 to 2010, including all geographical programmes (EDF, DCI, ENPI and predecessors) and thematic budget lines. It comprises all countries under the mandate of DG DEVCO and assesses every aid modality used in the health sector.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:** The EU support to the health sector was found coherent with the EU Development policy and well-focused on poverty reduction. However, the Commission still lacks a clearly articulated and implemented global strategy for health co-operation. Health strategies have tended to focus on the present, not on the longer term. The interventions in the health sector have been generally effective. However, in several areas, such as health finance reform and human resources, results have been found to be small compared to the scope of the challenges. Key conclusions:

- EC co-operation in health was relevant to needs and coherent with EU development policy. In general, the poverty focus of health cooperation was well maintained over the evaluation period. However, the Commission still lacks a clearly articulated and implemented global strategy for health co-operation with developing countries.
- Health strategies have tended to focus on the present, not on the longer term over which health sector development takes place (such as urbanisation and the demographic and epidemiological transitions).
- EU co-operation in the health sector has been generally effective. However, in a few areas, such as health finance reform and human resources, results have been found to be small compared to the scope of the challenges. A factor limiting effectiveness throughout has been the chronic shortage of technical expertise in EUDs.
- EU support, especially SBS, has led to improved health sector policy making capacities and improved management practices. While capacity for better PFM has been increased, the ultimate impact on health sector PFM has often not been seen. Not only PFM capacity, but also increased national resource allocations to the health sector are needed.
- Through support to research, infectious disease control, the EU significantly contributed to the production of global and regional public goods for health.

Key recommendations:

- Consolidate various global policy statements and approaches into a comprehensive health co-operation strategy that can be effectively operationalized at the field level in conformity with national sector development plans;
- In defining focus of support, take more carefully into account the shifting burden of disease and structural shifts such as urbanisation;
- While continuing to support global initiatives such as GFATM and GAVI, the Commission should use its influence to encourage further moves towards the health systems strengthening components of such vertical programmes and in particular address the human resource consequences;
- The EU needs to strengthen the availability of technical health capacity in Delegations and, in countries where this is impossible, should consider reducing its direct

participation in the health sector, delegating to others by participation in pooled funding, or drawing on expertise in EU MS embassies.

Uptake of the evaluation recommendations: Out of 12 key recommendations formulated by the evaluators, the Commission has fully accepted 8 recommendations, the other 4 being only partially accepted. Examples that will be taken by the Commission: Following the recommendation of the evaluation to consolidate various global policy statements and approaches into a comprehensive health co-operation strategy, the Commission (DG DEVCO) is now preparing an internal programme for action that will integrate existing policies and commitments for improved implementation of development programmes. In response to the recommendation to strengthen the availability of technical health capacity in the EU Delegations, the Commission is committed to strengthen its own sector and thematic expertise, among others through the creation of DEVCO regional hubs. The Commission will also concentrate the number of sectors of support in each partner country and will ensure that appropriate capacity will be available in the EU delegations to those 15-20 countries that choose health as a focal support sector. Regular training including regional health seminars will also be provided with strong HQ support.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2012/1308\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2012/1308_docs_en.htm)

## ABB 22 – Enlargement

### **Evaluation of governance, rule of law, judiciary reform and fight against corruption and organised crime in the Western Balkans (Lot 2)**

**1) ABB activities:** 22 02

**2) Timing:** 31 May 2012

Period covered by the report: The evaluation covered the pre-accession assistance deployed under the following programmes: Phare 2002-2006; CARDS 2001-2006 and IPA 2007- 2011 programmes under Component I.

**3) Budget :** Not applicable

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

Western Balkan countries are moving closer to the EU, albeit with considerable differences from country to country, by meeting established criteria and conditions. Irrespective of the differences in the accession process, in much of the Western Balkans, better governance, rule of law, judicial reform and the fight against corruption and organised crime remain a major issue. The overall objective and scope of this evaluation were to support EU's efforts for strengthening Governance, Rule of Law, Judiciary Reform and Fight against Corruption and Organised Crime in the Western Balkans, namely in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Kosovo, Montenegro and Serbia in the context of EC enlargement policy. This evaluation was focused at assisting the EC in further developing and strengthening its assessment tools in the area of Good Governance and Rule of Law and providing recommendations for improving the assessment process and tools in the above areas, including recommendations on possible SMART objectives and indicators of measurement of performance of financial assistance and reforms.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation :**

The evaluation contributed to elaboration of a sample set of SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound) objectives in the areas of Governance, Rule of Law, Judiciary Reform and Fight against Corruption and Organised Crime. For each of the objectives, the evaluation team proposed a balanced basket of indicators. In addition, the evaluation team assessed the availability of each proposed indicator and recommended in which sources the indicators are to be found. The combination of indicators contained progress or law indicators and performance or achievement indicators. Further, the evaluation explored and recommended existing verification sources for all indicators. The conclusions and recommendations shall be reflected in programming and operational aspects for the upcoming EU pre-accession assistance IPA II 2014-2020. Some of the proposed indicators are currently used to develop an indicator framework for the programming exercise for IPA H assistance

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/financial\\_assistance/phare/evaluation/2012\\_final\\_report\\_lot\\_2.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/financial_assistance/phare/evaluation/2012_final_report_lot_2.pdf)

## **Thematic Evaluation of Rule of Law, Judicial Reform and Fight against Corruption and Organised Crime in the Western Balkans - Lot 3**

**1) ABB activities:** 22 02

**2) Timing:** 20 February 2013, (Period covered by the report: 2007-2011)

**3) Budget :**

Indication of the overall multi-annual budget of the evaluated IPA program for a period 2007- 2011 is EUR 3.6 billion. As this is a thematic evaluation, the amount is notional to indicate its part in relation to the overall Programme budget.

**4) Background, scope and focus**

The overall objective of the evaluation was to provide findings and recommendations to assist the General Directorate Enlargement of the European Commission in the programming of pre-accession assistance to candidate and potential candidate countries in the Western Balkans and to improve the EC instruments to support the reform process, with particular regard to the areas of Governance, Rule of Law, Judiciary Reform, Fight against Corruption and Organised Crime. The specific scope and focus of the evaluation were to identify measures, reforms and actions having had an impact in the areas of Judiciary Reform and Fight against Corruption and Organised Crime in transition countries, including which were the key factors for success/failure and providing guidance on how measures and reforms should be prioritised and, where relevant, sequenced.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation**

The evaluations found out that in all seven Western Balkan countries, there have been major improvements to the fundamental institutional frameworks and reforms in the rule of law sector. Nevertheless, the challenges ahead are stronger political will, ownership by the beneficiary and local administrative capacity which remain crucial conditions for a sustainable judicial reform. The evaluation recommended that on the beneficiary side, judicial reform programmes should have clear priorities reflected in national policy and budget propositions, ensuring stable planning parameters and financing. Support to strengthening of public sector accountability actors and non-state actors is further welcomed for the sustainable judicial reform. On the EU side, the evaluator recommended that the EU shall elaborate overall and programme objectives with regard to Governance and Rule of Law and shall re-assess/increase the IPA funding for strengthening Rule of Law following the evidence based programming. Priority programmes shall follow multi-annual plan and have a four-to-seven year horizon with clear 'stoppage points' for review and adjustment. The simplification of IPA II programming to fewer instruments, more sector programming with longer time-horizons is strongly supported. In the implementation of IPA assistance, it was recommended further flexibility in the deployment of the assistance to be introduced and significant reduction of time between prioritization and actual activity design. Taking into account the results of the current

evaluation, a notion for introduction of multi-annual planning in IPA II assistance, covering the duration of the next multi-annual financial framework, with a mid-term review, was conceived.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/financial\\_assistance/phare/evaluation/2013\\_final\\_main\\_report\\_lot\\_3.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/financial_assistance/phare/evaluation/2013_final_main_report_lot_3.pdf)

**Thematic evaluation on judiciary and fundamental rights in Turkey**

**1) ABB activities : 22 02**

**2) Timing:** 31 October 2012, (Period covered by the report: 2004- 2009)

**3) Budget:**

Indication of the overall multi-annual budget of the evaluated subject to total IPA budget 2007-2009 and pre-IPA assistance to the Turkey 2004-2006 is about EUR 112.6 million. As this is a thematic evaluation, the amount is notional to indicate its part in relation to the overall Programme budget.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

