



Brussels, 21.11.2012  
SWD(2012) 383 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(2012) 675 final}

SECTION 1: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATIONS COMPLETED IN 2011 .....	3
SECTION 2: RETROSPECTIVE EVALUATIONS .....	25
01 – Economic and Financial Affairs .....	26
02 – Enterprise .....	30
04 – Employment and social affairs.....	38
05 – Agriculture and Rural Development.....	50
06 – Mobility and Transport .....	61
07 – Environment.....	68
08 – Research.....	70
09 – Information Society and Media .....	87
11 – Maritime Affairs and Fisheries .....	90
12 – Internal Market.....	90
13 – Regional Policy.....	90
14 – Taxation and Customs Union.....	90
15 – Education and Culture.....	90
16 – Communication.....	90
17 – Health and Consumer Protection .....	90
18 – Home affairs.....	90
19 – External Relations.....	90
20 – Trade .....	90
21 – Development and Relations with African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States .....	90
22 – Enlargement .....	90
23 – Humanitarian Aid.....	90
26 – Commission's administration .....	90
29 – Statistics .....	90
32 – Energy .....	90
33 – Justice.....	90
SECTION 3: PROSPECTIVE EVALUATIONS .....	90
04 – Employment and social affairs.....	90
08 – Research.....	90
11 – Maritime Affairs and Fisheries .....	90
16 – Communication.....	90
20 – Trade .....	90
22 – Enlargement .....	90
32 – Energy .....	90
SECTION 4: REFERENCES TO REPORTING ON PERFORMANCE IN THE ACTIVITY STATEMENTS (AS) TO THE DRAFT BUDGET 2013 .....	90

## **SECTION 1: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATIONS COMPLETED IN 2011**

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

The different types of studies are indicated as follows: retrospective evaluations are in plain script, prospective evaluations are indicated by italic script and evaluation-related studies are flagged by an asterisk.

Of all evaluations, 62% concerned expenditure programmes; 14% covered regulatory activities, linked to regulations, directives, regulatory policy communications and 'soft law'; 13% concerned communication, information and coordination activities; 3% internal administrative processes of the EU Institutions with the remaining 8% in other categories.

01 – Economic and Financial Affairs		
ABB-ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
01 02	Economic and monetary union	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the Joint Harmonised EU Programme of Business and Consumer Surveys</a></li> </ul>
01 03	International economic and financial affairs	
01 04	Financial operations and instruments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Ex-post evaluation of the Euratom Loan Facility</a></li> </ul>

02 – Enterprise		
ABB-ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
02 02	Competitiveness, industrial policy, innovation and entrepreneurship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Final Evaluation of the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Final evaluation of the Entrepreneurship and Innovation Programme</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the Executive Agency for Competitiveness and Innovation (EACI)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Final Evaluation of the Lead Market Initiative</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Interim evaluation of Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs</a></li> </ul>
02 03	Internal market for goods and sectoral policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the Directive 2009/142/EC on appliances burning gaseous fuels</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Ex-Post Evaluation on Enhancing the Implementation of the Internal Market Legislation Relating to Motor Vehicles</a></li> </ul>
02 04	Cooperation — Space and security	
02 05	European satellite navigation programmes (EGNOS and Galileo)	

03 – Competition		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
03 03	Cartels, anti-trust and liberalisation	
03 AWBL-03	Control of State aid	
03 AWBL-04	Merger control	

04 – Employment and social affairs		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
04 02	European Social Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of ESF support to gender equality</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of ESF Support for Enhancing Access to the Labour Market and the Social Inclusion of Migrants and Ethnic Minorities</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the capacity of the ESF delivery systems to attract and support OP target groups</a></li> </ul>
04 03	Working in Europe - Social dialogue and mobility	
04 04	Employment, social solidarity and gender equality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Assessing the effectiveness and the impact of the Social OMC in preparation of the new cycle</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">European Year 2010 for combating poverty and social exclusion- Ex-post evaluation</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Support for carrying out ex-ante evaluation for the new PROGRESS Programme post-2013*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Impact of enlargement and the functioning of transitional arrangements on labour mobility within the EU*</a></li> </ul>

04 05	European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF)	
04 06	Instrument for Preaccession (IPA) - Human resources development	

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>• <a href="#">Evaluation of income effects of direct support</a> (also covered by 05 03)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of CAP measures applied to the sugar sector</a> (also covered by 05 03)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of CAP measures applied to the dairy sector</a> (also covered by 05 03)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of CAP measures applied to the sheep and goat sector</a> (also covered by 05 03)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of promotion and information actions for products</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the exceptional market support measures in the poultry and egg sector</a></li> </ul>
05 03	Direct aids	
05 04	Rural development	
05 05	Pre-accession measures in the field of agriculture and rural development	
05 06	International aspects of "Agriculture and rural development" policy area	
05 07	Audit of agricultural expenditure	

05 08	Policy strategy and coordination of "Agriculture and Rural Development" policy area	
-------	---	--

06 – Mobility and Transport		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
06 02	Inland, air and maritime transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of Regulation 881/2004 establishing the European Railway Agency</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the Marco Polo Programme</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Ex post evaluation on EU Passenger Ship Safety Legislation</a></li> </ul>
06 03	Trans-European networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Mid-term evaluation of TEN-T programme</a></li> </ul>
06 06	Research related to transport	

07 – Environment		
ABB ACTIVITY		EVALUATION PROJECTS
N°	HEADING	
07 02	Global environmental and Climate Action affairs	
07 03	Development and implementation of Union environmental policy and legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Mid-term Evaluation of the Sustainable Consumption and Production and Sustainable Industrial Policy Action Plan</a></li> </ul>
07 12	Implementation of Union policy and legislation on climate action	