This was a thematic evaluation of EU pre-accession assistance in the areas of judiciary and fundamental rights in Turkey (chapter 23 of the *acquis communautaire*). The overall objective of the evaluation was to provide findings and recommendations to assist DG Enlargement in improving the programming and implementation of EU pre-accession assistance in the area of the political criteria and judiciary, and fundamental rights in Turkey. The specific scope and focus of the evaluation were to provide a judgement on the performance of assistance in the field of political criteria and judiciary; to provide a judgement on the performance of assistance in the field of fundamental rights and to provide operational recommendations for programming future EU assistance in the field and for taking corrective measures to improve the implementation and monitoring of on-going actions.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation**

EU assistance in judiciary and fundamental rights in Turkey was considered as supportive, adding value in enhancing human rights reforms to meet the political criteria for EU accession, strengthening the effectiveness of the court system to take into account European human rights standards and demonstrating an adequate level of delivery of results in view of the available resources. However, the evaluation found out several weaknesses in the programming and implementation of assistance, which deprive the assistance of some of its added value. In a context of continued distrust between national institutions and independent human rights actors, as well as of a lack of will on some of the authorities to implement certain human rights reforms, the effectiveness of EU assistance in relation to human rights needs further improvements. The lengthy programming process was the most significant challenge to efficiency since it affected the overall performance of each project. Sustainability was more challenging in relation to



civil society projects since NGOs often lack the capacity to maintain activities without project funding. The highest levels of sustainability were achieved by those projects that were most closely aligned with domestic policy priorities. Obstacles to achievement of impact included weak sharing of information among institutions and limited cooperation among ministries in the broader security sector. Following the evaluation's recommendations to streamline the programming process (while strengthening -the ownership by-relevant 'institutions' and enhance its transparency to beneficiaries), some amendments in programming IPA II were planned. Elements of flexibility, improved governance and growing ownership by the beneficiary country will be introduced in new IPA II programming to cater for emerging needs and give incentives to improve performance. The evaluation also contains a number of recommendations focus on the programming process and implementation of sector-based approach, which were taken on board when proposals for new IPA II programme were drafted.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/financial\\_assistance/phare/evaluation/2012\\_turkey\\_jhr\\_final\\_report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/financial_assistance/phare/evaluation/2012_turkey_jhr_final_report.pdf)

**Thematic Evaluation of EU's Support to Civil Society in the Western Balkans and Turkey**

**1) ABB activities:** 22 02 07 02

**2) Timing:** 20 June 2012, (Period covered by the report: IPA 2007-2009)

**3) Budget:**

Indication of the overall multi-annual budget of the evaluated subject to total IPA budget 2007-2009 is about EUR 1.4 billion. As this is a thematic evaluation, the amount is notional to indicate its part in relation to the overall Programme budget.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The EU's support to the sustainable development of civil society in partner countries aims at both improving the legal and financial conditions for civil society and at supporting the development of civil society organisations' capacities. EU assistance for civil society development and dialogue in the Western Balkans and Turkey has been given special attention under IPA. A broad range of organisations have received support, including in the areas of inter-ethnic relations, protection of minority rights, including Roma, poverty reduction, environmental protection and social development. This was a thematic evaluation of the EU's support to Civil Society in the Western Balkans (namely Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Kosovo, Montenegro and Serbia) and Turkey. The primary objectives of the evaluation were to provide findings and recommendations to assist DG Enlargement in the programming and implementation of EU pre-accession assistance to Civil Society in candidate and potential candidate countries and to assess the performance of financial assistance in achieving its

objectives in relation to its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The evaluation concluded that the objective of supporting the development and capacity of Western Balkans and Turkey Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) has largely been achieved. The planned administrative and organisational structures have generally been set up, but have highly variable effectiveness. The introduction of the Technical Assistance for Civil Society and its regional and national activities has so far been favourably perceived. The outreach of EU's support has not yet been balanced in terms of supporting not only large, but also smaller CSOs. The impact and sustainability of the EU's support to Civil Society Organizations have been hampered by institutional constraints and could be improved by reinforcement of the multi-beneficiary support, diversification of thematic programmes and promotion of wider use of geographical / sectoral or thematic small grant schemes. The evaluation recommended strengthening the external and internal monitoring of EU support to civil society. In addition the evaluation proposed better synergy between EU and non-EU interventions, in the programming and implementation of IPA assistance. The evaluation contributes to proposing some modifications in the management of the new IPA program in terms of increasing cooperation with other donors and International financial institutions at strategic level and enhancing stakeholder's participation in programming through working groups. Sectoral Monitoring Sub-Committee and Transition Assistance and Institution Building meetings.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/financial\\_assistance/phare/evaluation/2012\\_eval\\_cs\\_final\\_report\\_2.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/financial_assistance/phare/evaluation/2012_eval_cs_final_report_2.pdf)

**Strategic/interim evaluation of SIGMA programme**

**1) ABB activities:** 22 02

**2) Timing:** 31 October 2012, (period covered by the report: 2009-2011)

**3) Budget :**

Indication of the overall multi-annual budget of the evaluated subject to total IPA budget 2009-2011 is about EUR 10 million. As this is a thematic evaluation, the amount is notional to indicate its part in relation to the overall Programme budget.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

Sigma assistance started in 1992 when the EC and the OECD launched the first SIGMA programme to help the Central and Eastern European Countries to modernise their public administrations. SIGMA's main objective is to assist partner countries to develop public governance systems which are appropriate to a democracy operating under the rule of law and supporting a market economy. SIGMA's previous evaluation was done in 2007 and covered financing to SIGMA from PHARE Multi-Beneficiary programme. The primary objective of this evaluation was to provide relevant findings, conclusions and recommendations to the Commission about the performance of SIGMA's activities, based

on both the evaluator's assessment and as perceived by the beneficiaries, in the area of Public governance reform/ Public Administration Reform. It assessed the SIGMA's performance under the Instrument for Pre- Accession (IPA) 2009-2011.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation :**

The evaluation reported that SIGMA's input is considered indispensable and effective, but it also acknowledged that the process is driven by mutual demand as institutional and legislative developments are decisive factors in agreeing on collaboration. A structured and traceable hierarchy of general and specific objectives and integrated (political) risks is currently lacking, which hamper positive impact of SIGMA's input. To overcome the bottleneck, the evaluation proposed establishing a SIGMA's intervention logic, representing the programme as a whole. Furthermore, the evaluators advised that both EC services and SIGMA shall search for a new agreement, which could be useful to provide a real time overview of SIGMA's implementation context. The prioritisation of peer/stakeholder dialogue, at a national or regional level, is considered a crucial modality for achieving impact and awareness. Integrated dialogue modalities in SIGMA support and advice are often praised by stakeholders as a significant capacitating influence which facilitates engagement, ownership and awareness. It was recommended that both SIGMA and the Commission services would benefited from greater political leverage to maximise the potential effect of SIGMA outcomes. In this respect a proposal for participation of relevant EUD staff in programming and (general) implementation of SIGMA's missions, where and when feasible, was welcomed. These findings contributed to the Commission's future approach on planning and programming SIGMA with the view to responding better to the strategic goals of enlargement policy in the area of Public Administration Reform. In line with the evaluation recommendations, the purpose of the SIGMA assessment will be broadened. Starting in 2013, in three countries, the assessment will become the basis for a more effective policy dialogue, a tool for informing IPA national and regional funding, and a tool for SIGMA to develop country reform plans.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

Not yet available.

**Evaluation and review of humanitarian access strategies in DG ECHO funded interventions**

**1) ABB activities:** 23 02

**2) Timing:** June 2012

**3) Budget:** not applicable

**4) Background, scope and focus**

Lack of access means that humanitarian partners are not able to conduct adequate needs assessments of populations in need, nor can they subsequently implement and monitor their humanitarian assistance safely and effectively. The selective restriction of access to certain groups, whether by armed groups or by governments, may also compromise the independence, neutrality and impartiality of humanitarian aid.