07 13	Climate mainstreaming and innovation	
-------	--------------------------------------	--

08 – Research		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
08 02	Cooperation — Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Interim Evaluation of the Innovative Medicines Initiative Joint Undertaking</a></li> </ul>
08 03	Cooperation — Food, agriculture and fisheries, and biotechnology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Meta-analysis of "Bio-Technology", "Agriculture", "Food", "Marine and Maritime", and Horizontal themes</a></li> </ul>
08 04	Cooperation — Nanosciences, nanotechnologies, materials and new production technologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Interim Assessment of the Research Public Private Partnerships in the European Economic Recovery Plan: Energy-efficient Buildings, Factories of the Future, and European Green Cars Initiative</a></li> </ul>
08 05	Cooperation — Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">First Interim Evaluation of the Fuel Cells and Hydrogen Joint Undertaking (FCH JU)</a></li> </ul>
08 06	Cooperation — Environment (including climate change)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Stock-Taking of Results and Impacts of EU-Funded Environmental Research*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">State of the Art and Forward-Looking Analysis of Environmental Research and Innovation*</a></li> </ul>
08 07	Cooperation — Transport (including aeronautics)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Interim Evaluation of EU FP7 Transport Research, notably within Theme 7 of the Cooperation Programme "Transport (including Aeronautics)"</a></li> </ul>
08 08	Cooperation — Socioeconomic sciences and the humanities	
08 09	Cooperation — Risk-sharing finance facility (RSFF)	
08 10	Ideas	
08 12	Capacities — Research infrastructures	



08 13	Capacities — Research for the benefit of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)	
08 14	Capacities — Regions of knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Impact Assessment of the Regions of Knowledge Programme</a></li> </ul>
08 15	Capacities — Research potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Impact Assessment of the Research Potential Programme</a></li> </ul>
08 16	Capacities — Science in society	
08 17	Capacities — International cooperation activities	
08 18	Capacities — Risk- sharing finance facility (RSFF)	
08 19	Capacities — Support for coherent development of research policies	
08 20	Euratom — Fusion energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Fusion Energy – State of Development and Future Role*</a></li> </ul>
08 21	Euratom — Nuclear fission and radiation protection	
08 22	Completion of previous framework programmes and other activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Ex Post Evaluation of NMP FP6 - Project Level</a></li> </ul>
08 23	Research programme of the research fund for coal and steel	
08 AWBL 02	Policy strategy and coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Assessing the Effectiveness of Simplification Measures under FP7*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Long-Term Impact of the Framework Programmes*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Review of S&amp;T Cooperation between the European Union and the Republic of Argentina (2006-2010)*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Review of S&amp;T Cooperation between the European Union and the Republic of Chile (2007-2011)*</a></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>• <a href="#">Safer Internet Evaluation</a></li> </ul>
09 03	Information and communication technologies take-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">CIP ICT PSP Final (Second Interim) Evaluation</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">eContent Plus Final Evaluation</a></li> </ul>
09 04	Cooperation - Information and communication technologies (ICTs)	
09 05	Capacities — Research infrastructures	

10 – Direct Research		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
10 02	Directly financed research operational appropriations — Seventh framework programme (2007 to 2013) — EU	
10 03	Directly financed research operational appropriations — Seventh framework programme (2007 to 2011 and 2012 to 2013) — Euratom	
10 04	Completion of previous framework programmes and other activities	

10 05	Historical liabilities resulting from nuclear activities carried out by the Joint Research Centre pursuant to the Euratom Treaty	
-------	--	--

11 – Maritime Affairs and Fisheries		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
11 02	Fisheries markets	
11 03	International fisheries and law of the sea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Mission d'évaluation à mi-parcours du Plan Régional de Surveillance des Pêches dans le Sud-Ouest de l'Océan Indien</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>An ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the European Union and Madagascar (2007-2012)</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>An ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the European Union and Cape Verde (2007-2011)</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>An ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the European Union and Guinea Bissau (2007-2011)</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>An ex-ante evaluation for the conclusion of a new Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) and Protocol between the European Union and Mauritius</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>An ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the European Union and Mauritania, and an ex-ante evaluation and analysis of impacts of a potential future Protocol on sustainability</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>An ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the European Union and Gabon, and an ex-ante evaluation and analysis of impacts of a potential future Protocol on sustainability</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>An ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the European Union and Mozambique (2007-2011)</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>An ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the European Union and Greenland</u></a></li> </ul>

11 04	Governance of the Common Fisheries Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Interim evaluation of DG MARE external communication activities</a></li> </ul>
11 06	European Fisheries Fund (EFF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Interim evaluation (study) of the European Fisheries Fund (2007-2013)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Interim evaluation of the European Fisheries Fund (2007-2013) (Synthesis of the 26 national evaluation reports)</a></li> </ul>
11 07	Conservation, management and exploitation of living aquatic resources	
11 08	Control and enforcement of the Common Fisheries Policy	
11 09	Maritime policy	

12 – Internal Market		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
12 02	Single Market Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the Professional Qualifications Directive</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Impact and Effectiveness of EU Public Procurement Legislation</a></li> </ul>
12 04	Free movement of capital, company law and corporate governance	

13 – Regional Policy		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
13 03	European Regional Development Fund and other regional operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Enterprise support: support to SMEs and large enterprises in Italy, including a comparison of grants and other financial instruments*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Data-Linking and Impact Evaluation in Northern Ireland*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Study on the contribution of local development in delivering interventions co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) in the periods 2000-06 and 2007-13*</a></li> </ul>

13 04	Cohesion Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Policy analysis on the performance of cohesion policy 2007 – 2013</a>  <a href="#">Task 1: Policy Paper on Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency of Residential Housing</a>  <a href="#">Task 2: Country reports on achievements of cohesion policy</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Counterfactual impact evaluation of cohesion policy</a>  <a href="#">Work package 2: Examples from Support to Innovation and Research</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Ex post evaluation of cohesion policy interventions 2000-2006 financed by the Cohesion Fund</a>  <a href="#">Work Package B: Cost-benefit analysis of selected transport projects</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Ex post evaluation of cohesion policy interventions 2000-2006 financed by the Cohesion Fund (including former ISPA)</a>  <a href="#">Work Package C – Cost benefit analysis of environment projects</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Ex post evaluation of cohesion policy interventions 2000-2006 financed by the Cohesion Fund (including former ISPA)</a>  <a href="#">Work Package D – Management and Implementation</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Study on the relevance and effectiveness of ERDF and Cohesion Fund support to regions with specific geographical features – islands, mountainous and sparsely populated areas*</a></li> </ul>
13 05	Pre-accession operations related to the structural policies	
13 06	Solidarity Fund	

14 – Taxation and Customs Union		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
14 02	Policy strategy and coordination for the Directorate-General for Taxation and Customs Union	
14 03	International aspects of taxation and customs	
14 04	Customs policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Mid-term Evaluation of Customs 2013</a></li> </ul>

14 05	Taxation policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Mid-term Evaluation of Fiscalis 2013</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">A retrospective evaluation of the elements of the VAT system</a></li> </ul>
-------	-----------------	--

15 – Education and Culture		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
15 02	Lifelong learning, including multilingualism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">External Evaluation of the European Institute of Innovation and Technology</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Interim Evaluation of External Cooperation Agreements in Higher Education, Training and Youth with the US and Canada</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Interim Evaluation of the Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP) 2007-2013</a></li> </ul>
15 04	Developing cultural and audiovisual cooperation in Europe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Ex-post evaluation of 2010 European Capitals of Culture and Interim evaluation of selection and monitoring procedures of ECOC 2010-2016</a></li> </ul>
15 05	Encouraging and promoting cooperation in the field of youth and sports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of Preparatory Actions and special events in the field of sport</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Youth in Action – Interim evaluation</a></li> </ul>
15 07	People — Programme for the mobility of researchers	

16 – Communication		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
16 02	Communication and the media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Interim evaluation of Euranet – The European Radio Network</a></li> </ul>
16 03	"Going Local" communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the Management Partnership's Actions within the scope of the 2008-2010 Communication Plans in Portugal</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Ex-post Evaluation of the Management Partnership concluded between the Republic of Austria and the European Commission for the period of 2008-2010</a></li> </ul>
16 04	Analysis and communication tools	
16 05	Fostering European citizenship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Ex-Ante Evaluation of the European Year of Citizens 2013</a></li> </ul>

17 – Health and Consumer Protection		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
17 02	Consumer policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the European Consumer Centres' Network (ECC-Net)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of Consumer Education, Information and Capacity building actions</a></li> </ul>
17 03	Public health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">1st interim evaluation of the Public Health Executive Agency (Executive Agency) (EAHC since July 2008)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Ex-post evaluation of the Public Health Programme (PHP) 2003-2008</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Mid-Term Evaluation of the EU Health Strategy 2008-2013</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Mid-Term Evaluation of the Health Programme (2008-2013)</a></li> </ul>

17 04	Food and feed safety, animal health, animal welfare and plant health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the EU policy on animal welfare (EUPAW)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the EU-Reference Laboratories in the field of food and feed safety and animal health and live animals</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the Community Plant Variety Right Acquis</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the EU legislative framework in the field of cultivation of GMOs under Directive 2001/18/EC and Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003, and the placing on the market of GMOs as or in products under Directive 2001/18/EC</a></li> </ul>
-------	--	--

18 – Home affairs		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
18 02	Solidarity — External borders, return, visa policy and free movement of people	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the application of Directive 2003/109/EC concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the application of Directive 2005/71/EC on a specific procedure for admitting third country nationals for the purposes of scientific research*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the Application of Directive 2004/114/EC on the conditions of admission of third country nationals for the purposes of studies, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the results achieved and on the quantitative and qualitative aspects of implementation of the European Return Fund for the period 2008-2009 (report submitted in accordance with Article 50(3)(b) of Council Decision 575/2007/EV of 23 May 2007)*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the results achieved and on the quantitative and qualitative aspects of implementation of the External Borders Fund for the period 2007-2009 (report submitted in accordance with Article 52(3)(b) of Council Decision 574/2007/EV of 23 May 2007)*</a></li> </ul>



18 03	Migration flows - Common immigration and asylum policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the results achieved and on qualitative and quantitative aspects of implementation of the European Refugee Fund for the period 2005-2007 (COM(2011)2)*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">External Evaluation of the European Migration Network</a></li> </ul>
18 05	Security and safeguarding liberties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Mid-term evaluation of the Framework Programme “Security and Safeguarding Liberties (2007-2013) (SSL)”</a></li> </ul>
18 08	Policy strategy and coordination	