The main objective is to have an independent structured evaluation and review of humanitarian access strategies in line with Regulation (EC) 1257/96 concerning humanitarian aid to provide DG ECHO with an assessment of its own practices and those of its partners, considering these also in relation to those of other donors and implementing partners, and with a policy framework and practical guidelines for functioning effectively in situations of restricted access.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation**

Humanitarian access is both ability of humanitarian organizations to reach populations affected by crises and the ability of the humanitarian organizations to reach populations affected by the crises and the ability of affected populations to access humanitarian services.

The evaluation analyses the most important constraints to access, the strategies applied by humanitarian actors to overcome them and the compromises these strategies involve.

Access constraints identified are those related to security restrictions, those imposed by the Governments wanting to limit access through immigration policies or imposing travel restrictions. The indirect constraints such as internal security rules of organisations, legislation preventing organisations from engaging with armed actors considered as terrorists, or "politicization of aid" might also restrict access to people in need.

The evaluation has identified activities that can be undertaken to expand or preserve access: first to be tackled at the source of constraints by trying to persuade those in control to allow more access; second to mitigate and manage the security risks to continue the assistance, the third to operate through remote management and finally getting non-Western powers influencing governments on board.

Also, it should be decided what compromises are acceptable to continue serving those in need and/or eventually when to disengage. DG ECHO's standard instruments permit deciding whether or not to disengage, however potential negative effects of humanitarian activities are not sufficiently considered.

When attempting to maintain or increase access, the balance between humanitarian principles and minimum requirements for providing assistance should be duly analysed in order to not

compromise the credibility in the long term and running the risk of unintended harm.

Main recommendations:

1. More active and strategic role in advocacy should be adopted, as well positions on anti-terrorism legislation and UN integration. Efforts should be increased to define coherent positions on humanitarian issues within the Commission, the European Parliament and EU Member States. Encourage OCHA to focus more on liaising with governments.
2. Increase efforts to engage non-Western actors, particularly influential for increase of access.
3. Support staff members and ensure consistent decisions; further develop and practice with teaching cases to achieve coherent decision-making on moral and practical dilemmas.
4. Adopt a common definition of remote management, develop operational guidance and improve DG ECHO's ability to monitor projects directly.
5. Go into "hibernation" when compromises become excessive; reduce the overall budget and restrict funding to strategic partners and enable partners to maintain a networking capacity on the ground and support small-scale projects.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2012/GPPi\\_Access-Report\\_July-2012.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2012/GPPi_Access-Report_July-2012.pdf)

### **The evaluation of dg echo's disaster preparedness and disaster risk reduction actions in southern Africa & the Indian ocean**

**1) ABB activities:** 23 02

**2) Timing:** December 2011

**3) Budget:** EUR 16,568,343

#### **4) Background, scope and focus:**

The south-east African and south-west Indian Ocean region is one of the most disaster-prone regions in the world, experiencing multiple types of natural disasters.

A first Action Plan for Disaster Preparedness was launched under DG ECHO's Disaster Preparedness ECHO (DIPECHO) programme (implementation timeframe from October 2008 – March 2010), and was followed up by a second Action Plan for Disaster Preparedness from June 2010 to December 2011). The Action Plans aim to increase resilience and decrease the vulnerability of local communities and institutions by supporting strategies that enhance their capacities and enable them to better prepare for, mitigate and respond adequately to natural disasters.

Due to their pilot nature and to the DG ECHO aim for development donors and national governments to scale-up successful approaches tested through its DRR interventions, the evaluation should focus on the effectiveness of the different sets of activities implemented and their "fitness for purpose" in order to allow DG ECHO to select those interventions

which should be prioritized for consolidation in the third Action Plan (2012 – 2013) and thus implement a viable exit strategy of the current geographical areas of intervention within the parameters of DG ECHO.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The countries, the regions and the communities selected are among the most exposed to the selected priority hazards. The main impact of DIPECHO was in the strengthening (or set up) of local DRR committees at community level, a highly praised achievement. The national Disaster Risk Management organization expressed above all a need for direct funding for their activities and contribution to the DIPECHO DRR projects: an option currently not available. DG ECHO dedicated considerable efforts to promote inter-governmental coordination. The effectiveness of its actions was in terms of prospective (but hypothetical) benefits in case of disaster but above all in immediate and more tangible results (better crop, access to safe water, etc.). In terms of location (access and number of communities), hazard (drought, earthquake), thematic priority (urban or rural), there is a need for improving and explaining the coherence and consistency of the DG ECHO strategy. The selection of partners and projects appears to be participative within DG ECHO, but does not meaningfully involve outside stakeholders essential for ensuring sustainability: national authorities, EU delegation and some agencies with critically relevant mandate such as UNDP and Red Cross. The concept of an exit strategy is poorly understood and not taken seriously by Partners. It is time for consolidation to ensure full ownership and moving on to new innovative untested ideas, expanding the hazards or the context and including new unchartered countries.

The recommendations are grouped in three themes: 1) improving the strategy, 2) ensuring sustainability and 3) specific suggestions for DIPECHO III.

1) Adoption of operational criteria for selection of targets specific to increase the chance of success and visibility of pilot projects. Inclusion of food/livelihood security DRR activities. Extension of duration of financing to 24 months. Continuing the focus on communities, increasing impact at national level and curtailing intergovernmental coordination initiatives. 2) Identifying among the “best practices” those that are actually scalable up and focusing on their marketing before other donors. Establishing true partnership with EU Delegation and other development instruments. In partnership with EuropeAid, organize a meeting of global donors to promote a few specific interventions most suitable for integration into projected DRR related programs. 3) Favouring a consortium approach (one joint project) in each country. Limiting isolated projects to highly innovative interventions too specific or risky for adoption by all partners of the consortium. Sharing decision making on selection of projects with the EU delegation and involving national authorities in the process. Identifying a mechanism for funding of the involvement of the national DRR Authority (Civil protection, UNDP or other). Establishing a roster and mobilization mechanism for rapid and systematic evaluation of DRR effectiveness (impact) in the aftermath of a disaster in the target communities. Limiting regional projects mostly to the provision of technical assistance and support. Extending DIPECHO to Namibia in soliciting a joint (consortium) project from UN and Red Cross and preparing the ground for further expansion in Southern Africa.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2012/DIPECHO\\_south\\_africa\\_indian\\_ocean.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2012/DIPECHO_south_africa_indian_ocean.pdf)

## Evaluation of the European Commission in Ethiopia

**1) ABB activities:** 23 02

**2) Timing:** July 2012

**3) Budget:** EUR 192.76 million since 2007

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

Since 2007, DG ECHO has adopted 18 Financial Decisions related to Ethiopia. In these Decisions a total of over EUR 192.76 million has been committed in order to respond to humanitarian emergencies, targeting millions of people each year.

The main purposes of the evaluation are lesson learning and accountability in order to improve future performance.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The strengths of the DG ECHO contribution to preventing catastrophic crises are in its focus on communities and its potential for innovations. These strengths have not been fully channelled within the framework of a clear strategy. The resources spread increasingly thinly over a large number of projects, places and beneficiaries. Little impact should be expected from interventions providing mono-sectoral services to many dispersed targets. In addition to scattered over too many projects, the action is also lacking integrated multi-sectoral approach. Livelihood, nutrition, WASH or health activities are usually isolated and disconnected from each other.

Linking with EU development instruments has been priority. This collaboration with DG DEVCO and promotion towards combined effort are ultimately on the point to produce concrete results: i.e. the EU SHARE initiative should provide the EU delegation with a tool to build on the work of the humanitarian partners, with DG ECHO as a source of technical expertise and advice. Regarding draught risk reduction, partners' projects are reasonably inserted in LRRD perspective. However, the LRRD problem seems to be the relief part of the concept, as some of the worthwhile projects have limited link with emergency relief.

The Rapid Response to crises is DG ECHO's public trademark. However approval process is perceived by most partners as comparatively slower and less flexible. Once activated, the assistance covered the scope of needs across sectors.