19 – External Relations		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
19 02	Cooperation with third countries in the area of migration and asylum	
19 03	Common foreign and security policy (CFSP)	
19 04	European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR)	
19 05	Relations and cooperation with industrialised third countries	
19 06	Crisis response and global threats to security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the crisis response and preparedness components of the European Union’s Instrument for Stability (IfS)</a></li> </ul>
19 08	European Neighbourhood Policy and relations with Russia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation des opérations d'aide budgétaire de la Commission Européenne à la Tunisie entre 1996 et 2008</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation de la coopération de l'UE avec la Tunisie de 1995 à 2008</a></li> </ul>
19 09	Relations with Latin America	

19 10	Relations with Asia, Central Asia and Middle East (Iraq, Iran, Yemen)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the European Commission's co-operation with the Philippines</a></li> </ul>
19 11	Policy strategy and coordination for 'External relations' policy area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the European Commission's co-operation with overseas countries and territories</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Thematic evaluation of European Commission support to conflict prevention and peace building (CPPB)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Thematic evaluation of the EC Support in Employment and Social Inclusion sectors in partner countries 1999-2009</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Thematic evaluation of the European Commission support to Justice and Security System Reform (JSSR)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Study on legal instrument and lessons learned from the evaluations managed by the joint evaluation unit</a></li> </ul>

20 – Trade		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
20 02	Trade policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the Commission's Market Access Database (MADB)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Trade SIA relating to the negotiation of a comprehensive economic and trade agreement between the EU and Canada</a></li> </ul>

21 – Development and Relations with African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
21 02	Food security	
21 03	Non-State actors in development	

21 04	Environment and sustainable management of natural resources, including energy	
21 05	Human and social development	
21 06	Geographical cooperation with African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the European Commission's co-operation with the Dominican Republic</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the European Commission's co-operation with the Republic of Malawi</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation conjointe des opérations d'aide budgétaire au Mali entre 2003 et 2009</a></li> </ul>
21 07	Development cooperation actions and ad hoc programmes	
21 08	Policy strategy and coordination for "Development and relations with ACP States" policy area	

22 – Enlargement		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
22 02	Enlargement process and strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Interim Evaluation of Cross-Border Programmes between Candidate/Potential Candidate Countries (Intra-Western Balkan Borders) under the Cross-Border Cooperation Component of IPA; Report II – Performance of assistance</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Retrospective evaluation of EU pre-accession assistance to CBC programmes in Bulgaria and Romania</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Thematic evaluation of EU's support to civil society in the Western Balkans and Turkey</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Thematic Evaluation of IPA-Funded Information and Communication Activities</a></li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Thematic evaluation of EU pre-accession multi-beneficiary assistance to Western Balkans and Turkey in the fields of environment and disaster risk reduction</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Review of Twinning in Turkey*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of Twinning versus Technical Assistance</a></li> </ul>
22 AWBL- 03	Enlargement pre-accession negotiations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Strategic/Interim Evaluation of EU IPA Pre-Accession Assistance to Albania</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">(Ex-ante) Evaluation to support the preparation of pre-accession financial instruments beyond 2013</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Strategic/Interim Evaluation of EU IPA Pre-Accession Assistance to Kosovo* (under UNSCR 1244/1999)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Strategic/Interim evaluation of IPA pre-accession assistance to Serbia</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation on stakeholder participation in programming and implementation of pre-accession assistance to Turkey</a></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>• <a href="#">Evaluation and Strategy Orientation of DG ECHO-Funded Health Sector Activities in Burmese Refugee Camps in Thailand (2004-2009)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of DG ECHO's Actions in the Water Sanitation/Public Health Sector in Zimbabwe</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the DG ECHO action in Uganda</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Real-time evaluation of humanitarian action supported by DG ECHO in Haiti 2009-2011</a></li> </ul>
23 03	Civil Protection Financial Instrument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Commission evaluation of the Civil Protection Mechanism and the CP Financial Instrument 2007-2009</a></li> </ul>

26 – Commission's administration		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
26 01	Administrative expenditure of 'Commission's administration' policy area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of internal communication and staff engagement strategy of the European Commission</a></li> </ul>
26 02	Multimedia production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Ex-ante evaluation of the contract "Processing of public procurement notices for publication in the Supplement to the Official Journal of the European Union, hereafter OJ S"*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Ex-ante evaluation of the contract "Performance of publication services"*</a></li> </ul>
26 03	Services to public administrations, businesses and citizens	
26 AWBL - 27	Policy strategy and coordination for 'Personnel and Administration' Directorate-General	

29 – Statistics		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
29 02	Production of statistical information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the quality of fiscal data reported by Member States in 2010*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 450/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the labour cost index (LCI)*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation of Decision (EC) No 1297/2008/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on a Programme for the Modernisation of European Enterprise</a></li> </ul>

		<p><a href="#">and Trade Statistics (MEETS)*</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Rolling review of the Education Statistics*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Rolling review of the Information Society (IS) Statistics*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Rolling Review on Inland Waterways Transport Statistics*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Rolling Review - Labour Force Survey Statistics*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Rolling Review - Maritime Transport Statistics*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Rolling Review - EU National Accounts*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation of Decision No 1608/2003/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on science and technology statistics*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council concerning short-term statistics as required by Council Regulation (EC) No 1165/1998 of 19 May 1998*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation of Council Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 58/97 and of the Regulation (EC) No 295/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning structural business statistics (recast) which repealed and replaced Regulation No 58/97*</a></li> </ul>
--	--	---

31 – Language Services		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
31 AWBL - 02	Interpreting and linked activities	
31 AWBL - 03	Logistic assistance for Commission events (LACE)	
31 AWBL - 04	Conference organisation and advice	