Malnutrition rates are affected by multiple factors and influenced by much larger programmes than those of DG ECHO. A change of acute malnutrition or crude mortality rates is not necessarily reflecting the effectiveness or lack of emergency projects.

Main recommendations:

1. DG ECHO should adopt distinct strategies for protracted food crises, acute food emergencies and sudden onset crises and conflicts.
2. The number of projects directly funded and monitored by its staff should be considerably reduced.

3. A cost-effective multi-sectoral package to fewer beneficiaries in a limited number of *woredas* in protracted crises should be foreseen. In particular, in-depth review could be launched specifically to define the supporting role of health sector in tackling food security and nutritional problems.

4. In situations requiring a rapid response, DG ECHO should explore a mechanism to pre-assign funding to select partners.

DG ECHO and its partners should pay more attention to the selection of appropriate indicators to measure the impact of their interventions. This is especially critical for changes in rates of acute malnutrition in protracted food crises

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2012/ethiopia\\_final\\_report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2012/ethiopia_final_report.pdf)

## **Evaluation of the European Commission's Humanitarian Activities in Bangladesh**

**1) ABB activities:** 23 02

**2) Timing:** October 2012

**3) Budget:** Humanitarian aid to Bangladesh has totalled over EUR 107 million since 2000.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The European Commission's Directorate General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (DG ECHO) has been working in Bangladesh for many years, both in disaster preparedness and in response activities. Humanitarian aid to Bangladesh has totalled over EUR 107 million since 2000.

DG ECHO has also contributed more than EUR 53 million in humanitarian aid for the victims of cyclones Sidr and Aila since 2007 and over EUR 29 million for flood victims since 2004. The funding was used to help the most vulnerable people, some of them displaced from their homes, with basic humanitarian life saving support (food assistance, drinking water; sanitation and hygiene facilities; emergency shelter materials) and to regain self-sufficiency through income generating activities.

The scope is to assess the appropriateness and effectiveness of the Commission's actions, in accordance with DG ECHO's mandate, in order to establish whether they have achieved their objectives and to produce recommendations for strengthening the impact of future operations in Bangladesh. The results of the evaluation will be used in the preparation of the 2013 strategy for Bangladesh.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

In no other country DG ECHO's expertise is more needed than in Bangladesh; given its unique vulnerability to disasters. Due to the widespread network of implementing partners DG ECHO's emergency response programmes effectively assisted the affected population, recovered livelihoods and reinstated coping mechanisms. Response times are considered as very quick and the speed of funding is very pleasing for most local NGOs.



The 'bottom up' approach of DIPECHO programmes has proved that affected local communities were better prepared for disasters, the coordination on local level was enhanced, and the most vulnerable people were addressed. The evaluation of the Consortium System has also shown convincing results in managing several agencies engaged in a single project; even though group agreements might take up more time and potentially slow down the overall response process.

The relationship and coordination between DG ECHO and the Government of Bangladesh and other humanitarian donors leaves potential for improvement. So far, DG ECHO's assistance to unregistered refugees provides additional value to UNHCR activities in the country. However, in order to make cooperation on local level more effective, a more targeted and prioritised approach would be beneficial.

Due to the lack of a clearly articulated, national LRRD strategy DG ECHO's emergency response programmes rather do not have long-term effects. A national strategy would allow replication of successful projects, facilitate responses for chronic emergencies, improve the issues of malnutrition and food security, and contribute to the overall development process of the country.

Main recommendations:

- 1.) Especially in the case of bigger disasters, DG ECHO's activities need to be more targeted and prioritised to increase coordination with other donors and thus effectiveness.
- 2.) DIPECHO programmes should be complementary to governmental work (CDMP), in order to achieve more long-term stability and foster the multiplier effect.
- 3.) DG ECHO needs to continue emphasising the abuse of human rights of Rohingya refugees in the region.
- 4.) The current strategy towards malnutrition should be continued and yet extended by rigorous prioritisation and by decisions on entry and exit strategies.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2012/Bangladesh.pdf>

### **Evaluation of the European Commission's Humanitarian Activities in Colombia**

**1) ABB activities:** 23 02

**2) Timing:** November 2012

**3) Budget:** The budget allocated for humanitarian emergency assistance to IDPs is around EUR 200 million per year

**4) Background, scope and focus :**

The main humanitarian actor in Colombia is the Government of Colombia (GoC). The budget allocated for humanitarian emergency assistance to IDPs is estimated at some EUR 200 million per year. Performance of the social agencies of the GoC to deliver humanitarian aid has increased during the past years, particularly in capitals of departments. Nonetheless, official assistance to rural zones affected by the conflict is

scarce; civil servants are afraid of working in those zones due to prevailing insecurity. ECHO has progressively concentrated more humanitarian aid in those rural zones where this gap exists.

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the appropriateness of DG ECHO's actions, in accordance with DG ECHO's mandate, in order to establish whether they have achieved their objectives and to produce recommendations for improving the effectiveness of future operations in Colombia.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

Due to its expertise DG ECHO took on a leading role in terms of coordinating humanitarian donors in Colombia. As a result the Directorate assisted UN OCHA in setting up a common humanitarian framework and ensured that LRRD was effectively integrated into a broader strategy.

The evaluation revealed that DG ECHO's emergency response to natural disasters was conducted in a timely manner, addressed the right needs due to effective prioritisation, and close monitoring of on-going projects allowed for quick adaptation if unforeseen changes occurred.

However, in regards to DG ECHO's focus on supporting registered asylum seekers, poor selection of eligibility criteria by local partners resulted in the exclusion of many unregistered IDPs and PNIPs. Legal and institutional changes in Colombia, but also in the neighbouring Ecuador, additionally reduced the number of people with refugee status. For this reason, there is disagreement on the official number of IDPs and PNIPs, and therefore the coverage of DG ECHO's support can only be estimated.

Although successfully implemented, DG ECHO's LRRD efforts were severely hindered by the armed conflict in the country. A long-term approach to improve the livelihood of the population depends on the commitment of the local government, which is especially difficult when the government itself is a party in the conflict.

Main recommendations:

1. Change eligibility criteria and increase coverage of registered and non-registered IDPs and PNIPs.
2. Review data collection procedures in order to improve monitoring DG ECHO's efficiency.
3. LRRD coordination with government institutions and other humanitarian actors needs to be improved.
4. The Directorate should continue its community/neighbourhood approach and encourage other implementing partners to support the basic needs of vulnerable groups.
5. DG ECHO should extend its activities to urban settings

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

<http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2012/Colombia.pdf>

## **Evaluation and Review of the DG ECHO financed Livelihood Interventions in Humanitarian Crises**

**1) ABB activities:** 23 02

**2) Timing:** March 2012

**3) Budget:** Overall budget humanitarian aid EUR 6.1 billion over period 2007-13.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

Livelihoods comprise the capabilities, assets (including natural, material and social resources) and activities used by a household for survival and future well-being. Livelihood strategies are the practical means or activities through which people access income, while coping strategies are temporary responses forced by food insecurity. A household's livelihood is secure when it can cope with and recover from shocks, and maintain or enhance its capabilities and productive asset base.

The main objective of the evaluation exercise is to provide DG ECHO with a multi-regional evaluation of its activities in the livelihoods support sector. The evaluation will cover the entire range of livelihoods support activities financed across the spectrum of humanitarian interventions. This will involve analysing a selection of DG ECHO funded livelihood interventions or interventions with livelihoods support components undertaken since the creation of the food aid budget line in 2007 (although the evaluation will not be exclusively limited to livelihoods support actions targeting food insecurity).

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

DG ECHO has made considerable progress in making the livelihood programmes more defined, coherent and innovative, even though there have been missed opportunities for the exchange of good practices across countries and regions. Standardized programming options have not clearly demonstrated to be effective.

The Directorate's emergency livelihood activities are characterized by well coordination and open dialogue with local partners. Although it was not always possible to evaluate DG ECHO's work with much precision – because of the lack of thorough documentation, the team's response to the chronic food insecurity in the Sahel or disaster risk reduction programmes in the Horn of Africa, were considered good examples for LRRD.