31 AW BL- 11	Translations	
-----------------------	--------------	--

32 – Energy		
ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
32 03	Trans-European networks	
32 04	Conventional and renewable energies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Mid-term evaluation on the European Energy Programme for Recovery (EERP)</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Mid-term evaluation on horizontal issues concerning energy savings in the EU</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Report of the Mid-term Evaluation on the Background study for energy supply side efficiency framework</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Report on the final evaluation of the Intelligent Energy Europe II</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Report on Ex-ante Evaluation/impact assessment of a possible successor to the intelligent Energy II Programme</u></a></li> </ul>
32 05	Nuclear energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Ex-Ante Evaluation preparing a Euratom Council Regulation on Union support for the nuclear decommissioning assistance programmes in Bulgaria, Lithuania and Slovakia</u></a></li> </ul>
32 06	Research related to energy	

### 33 – Justice

ABB ACTIVITY		TITLE OF EVALUATION
N°	HEADING	
33 02	Fundamental rights and citizenship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Report on the interim evaluation of the "DAPHNE III Programme 2007-2013"</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Report on the interim evaluation of the "Fundamental Rights and Citizenship Programme 2007-2013"</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Evaluation of the impact of the EU instruments affecting children's rights with a view to assessing the level of protection and promotion of children's rights in the EU</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Communication from the COM to the EP and the Council Consular Protection for EU citizens in third countries: state of play and way forward*</a></li> </ul>
33 03	Justice in criminal and civil matters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Report from the COM to the EP and the Council on the implementation since 2007 of the Council Framework decision of 13 June 2002 on the European arrest warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States (COM(2011) 175 final)*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Report on the interim evaluation of the specific Programme "CIVIL Justice"; (JCIV) 2007-2013</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Interim evaluation report on the Criminal Justice Programme</a></li> </ul>
33 04	Drugs prevention and information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Study for an external, independent assessment of the European Action on Drugs*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Report from the COM on the functioning of Council Decision 2005/387/JHA on the information exchange, risk assessment and control of new psychoactive substances (COM(2011) 430 final)*</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Report on the interim evaluation of the specific Programme "Drug prevention and information"; (DPIP) 2007-2013</a></li> </ul>
33 05	Policy strategy and coordination	
33 06	Equality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">The Mid-term Evaluation of PROGRESS - Final Report</a></li> </ul>



## **SECTION 2: RETROSPECTIVE EVALUATIONS**

This section provides fact sheets for 118 retrospective evaluations (i.e. interim and ex post evaluations) and 39 evaluation-related studies (e.g. focusing on monitoring or implementation), with information on their findings and conclusions.

## 01 – Economic and Financial Affairs

### Evaluation of the Joint Harmonised EU Programme of Business and Consumer Surveys

<b>ABB activities:</b>	01 02 Economic and monetary union
------------------------	-----------------------------------

<b>Timing:</b>	27/02/2012
----------------	------------

#### Background, scope and focus

ECFIN's business and consumer surveys summarise the attitudes and judgement of a large number of business managers and consumers, with harmonised and comparable results being published on a monthly basis

The emphasis of this evaluation is on improving the functioning of the BCS with a view to better meeting users' needs and to raising the efficiency of DG ECFIN's management of the Programme.

The evaluation concerns the implementation and use of the BCS in the Member States. The main evaluation issues to be covered in the exercise are the effectiveness, efficiency and utility of the instrument. In particular, the exercise should include an analysis of user needs and their appreciation of the surveys.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

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

##### Meeting users' needs and expectations

Overall, the BCS Programme is well aligned with users' needs and expectations. However, there are some issues requiring attention. These are as follows:

**Relevance:** the programme is not considered relevant by users who are specifically interested in data for Ireland (due to lack of data for the period 2008 to 2011). The relevance of some components of the programme is greatly reduced by their limited sectoral coverage (Flash Indicator is only available for the consumer sector) or non-availability of country level data (Flash Indicator and the Financial Services Survey).

**Timeliness:** a number of users expressed frustration that the BCS data are released later than the Flash PMI and the national surveys (in some cases).

**Comparability:** the two main concerns expressed by the users are (a) a relatively short time series for the Services and the Financial Services survey; and, (b) non-homogeneity of approach across partner institutes e.g. the reference period for the questions being different across countries (six months instead of three months).

**Methodology:** some methodological approaches were criticised by the users notably, the use of

DAINTES for seasonal adjustment; the practice of assigning equal weights to all questions in the construction of indices; and the phrasing of survey questions which in their present form, seek to elicit information regarding intended behaviour as opposed to the actual behaviour of economic agents.

Interpretability: users have expressed demands for more guidance on how to interpret survey questions as well as survey answers.

Transparency: BCS surveys are quite transparent in terms of the information available on DG ECFIN's website notably, comprehensive metadata by sector and country; a methodological user guide; press releases; list of partner institutes; and, contact details. However, users are often not aware of the existence of this information and, in some cases, have requested for further information.

Accessibility: a number of external users and even some internal users consider that the visibility and accessibility of the survey products could be greatly improved. Some users expressed a preference for data to be made available in alternative formats (.CSV or access database).

Frequency: some users would like the European Business Cycle Indicators (EBCI) and Investment Survey to be produced on a monthly basis, and the question on capacity utilisation to be asked on a monthly basis

#### **New needs arising from the financial and economic crisis**

The financial and economic crisis has reinforced the importance of early warning signals. Due to greater economic uncertainty and instability, there is a greater urgency to access data in a timely manner. For many users, the crisis has shifted emphasis from EU or Euro-area level to a country level analysis.

#### **Assessment of EU added value of the programme**

The main added value of the programme is that it generates harmonized data which enables cross-country comparisons and the construction of EU/ Euro-area indicators. Furthermore, the programme promotes capacity building and knowledge sharing among partner institutes.

#### **Comparison with alternative survey products notably, the PMI**

The relative strengths of BCS products as compared to the PMI are: its wider sectoral and geographical coverage; availability of data for sub-sectors; longer time series; larger sample sizes; and, methodological transparency.

#### **The scope for cost savings**

The evaluation did not find any compelling reasons for discontinuing survey products that are less used. On the other hand, there is a case to be made for improving the usability of the surveys that are relatively less used by improving their visibility, expanding their coverage and/or improving the survey questionnaires.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/evaluation/completed/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/evaluation/completed/index_en.htm)

## Ex-post evaluation of the Euratom Loan Facility

**ABB activities:**

01 04 Financial operations and instruments

**Timing:**

13/06/2011

### Background, scope and focus

The Facility was created by Council Decision 77/270/Euratom of 29 March 1977 and Council Decision 94/179/Euratom of 21 March 1994 extended the Facility to some non-member countries.

Considering the current policy context of the drive to develop low carbon technologies, the fight against climate change and the EU2020 targets, it is considered opportune to evaluate whether the scope, objectives and the limits fixed by the current Council Decisions remain appropriate and effective.

The scope of the evaluation concerns mainly: The relevance and EU added value of the Facility; The functioning of the Facility; The assessment of the parameters of the Facility;

The main criteria for the evaluation of the Facility are the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and coherence of the instrument so as to fulfil its legal and institutional mandate.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

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

- The underlying intervention logic of the Euratom Loan Facility remains valid in the context of the EU's increasing dependence on energy imports; high and volatile oil prices; projected growth in electricity consumption within the EU; and, the need to cut greenhouse gas emissions to mitigate the impact of climate change.
- The overall objectives of the Euratom Loan Facility are strongly aligned with the EU's policy objectives relating to secure and affordable energy supply; climate change; job creation and economic growth; and, promotion of nuclear safety and security in third countries.
- The Euratom Loan Facility has promoted and accelerated the development of the EU's nuclear energy sector through direct financing of economically viable and environment friendly projects. It is estimated that Euratom loans co-financed 21 per cent of the total investment in new builds in the EU over the period 1977 to 2003.
- By enabling investment in the nuclear sector, the Euratom Loan Facility has contributed to the decarbonisation and diversification of the EU's sources of energy supply.
- A majority of the plants co-financed by Euratom loans are still in operation, generating 114,142 GWh of low carbon electricity annually (representing circa 6 per cent of the EU's gross

electricity generation and 12 per cent of nuclear electricity generation).

In the absence of this indigenous production capacity, the EU would be importing an additional 10Mtoe of energy on an annual basis. Secondary benefits of the Facility include the creation of 6,000 highly skilled jobs at the plants under operation plus jobs and output creation in the wider economy through backward and forward linkages.

– The expansion of the geographic scope of the Euratom Facility in 1994 to CEEC and CIS was relevant and appropriate. Loans approved under the 1994 Decision directly contributed to safety enhancements and promoted greater transparency of nuclear operations in Bulgaria, Romania and Ukraine. Safety improvements financed by Euratom loans have helped bring the nuclear installations in these countries in line with internationally recognised nuclear safety principles and standards. Euratom lending was also crucial in achieving wider reform in these countries such as the creation and funding of decommissioning funds; reform of electricity tariffs; and, increase in the scale of nuclear insurance.

– The Facility has an important ‘signalling’ effect i.e. an EU endorsement of the project which provides a positive message to the market, Governments and the public about the project’s economic and technological viability; and, a ‘catalytic’ effect i.e. Euratom lending helps leverage financing from other sources.

– The Euratom Loan Facility provides loans on attractive terms to borrowers. The European Commission operates on a non-profit basis and passes on the benefits of its AAA/Aaa rating to its borrowers. The difference between the cost of capital raised on the market and the cost of the Euratom loan represents the financial added value of the Facility in the case of each project.

– As regards the financing needs of the nuclear sector, the evaluation identifies a financing gap for new builds and large scale infrastructure for demonstration of next generation technologies. Additional, exceptional financing needs (as yet hard to quantify) might also arise from safety improvements/ upgrades required as a result of the EU ‘stress tests’.

– The amount available for new loans within the current ceiling is EUR 626 million. The present resources and borrowing ceilings for the Facility would not be adequate to meet the expected future demand for loans.

– The financial management and implementation arrangements for the Euratom Loan Facility have worked extremely well and there is evidence of them being effective: all loans within the EU have been fully repaid; there has been no recourse to the EU budget guarantee during the lifetime of the Facility; and, the Euratom Loan Facility has delivered its stated objectives.