However, LRRD implementation in the area of food security bears a challenge. The risk exists that a central focus on livelihood approaches may lead to an omission of vital relief activities. A key issue here is the rather short timeframe of livelihood programmes of 12 months which threatens the effectiveness of project implementation. Certain livelihood recovery and protection projects can just not be tied to annual programme cycles.

Because of limited technical capacities of its staff response analysis and impact evaluation are notable weaknesses of DG ECHO and its partners in the field. For the same reasons, it is hard to establish purposeful mechanisms that allow for learning and knowledge exchange. Structural changes would facilitate the usage of evaluation findings and contribute to the effectiveness of individual projects.

Main recommendations:

- 1) Clear documentation, adequate monitoring of activities and collection of quality data will increase the meaningfulness of analysis and evaluations and in turn have a positive effect on single projects.
- 2) DG ECHO needs to continue its drive for innovation and not follow tendencies to standardized default responses.
- 3) DG ECHO needs to extend timeframes for particular livelihood projects in order to increase the project's effectiveness.
- 4) Regular knowledge/information exchange and the creation of associated mechanisms will lead to greater efficiency and better practices across countries and regions.
- 5) The Directorate needs to take care that LRRD approaches combine relief assistance, long-term development strategies and regional integration.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2012/Livelihood\\_interventions.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2012/Livelihood_interventions.pdf)

**The evaluation of echo's intervention in the occupied Palestinian territory and Lebanon**

- 1) **ABB activities:** 23 02
- 2) **Timing:** March 2012
- 3) **Budget:** EUR 600 million since 2000.
- 4) **Background, scope and focus :**

The European Commission has provided almost EUR 600 million in humanitarian aid to help to meet the basic needs of Palestinians in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (oPt) as well as the Palestinian refugees living in Lebanon, Jordan, and Syria since 2000. ECHO has been active in the oPt since 2000, (beginning of the Second Intifada). 2006 noted a peak in terms of funding with a total allocation of EUR 84M to address the humanitarian needs of Palestinians in the oPt following the Hamas take-over of Gaza and the ensuing events that resulted directly or indirectly from this result -including multiple incursions by the Israeli Army in the Gaza strip, the freeze by the Israeli government of Palestinian VAT revenue transfers, the continuation of the construction of the Wall, and the reduction by main donors of their foreign assistance.

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the appropriateness of ECHO's actions vis à vis its mandate, in order to establish whether objectives have been achieved; to evaluate the effectiveness and timeliness of ECHO's strategic approach to the Palestinian refugees in the oPt and Lebanon; and finally to produce recommendations for defining ECHO's multi-sectoral strategy and for improving the effectiveness of future operations in addressing the needs of the Palestinian Refugees in the oPt and Lebanon.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

Over the reporting period in West Bank and Gaza (WBG), DG ECHO has supported different humanitarian and protection activities in order to assist the suffering population, such as food assistance, livelihoods, shelter, healthcare, monitoring violations of International Humanitarian Law and International Human Rights Law. However 'victims' humanitarian needs in OPT and Gaza are not prima facie as severe as those normally addressed by DG ECHO in other theatres and, this is not therefore a humanitarian crisis but a rights crisis with humanitarian consequences. The causes of the humanitarian needs are clear but addressing symptoms only, and not the threats or violations, does not address the vulnerabilities in a sustainable manner. While protection has been identified as the priority sector, intervention has had little impact on stopping brutal violations and denials of human rights such that associated interventions constitute little more than short-term alleviations of the symptoms. Within its mandate, ECHO has the opportunity to do both, providing humanitarian assistance and advocating for addressing the root causes of the vulnerabilities, thus increasing its impact in alleviating humanitarian suffering.

#### Main Recommendations:

While DG ECHO is limited by its mandate to politically address the causal factors of the consequent urgent humanitarian needs, it can still take a stronger principled stand with regard to victims' vulnerabilities and translate this into more effective concrete actions (both in the courts and through international and Israel-based advocacy) while continuing to address those needs. ECHO needs to respond, not only to ex-post symptoms of violations, but also to victims' vulnerabilities to violations, particularly with regard to demolitions, settler violence and forced displacements and ensure it is done in a comprehensive way through encouraging coordination between relevant actors. DG ECHO has not well been able to monitor partners' efforts and how successful each has or has not been. It should provide better guidance on its definitions and implementation approach, as well as sharing good practices. It should develop a tool that would enable it to monitor how partners are implementing this in the field and where their successes lie. The Protection Cluster's emergency response mechanism (established mostly for the West Bank) which comprises a multi-partner humanitarian assistance, protection and litigation response is excellent, and needs to be expanded and supported.

#### 6) Availability of the report on Europa:

Not available on Europa.

### Evaluation of the European Commission supported humanitarian aid in urban settings

1) **ABB activities:** 23 02

2) **Timing:** June 2012

3) **Budget:** Overall budget humanitarian aid EUR 6.1 billion over period 2007-13.

4) **Background, scope and focus :**

Urban areas are complex settings to implement humanitarian assistance and vary from rural areas in terms of needs and vulnerabilities. Institutions, partners, and intervention

methods also vary considerably among small, medium and large cities and among regions. Humanitarian assistance in urban settings is dependent upon a range of local, national and international interlocutors. The capacities, human and financial resources, tools and procedures and level of preparedness for disasters can vary among cities to a large degree.

There are two main objectives for this evaluation. Firstly, the evaluation should provide an independent structured evaluation of the results of DG ECHO's strategic and operational capacity and ability to fund needs based humanitarian operations in urban areas in line with DG ECHO legal basis 1257/96, with the overall purpose of improving performance through lesson learning and accountability. Secondly, the evaluation should assess the scope, lessons learned, outcomes, limits and comparative advantage of DG ECHO funded actions in urban contexts to-date, and to provide advice to DG ECHO, particularly in relation to its institutional practices and tool kit.

#### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

DG ECHO has provided resources to a broad range of stakeholders within the humanitarian operations supporting urban settings. However while many of them had some experience in urban settings, none of them had a clear strategy for conducting operations. Humanitarian response in urban settings requires a specific approach in view of the complexity of the urban environment. Delivering humanitarian aid in urban settings is often dangerous, logistically difficult and requires significant resources in view of urban disasters.

Engaging humanitarian aid in urban settings requires both an appropriate analyses of the evolution of the on-going crises and understanding of the urban settings. There are challenges to be addressed that depend on specific contexts such as slums or organized urban violence. Risks associated with getting involved have to be assessed carefully; exit strategies need to be identified.

Urban disasters need to be addressed very quickly: introduction of "primary emergency decision" and "small-scale emergency decision" are appropriate and important DG ECHO's funding tools, however lack of coherence or coordination and competition between donors and agencies are harmful to address urban disasters.

LRRD (Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development) in urban context proved difficult within European aid framework. Urban issues are seldom included in development programmes, and if so, in a superficial way. DG ECHO is involved in Post-Disaster Needs Assessment with other donors, however when the Commission's humanitarian and development directorates are engaged, completed with experts from Member States, the Post-Disaster Need Assessment works even better.

Main recommendations:

1. The Commission should ensure that operational concepts and methods used make optimal use of all opportunities and options available in urban settings. City-to-city cooperation and agreement between humanitarian agencies and municipal technical departments should be further strengthening.
2. The entry criteria and exist strategies for engaging in urban settings should be clarified. The exit strategies should be developed at the early stages of needs and capacity assessment and the design of intervention logic.

3. DG ECHO should continue its efforts to be a driving force in terms of coordination between donors. It should also ensure that community participation and coordination with local civil society is the rule rather than exception.

To address issues of LRRD the DG ECHO should strengthen its dialogue with other donors

**6) Availability of the report on Europa**

Not available.

**Evaluation of the DG ECHO Legal Framework for Funding of Humanitarian Actions (FPA 2008)**

**1) ABB activities:** 23 02

**2) Timing:** June 2012

**3) Budget:** not applicable

**4) Background, scope and focus :**

The partnership has been established since 1993 through the signing of a Framework Partnership Agreements which operates as a long-term cooperation mechanism between the Parties designed to ensure that ECHO- funded humanitarian partners and operations meet the highest standards of performance and quality.