– However, some operational aspects of the Facility could be improved. There is scope to enhance the visibility of the Facility and the processes relating to the procurement of external expertise could be streamlined.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/evaluation/completed/index\\_en.htm#loan\\_facility](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/evaluation/completed/index_en.htm#loan_facility)

## 02 – Enterprise

### Final Evaluation of the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme

**ABB activities:**

02 02 Competitiveness, industrial policy, innovation and entrepreneurship

**Timing:**

December 2011

#### Background, scope and focus

The Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP) aims to foster the competitiveness of enterprises, in particular of SMEs; to promote innovation, including eco-innovation; to develop a sustainable, competitive, innovative and inclusive information society and to promote energy efficiency and renewable energy. The CIP was established by Decision No 1639/2006/EC which included specific provisions relating to the evaluation of the Programme. The final evaluation of the CIP provided an overall assessment of the CIP by analysing the existing evaluations of each of the three component programmes (EIP, ICT-PSP and IEE), with a special emphasis on tracing cross-cutting issues and themes.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

The evaluation concludes that the framework programme as a whole and its specific programmes individually are all performing well, in line with expectations at the launch of the programme. The CIP has become a major vehicle for promoting innovation. Innovation in this case is viewed as a relatively open process going beyond the simple focus on technological development. It is a broader activity that encompasses developments in the service sector as much as in manufacturing and relates to processes and business models as much as products, which in turn makes a major contribution to the competitiveness of the European economy.

The evaluation reports that major measures such as Financial Instruments, Enterprise Europe Network, innovation and eco-innovation are on track to achieve the targets set. The evaluation also draws attention to small budget items which are far from negligible in their effects. For example, the action programme for reducing administrative burdens and its follow-on measures are estimated to be delivering savings for enterprises valued at over €40 billion.

The evaluation concludes that the current economic and financial crisis has underlined the significance of many of the issues that the CIP was designed to address, while the urgency of measures to meet the 2020 climate targets continues to increase.

The utility of the CIP is thus higher than ever, especially since, notwithstanding the scope for

further improvements, the effectiveness of the instruments used has increased over time. The results of the evaluation were presented to the CIP joint committee meeting as well as at the expert workshop on the effectiveness of the CIP which was organised by the Policy Department of the European Parliament.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/cip\\_final\\_report\\_cses\\_300112\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/cip_final_report_cses_300112_en.pdf)

### **Final evaluation of the Entrepreneurship and Innovation Programme**

#### **ABB activities:**

02 02 Competitiveness, industrial policy, innovation and entrepreneurship

#### **Timing:**

April 2011

#### **Background, scope and focus**

The Entrepreneurship and Innovation Programme (EIP) aims to support entrepreneurship and innovation and to promote the development and growth of SMEs across the EU. The programme (2007-2013) was established as one of the three 'pillars' of the CIP by Decision No 1639/2006/EC which included specific provisions relating to the evaluation of the Programme. The final evaluation of the Programme was designed to address the relevance, coherence and synergies, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and utility of the EIP, and where possible the distribution of funding with regard to sectors.

#### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The final evaluation of the EIP concluded that the programme is on track to achieve the anticipated impacts. It is effectively benefitting end-users, in particular SMEs, and its major strength is that it is able to concentrate on core issues for SMEs in a direct and practical way. The measures under the EIP, notably the financial instruments and eco-innovation, have effectively created conditions for real replication in the market. The eco-innovation first application and market replication funding scheme is successfully addressing an important market failure in the implementation of new ideas and approaches in products and services that

benefit the environment. Innovation actions, with their focus on clusters, innovation in services and eco-innovation, are regarded as successful and appropriate, especially by those who have participated in them. The actions have been characterised by easier procedures and shorter time to contract than comparable award and management processes in the research and development area. The Enterprise Europe Network is a major policy asset for the EU's relationship with enterprises. It has considerable further potential in terms of the engagement of SMEs, with its integration into the business support system across Europe, and the strength of the personal links between its members. Financial Instruments are achieving their objectives of facilitating access to finance for the start-up and growth of SMEs. The GIF facility and SMEG loan and micro credit windows are relevant to the needs of European SMEs; they fulfil a demand for finance which otherwise would not have been met. The findings and recommendations of this evaluation have guided the preparation of the follow-up programmes, COSME and Horizon 2020.

### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/110426\\_final\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/110426_final_report_en.pdf)

## Evaluation of the Executive Agency for Competitiveness and Innovation (EACI)

<b>ABB activities:</b>	02 02 Competitiveness, industrial policy, innovation and entrepreneurship
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	May 2011
----------------	----------

### Background, scope and focus

Art. 25 under Council Regulation (EC) No 58/2003 requires an external evaluation of executive agencies on a three year basis. This evaluation covers the second three years of operation of EACI, between 1 July 2008 and 31 December 2010 focusing on the implementation of the Intelligent Energy Europe Programmes (IEE I and IEE II) as well as part of the Entrepreneurship and Innovation Programme (EIP) in particular the Enterprise Europe Network, Eco-innovation and IPeuropeAware initiative and Marco Polo I and II programmes. The purpose of this evaluation was to examine how the EACI has handled specific project management tasks (project application and award procedures, monitoring, financial aspects, etc.).

### Summary of findings and conclusions



The evaluation confirmed that, overall, the EACI is performing well and is an efficient and effective delivery mechanism for the initiatives for which it has operational responsibility. The main recommendations addressed improvements needed to the EACI staff retention rate; the short average period of staff remaining at the Agency and the relatively high costs arising from the staff turnover rate, should be avoided in order to increase operational effectiveness. It may be necessary to tackle this issue jointly with other Executive Agencies as it could involve changes in current regulations. The evaluation also recommended further IT improvements throughout the Agency's systems to enhance its performance. This was judged as particularly necessary in the case of the Enterprise Europe Network where an effective, reliable IT backbone for delivery of services and support for administrative functions is needed. Finally, the evaluation called for further development of the operational indicators used by the EACI: in order to provide on-going updates and feedback on the effectiveness of programmes and initiatives, the EACI should develop operational indicators, in collaboration with parent DGs, rather than doing so at longer intervals of 2-3 years.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/110512\\_evaluation\\_eaci\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/110512_evaluation_eaci_en.pdf)

### Final Evaluation of the Lead Market Initiative

<b>ABB activities:</b>	02 02 Competitiveness, industrial policy, innovation and entrepreneurship
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	July 2011
----------------	-----------

#### Background, scope and focus

The Lead Market Initiative (LMI) aims to promote greater innovation in Europe and is now a central feature of Europe 2020. It promotes the development of 6 specific lead markets: bio-based products, eHealth, protective textiles, sustainable construction, recycling and renewable energies (corresponding action plans operational for 3-5 years). The Commission Communication that launched LMI envisaged that a final evaluation report on the first cycle of the LMI would be presented in 2011. The purpose of this evaluation is to prepare the report.