The scope of the evaluation will cover the evolution of the different FPAs with a special focus on the implementations of the FPA rules and procedures that entered into force on January 2008 and which are still applied today.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

Although working relationships between ECHO and the partners are generally good, the principles of trust, mutual respect and ownership in the asymmetric partnership between donors and recipient agencies are not always applied in a consistent manner.

The effectiveness of a small group of "quality partners" would benefit from greater flexibility and some type of non-earmarked funding. Categories of partners should be more accurately defined with operational and not only financial criteria. It should be also possible for eligible weaker partners to become stronger.

There is need for greater flexibility of funding, in particular to ensure rapid response to new or worsening emergencies. Regular delays in contracting and funding of emergency projects may be detrimental to the delivery of aid to the beneficiaries. However funding modalities and timeframes are imposed by the Humanitarian Aid Regulation and the Financial Regulation, or are not always interpreted in a flexible enough or adequate manner.

The presence of ECHO experts in the field, the focus on forgotten crises and non-partisan/political approach, the promotion of humanitarian principles , the focus on results,

the diversity of partners and the scale of funding are key perceived advantages of ECHO compared to other donors. However there is no guidance on how implement a result-based approach. The efficiency has been hampered by a number of key problems at the proposal and liquidation stages.

#### Recommendations

1. Improved quality criteria should be used to define categories of partners according to their operational and not only on financial capacities in particular a category of "quality partners". Selected "quality partners should benefit from more flexible fast-track procedures. DG ECHO should continue working with the various for a used for consultation process with partners.
2. In order for the FPA to be flexible "fit for purpose" instruments, procedures should be better adapted to the different categories of partners and situations. The new FPA should include the possibility of providing flexible funding to partners' disaster response tools and assets.
3. Efficiency could be improved if, for instance, at the project proposal selection of proposals should be more transparent, clarified terminology and timeline of expected results; regarding implementation more efficient e-tools should be proposed and used; at the liquidation stage more inter-service coherence and coordination between ECHO operational, Finance, Audit units should considered.
4. ECHO should advocate in the revision of the Financial regulation for more flexibility regarding indirect (transaction) costs.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2012/fpa2008\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2012/fpa2008_en.pdf)



**Evaluation of the language training organised in Brussels by DG HR**

**1) ABB activities:** 26 01

**2) Timing:** 24/01/2013, (period covered: 2012)

**3) Budget:** EUR 84,990

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The evaluation covers the language trainings courses organised for EU Institutions staff in Brussels by DG HR.

The objective of this evaluation is to support DG HR in (1) defining the learning needs and the new language training priorities of the Commission; (2) assessing the effectiveness of the current language training within the Commission; and (3) analysing the most effective way to introduce new alternative methods of language training, such as e-Learning or blended learning.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

Main results of the evaluation

- Language learning needs are better addressed and language learning is more efficient for units where language learning is strongly related to their performance.
- There is a strong requirement by services and learners for proficiency; however, since most of the learners are beginners, the actual language needs of the services and staff will be met over a longer period.
- A more systematic evaluation of the courses' outcomes should be introduced, as well as evaluation of the degree to which the new skills are effectively used to respond to the actual needs and objectives of learners and services.
- Staff generally considers that the current language training offer responds to their needs, but the extent to which this is achieved is medium.
- Course attendance should be enhanced by several incentives e.g. promotion of officials. More formal consequences should be introduced if courses are abandoned.
- Blended and virtual learning are likely to increase in popularity as delivery methods of workplace learning in the future. These methods will increase learning options and may improve learning efficiency.
- Alternative methods facilitate differentiation in language learning content and allow addressing different target groups and preferred learning style of learners. They also offer a means to reduce absenteeism.

Overall conclusion

The current language training provision is the most used means through which Commission staff acquires new language skills, which highlights its role and importance.

However, attaining the highest effectiveness possible would require that the language offer and content be customised and become more flexible.

#### Recommendations

The evaluation report proposes a set of recommendations to improve various aspects of the policy of language training:

- Redefining language learning priorities, by putting the accent on professional training in the context of policies related to multilingualism in the Commission and staff mobility.
- Actively involving units in conducting an in-depth training needs analysis. This will lead to the development of language training policies and criteria for assessing language training needs and authorising participation in the language courses.
- Introducing feedback mechanisms to measure the effectiveness of immediate language course outputs (how courses enhance new skills) and longer term outcomes (how new skills are used to serve the learning objectives of services and staff).
- Introducing measures to increase motivation and commitment of staff to follow language courses until they reach their learning objectives. These measures will also decrease the important dropout rates currently observed and focus attention on advanced knowledge of languages which are mostly needed in the Commission.
- Increasing the flexibility of the current training provision through customisation of the learning content and the possibility offered to motivated learners to catch up on missed time through personal effort.
- Developing alternative learning methods, as a means to support course customisation and to respond better to the different learning styles of participants.

#### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

For internal use of the Commission services.

### **Interim evaluation of the ISA programme**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 26 03

**2) Timing:** January 2013, (period covered: end 2010 - mid 2012)

**3) Budget:**

The overall multi-annual budget of the ISA programme is EUR 164.1million. This amount will have to be reviewed at the light of the MFF currently under discussion, which will influence the expenditure for the years 2014-2015.

**4) Background, scope and focus**

By decision of the European Parliament and the Council (the ISA Decision)<sup>1</sup> the six-year

<sup>1</sup> Decision No 922/2009/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 on interoperability solutions for European public administrations (ISA), OJ L 260, 3.10.2009, p. 20.

programme on interoperability solutions for European public administrations (the ISA programme) was launched on 1 January 2010 as a follow-up programme to the IDABC programme<sup>1</sup>. The objective of the ISA programme is to support cooperation between European public administrations by facilitating the efficient and effective electronic cross-border and cross-sectoral interaction between such administrations, including bodies performing public functions on their behalf, with a view to enabling the delivery of electronic public services supporting the implementation of EU policies and activities<sup>2</sup>.

The need to carry out an interim evaluation of the Programme stems from Article 13(3) of the ISA Decision. The evaluation was performed by the Commission using a team of independent experts from a consultancy company (the evaluation team). Representatives of Commission services have overseen the evaluation through a Commission steering group<sup>3</sup>.

##### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

The evaluation was largely positive, describing the ISA programme as aligned with the policy priorities of the European Commission and the needs of Member States and implemented efficiently and coherently, delivering results that are reused by both Commission services and Member States. Nevertheless the evaluation report also highlights some shortcomings and makes recommendations with regard to:

###### *Communication and raising awareness*

The ISA programme made important efforts last year to increase participation in national events and improve communication and information dissemination. Further to these efforts, the Commission is revising the communication strategy and will complement the overall strategy by pursuing dedicated communication activities in specific areas.

The Commission will analyse the cost-effectiveness of the evaluation recommendations at the light of financial perspectives for the years 2014-2015 and will increase collaboration with other stakeholders, i.e. other European institutions, academia and the ICT industry

<sup>1</sup> Decision 2004/387/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 April 2004 on interoperable delivery of pan-European eGovernment services to public administrations, businesses and citizens (IDABC), OJ L 144, 30.4.2004 (see OJ L 181, 18.5.2004, p. 25).

<sup>2</sup> Article 1(2).

<sup>3</sup> DG CONNECT, DIGIT, MARKT, SG, TAXUD.

<sup>4</sup> Commission IT Governance bodies are: Comité Technique Informatique (CTI), High Level Committee on Information Technologies (HLCIT), Activity Based Management Steering Committee covering IT (ABM+IT) and the Information Systems Project Management Board (ISPMB).

<sup>5</sup> Also addressing one recommendation in the IDABC final evaluation: a common 'promotion' document, focusing on the policy alignments and the synergies between the different eGovernment programmes, should be produced.

<sup>6</sup> The "Annex I to the Commission communication on interoperability - European Interoperability Strategy (EIS)" is available at [http://ec.europa.eu/isa/documents/isa\\_annex\\_i\\_eis\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/isa/documents/isa_annex_i_eis_en.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> These actions can be found in the recent ISA Work Programme at: [http://ec.europa.eu/isa/library/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/isa/library/index_en.htm) under the "ISA Work Programme" heading.

accordingly.

*Engagement of stakeholders and project management continuity*

The Commission proposes to support the Member States in implementing this recommendation in various ways.

In addition, the ISA programme will give priority to activities to assess the ICT implications of EU legislation, which Member States consider to be an important issue that has not yet been addressed.

The Commission is closely following up the procedure for framework contracts, which will assure the timely launch of the required call for tenders.

*Avoiding overlaps and duplications, of work, increasing reusability and ensuring sustainability*

The Commission takes a holistic approach to addressing the reusability and sustainability of interoperability solutions by acting at different levels:

- At governance level, by improving the links between the Commission's IT governance<sup>9</sup>, the ISA programme and through the ISA committee with the Member States. The ISA is currently presented annually to the CTI and individual ISA actions led by Commission services must be approved by the ISPMB;
- At the strategic level, by putting more emphasis on reusability and sustainability in future ISA work plans and if necessary by a possible review of the European Interoperability Strategy<sup>10</sup> (EIS)<sup>11</sup>;
- At operational level, by taking action to ensure better reusability of interoperability solutions and to develop sustainability enablers (e.g. European Interoperability Architecture (EIA), European Federated Interoperability Repository (EFIR), Assessment of trans-European networks supporting EU policies, Sharing and reuse strategy)<sup>12</sup> and by considering possible means of financial sustainability including the proposed CEF.

Finally, in line with the evaluator's recommendation, the ISA unit will identify actions producing concrete results by reviewing ISA solutions every two years as specified in Article 13(2) of the ISA Decision.

No conclusions can be drawn at this at this stage in what concerns the effectiveness, utility and sustainability criteria since the programme is still at its early stages.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/isa/documents/interim\\_evaluation\\_of\\_the\\_isa\\_programme.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/isa/documents/interim_evaluation_of_the_isa_programme.pdf)

### Rolling Review for Regional Statistics

1) **ABB activities:** 29 02

2) **Timing:** 27 October /2012

3) **Budget:** Included in the overall budget of the CSP 2008-2012

4) **Background, scope and focus:** A Rolling Review is a formative evaluation of the statistical data, the processes involved in compiling these data, working structures and data quality. The Review for Regional Statistics focuses on a number of thematic domains from a spatial perspective and consists of three main parts:

- Review of user satisfaction.
- Review of partner satisfaction.
- Review of special production processes.

Findings are used to formulate recommendations for improvement and identify ways to implement them.

5) **Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:** The outcomes of the Review reveal a high demand for regional statistics. The satisfaction with statistical information services offered by Eurostat in general is very high. The data quality aspects of accessibility, accuracy and comparability are considered as very good. Similarly, aspects of data coherence and clarity are considered as rather positive. The opinion about the internal coordination within Eurostat as regards requests for regional data from the NSIs, harmonisation of regional statistics as well as compilations and publications in the field of regional statistics are very well assessed. However, the results also point out areas for future improvement. In particular, further enhancements are needed in provision of better access to data, familiarity of partners with regional statistical programmes, closer cooperation with NSIs, better data timeliness, completeness and clarity. Notices on the need for more statistics and more efficient documentation have also been registered. With regards to regional statistics, 10 recommendations for improvement were made. 4 of these relate to improvement of dissemination products, 3 to improvement of data qualities and 3 in other fields. As for recommendations on special production processes, some 8 suggestions were made with majority concerning regional labour market statistics and indicators on metro-regions and urban-rural typology.

6) **Availability of the report on Europa:**

<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/RR%20Regional%20Statistics%20Executive%20Summary%20FINAL%20to%20be%20pub.pdf>

## Rolling Review for GISCO

**1) ABB activities:** 29 02

**2) Timing:** October 2012

**3) Budget (annual):** Included in the overall budget of the CSP 2008-2012.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

GISCO is a Eurostat service which promotes and stimulates the use of Geographical Information Systems (GIS) within the European Statistical System and the Directorates-General of the Commission. Rolling Review for GISCO is a part of the overall Quality Assurance Framework. This review was implemented between May 2011 and August 2012, and conducted in four parts:

- Two user satisfaction surveys (for data and maps).
- Two checklists, completed by the GIS staff, assessing major steps within the provision of geographical reference data and production of maps.

The results of these assessments are used to formulate recommendations for improvements and to identify ways for implementing these improvements.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

An increasing relevance of geographically oriented analysis for administrative and political decisions was recognised in the last years. A great majority of respondents stressed the importance and even essentiality of georeference data. Characteristics such as accessibility, quality, clarity and comparability were generally assessed as good. Positive results of user satisfaction are also found with quality of Eurostat maps.

What emerged from the review is the normal tension between the needs of the users of the georeference data and those who buy and supply the data. Users want a wider range of geographic data, while GISCO is more concerned with spending the limited resources to buy data which are required to support Eurostat's publications (thematic maps) and geographical oriented applications of the Commission (projects).

A total of 18 recommendations were provided with highest priorities concentrating on the fields of future trend for GISCO responsibilities and strengthening geographical data production and dissemination according to user demands.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa**

<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/RR%20GISCO%20Executive%20Summary%20FINAL.pdf>

## **Rolling Review for Harmonised Indices of Consumer Prices and related price statistics**

**1) ABB activities:** 29 02

**2) Timing:** April 2012

**3) Budget (annual):** Included in the overall budget of the CSP 2008-2012.

**4) Background, scope and focus:** As part of Eurostat's quality assurance framework, a rolling review of Harmonised Indices of Consumer Prices (HICPs) and related price statistics was undertaken starting in the late Summer of 2011 to assess the quality of HICP data and the statistical processes used to produce them. The survey was conducted in three parts:

- User survey.
- Partner survey.
- Self-assessment performed by the staff of Eurostat Unit C5.

A number of recommendations for improvement were made based on the views, comments and concerns of users, partners and HICP staff.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:** The HICP and related price statistics domain is a well-established and well regarded statistical domain by users, partners and Eurostat alike. Data quality, assessed under the criteria of accuracy, timeliness, accessibility, completeness, clarity, comparability and coherence is rated as very good or good by users, partners and the staff, with all criteria being of importance. Partners are very positive about Eurostat's role in the organisation and functioning of the HICP programme and its direction of change. Data treatment, validation and dissemination, publications, data confidentiality and information exchange tools are all very highly rated. User responses also point out a good support service provided by Eurostat. This is consistent with staff evaluation of systems and processes for data production which are well established and work well. While the rolling review assessments positively endorse the areas above, 14 sets of recommendation are provided with highest priorities assigned to:

- Compiling of detailed inventories / technical manuals of national HICP implementation practices and procedures.
- Reviewing compliance monitoring.
- Adopting a formal risk management approach for the HICP production processes at Unit level, coherent with Eurostat's overall risk management strategy.
- Improving to the on-going development of the HICP.
- Improving bilateral communications with key stakeholders

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/RR%20HICP%20Executive%20Summary.pdf>

## Rolling Review for Postal Statistics

**1) ABB activities:** 29 02

**2) Timing:** August 2012

**3) Budget (annual):** Included in the overall budget of the CSP 2008-2012.

**4) Background, scope and focus :**

Rolling Review for Postal Statistics is part of the Quality Assurance Framework related to streamlining the existing quality activities in Eurostat and to position them in the wider framework of the European Statistics Code of Practice and Total Quality Management. The focus of this review is assessment of postal statistics which supports the purpose of Community policy in the postal sector. The importance of postal services both for the economic prosperity and social well-being and cohesion of the EU make this a priority area for Community action and emphasises the importance of postal statistics. The review was implemented during September 2011 to May 2012 and conducted in three parts:

- User satisfaction survey.
- Partner satisfaction survey.
- Assessment of the production process by the professional staff within Eurostat.

Results are used to formulate the actions to improve the performance of the European Statistical System in the field.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The results of user survey indicate there is a major demand for postal statistics.

Users, in general, perceive the quality of postal data as good or adequate. However, concerns were raised with regards to timeliness and confidentiality.

Partners had a favourable opinion of Eurostat's work and were also very positive about the direction of change in Eurostat's performance over the past 3 years. Concerning data quality, partners had a positive appreciation of the Eurostat postal statistics, aside from timeliness.

A total of 14 recommendations were provided as the outcome of the survey. Importance was highlighted to the possible collection of European postal statistics by DG MARKT and processes related to the transfer as well as improvement of data collection

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/RR%20Postal%20Statistics%20Executive%20Summary%20FINAL%20VERSION\\_0.pdf](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/RR%20Postal%20Statistics%20Executive%20Summary%20FINAL%20VERSION_0.pdf)



## Rolling Review for Innovation and R&D Statistics

**1) ABB activities:** 29 02

**2) Timing:** March 2012

**3) Budget (annual):** Included in the overall budget of the CSP 2008-2012.

**4) Background, scope and focus:** Rolling Review for Innovation and R&D Statistics is a part of the Quality Assurance Framework aimed at streamlining the existing quality control activities in Eurostat. A review was undertaken on Innovation statistics, covering both innovation surveys and R&D statistics.

The main components of the review, which were implemented between February and November 2011, were:

- User satisfaction survey.
- Partner satisfaction survey.
- Self-assessment checklist implemented by the staff of Eurostat Unit G6.

The survey aimed to identify and give recommendations for improvement which have been made available for general publication.

### **5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation :**

The results of user survey indicate that both R&D and Innovation statistics are essential tools for majority of respondents. The data are mainly used for research, policy preparation or trend analysis. The quality was considered to be quite good with respect to accuracy, coherence and relevance; however criteria, such as accessibility, completeness and comparability needed further enhancements. Self-assessment responses indicate that information seems to be rather complete concerning both the data and metadata. The R&D figures published by Eurostat are regarded as being accurate and the timeliness of dissemination considered satisfactory. There seems to be general partner satisfaction with the way the system of R&D and Innovation statistics works within the European Statistical System. Two thirds of countries think that data quality has increased as a result of the introduction of the

Regulation for R&D statistics. However, several suggestions were made for simplification of the statistics.

A total of 8 recommendations were given, with improvement of Eurostat internal processes given the highest priority.

### **6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/RR%20Innovation%20and%20RD%20Statistics%20Executive%20Summary\\_0.pdf](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/RR%20Innovation%20and%20RD%20Statistics%20Executive%20Summary_0.pdf)

## **Programme for the Modernisation of European Enterprise and Trade Statistics (MEETS)**

**1) ABB activities:** 29 02

**2) Timing:** November 2012

**3) Budget (annual):** In total, the EU budget for the 2012 work programme is set at nearly EUR 9 million, and it covers 17 annual actions, plus the necessary technical and administrative support to implement the programme.

**4) Background, scope and focus:**

The report provides an overview of the progress made by the Member States and the Commission (Eurostat) in implementing the activities under the MEETS Programme during 2012.

4 main objectives have been identified which resulted in a number of MEETS actions being integrated:

- Objective 1: To review priorities and develop target sets of indicators for new areas.
- Objective 2: To achieve a streamlined framework of business-related statistics.
- Objective 3: To support the implementation of a more efficient method of producing enterprise and trade statistics.
- Objective 4: To modernise Intrastat.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation:**

The activities started in 2009 and early 2010, have done sterling work and main pillars of the MEETS programme (consistency of legal acts, data warehouse and data linking initiatives) are now well on track. Whereas in 2011 they were still dealing with preparatory work, in 2012 they have already started to produce practical results. In addition, financing through individual grants has continued, mainly to accompany progress in methodology and test recommendations, but also to develop the tools to make extraction, transmission and processing of data more efficient. A number of results are already available, but most actions are still on-going.

**6) Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/MEETS\\_0.pdf](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/MEETS_0.pdf)

**Evaluation of 5 TEN-E completed projects of European interest**

**1) ABB activities concerned:** 32 03

**2) Timing:** April 2012, (Period covered by the report: 2007-2012)

**3) Budget:** The TEN-E budget for the period 2007-2013 is EUR 150 million.

**4) Background, scope and focus**

The evaluation was conducted in the context Article 8.5 of the Decision No 1364/2006/EC of the EP and Council laying down guidelines for TEN-E. It stipulates that evaluation should be carried out five years after the completion of projects of European Interest. The evaluation was conducted for 5 projects.

The aim the evaluation was to assess the socio-economic impact, the impact on environment, the impact on trade between Member States and the impact on territorial cohesion.

**5) Summary of findings and conclusions of the evaluation or evaluation related study**

– *key issues of EU value added, effectiveness and efficiency;*

The 5 TEN-E completed projects provided 2 electricity interconnections (Finland-Estonia, France-Belgium and reinforcement), reinforcement of the electricity internal grid in Denmark and Italy and one submarine gas pipeline (Greenstream) between Libya and Italy. Projects were completed during the 2003-2006.

The implementation of these projects was successful as it increased energy capacities between regions in Europe, contributed to integrate energy markets within the EU and allowed for transportation of energy from locations with low cost production to the locations of the consumers. Such integration activities generally contribute to more competitive wholesale and retail pricing of energy, which has the potential of decreasing overall energy costs.

Regarding effectiveness, the evaluation showed that overall the 5 projects have been successful, although there are some variations between the projects. The success is mainly related to the increased potential of exchanging energy between regions in Europe, with planned addition to capacity being attained in all projects. Exchange of energy is a cornerstone of a single European energy market, as it allows for transportation of energy from locations with low cost production (gas/power) to the locations of the consumers (load centres). This creates more competitive wholesale and retail pricing of energy, which encourages effective production of energy and lower prices for consumers.

Significant problems or obstacles in the construction phase have only been encountered in the building of overhead power lines, due to their land use interference and visibility, and to the relative sensitivity of the topic of electromagnetic fields. This often affects the authorisation processes considerably where some starting dates were significantly behind schedule.

Regarding efficiency, documentation prove that the interconnector between Finland and Estonia, Estlink 1 and the Libya-Italy submarine gas pipeline, Greenstream have created very high benefits from day one of implementation. It had high capacity factors, i.e. the full physical capacity of the lines were used more than 65% of the time. While the utilisation of

the Avelin-Avelgem, Vester Hassing-Trige and S. Fiorano – Nave – Gorlago has so far remained more modest, the utilisation is expected to increase in the near future as higher shares of intermittent (more volatile renewable electricity (RES-e) will lead to more demand for capacity also for these lines. Another benefit associated with the projects is that the strategic security of supply has indisputably increased within the Baltic area, as electricity now can be sourced from other regions than the region east to Baltic states (through Estlink1), and since the supply of gas to the European region (Italy) now stems from a new source of production (through Greenstream).

– *information contributing to modifications in the management of the programmes which could contribute to improve their final impacts;*

– The evaluation recognised that reporting on the implementation of projects was rather limited, given that every two years the Commission in close collaboration with the Member States has to present a report. The Commission proposed a new legislation on Energy Infrastructure to be formally adopted by April 2013 (entry into force foreseen by June 2013) where the present TEN-E guidelines will be completely revised. This will widely address the reporting activities on projects in much more developed way than the current TEN-E Guidelines.

– *examples of evaluation results having contributed to the design of the successor measures or influenced policy making;*

Permit granting has been assessed as one of the major element to delay development of infrastructure projects and this is fully addressed in the new legislation on Energy Infrastructure.

– *any limitations, constraints and difficulties (e.g. early timing of the evaluation, lack of data, reliance on information from MS) that prevent drawing conclusions on the issues above.*

The assessment of the five TEN-E completed projects demonstrated that access to information from project promoters (mainly private companies) five years after their completion was a challenging exercise. A complete picture of the project from the study to implementation phases would require the availability of data across 15 years.

## **6) Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/energy/evaluations/doc/2012\\_ten\\_e\\_projects\\_final\\_report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/energy/evaluations/doc/2012_ten_e_projects_final_report.pdf)

**SECTION 3: REFERENCES TO REPORTING ON PERFORMANCE IN THE ANNUAL ACTIVITY  
REPORTS 2012**

- The AAR 2012 (PART 1): [http://ec.europa.eu/atwork/synthesis/aar/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/atwork/synthesis/aar/index_en.htm)