## Summary of findings and conclusions

The evaluation report of the first cycle of the LMI concludes that the major strength of the initiative was targeting interrelated policy areas for promising markets that would not be picked up by other policy frameworks. LMI has promoted the use of demand-side policy tools (e.g. public procurement, standardisation, regulation and complementary actions) as an important new element in innovation policy. The six markets initially chosen as targets continue to show a marked potential for further growth. In four sectors (i.e. bio-based products, e-Health, protective textiles, and sustainable construction) the LMI has showed clearly that co-ordinated demand-side initiatives at European level are valuable instruments for promoting market uptake of innovative products. It is important that there should be follow-up to the results achieved under the Action Plans. In particular the full impact of the work of the procurement networks will only be felt if there is effective dissemination and take-up of the initial results.

## Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/final-eval-lmi\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/final-eval-lmi_en.pdf)

## Interim evaluation of Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs

### ABB activities:

02 02 Competitiveness, industrial policy, innovation and entrepreneurship

### Timing:

May 2011

## Background, scope and focus

Under Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs, new entrepreneurs can acquire the skills necessary to manage an enterprise by working with an experienced entrepreneur in another EU member State for between 1 to 6 months. The rationale for the Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs is provided by the Small Business Act for Europe. The objective of the interim evaluation of Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs was to evaluate the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the actions implemented in the framework of the Pilot Project and the Preparatory Action.

## Summary of findings and conclusions

The evaluation showed that there is a strong rationale for the Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs scheme. There is positive feedback from new entrepreneurs on the contribution of stays to their business ideas. The mobility scheme is likely to increase the quality of start-ups, SME innovation as well as the SMEs' internationalisation. The research suggests it has the potential to help create a significant number of jobs if it is expanded. Some shortcomings (e.g. a backlog of unmatched new and host entrepreneurs) are due to teething problems rather than to fundamental design faults. The evaluation gave a number of recommendations how to tackle these issues and improve the scheme.

The participation in the programme has been intensifying since last year. Whereas it took 16 months to organise 400 exchanges in 2010, the last 400 exchanges have been organised in 11 months. This partially results from the implementation of evaluation recommendations in relation to the IT matching tool, the increased management of the "dormant" entrepreneurs' applications, the increased number of available host entrepreneurs in countries in high demand and the better EU coverage of the network of Erasmus for Entrepreneurs local contact points.

## Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/eye\\_final\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/eye_final_report_en.pdf)

## Evaluation of the Directive 2009/142/EC on appliances burning gaseous fuels

<b>ABB activities:</b>	02 03 Internal market for goods and sectoral policies
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	March 2011
----------------	------------

## Background, scope and focus

Directive 2009/142/EC on Appliances Burning Gaseous Fuels (GAD) came into force on 1 January 1996 and aims to promote free circulation of gas appliances within the internal market and achieve a high standard of consumer protection. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess its relevance, utility, effectiveness and efficiency in order to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Directive and assess the potential for its future improvement.

## Summary of findings and conclusions

The evaluation concluded on the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation and functioning of the gas appliance directive in meeting its main objectives of ensuring free movement of products and protecting against risks to safety and health. The issues identified relate to necessary clarifications and technical updates of its current provisions and to the scope of the directive. These issues are being further analysed in the context of the alignment of the directive with the new legislative framework, scheduled for 2013: a public consultation took place between December 2011 and March 2012, and an impact assessment study is being carried-out (due to be completed in September 2012).

## Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/03\\_2011\\_finalreport\\_gas\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/03_2011_finalreport_gas_en.pdf)

## Ex-Post Evaluation on Enhancing the Implementation of the Internal Market Legislation Relating to Motor Vehicles

<b>ABB activities:</b>	02 03 Internal market for goods and sectoral policies
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	June 2011
----------------	-----------

## Background, scope and focus

Directive 2007/46/EC establishes a framework for the approval of motor vehicles and their trailers, and of systems, components and separate technical units intended for such vehicles. The Directive was subject to a combined ex-post evaluation and impact assessment study aiming at supporting the preparation of a new legislative proposal for the directive. The process was in line with the new requirement in the Commission's Working Methods (reiterated in the Smart Regulation Communication of October 2010) to base all significant proposals for a revision or a new legislative measure on an evaluation of policy framework already in place.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The evaluation concluded that the Directive has proven its relevance, although the scope may not be sufficient to address future market changes. Additionally, there are still problems with unsafe and/or non-compliant automotive products being placed on the EU market. Finally, the effectiveness of Directive 2007/46/EC relies significantly on the quality and performance of technical services and also on the ability to ensure conformity of production. Actions which undermine the effectiveness of technical services (such as type approval hopping) also undermine the Directive's effectiveness. Therefore, the revision of the directive should consider proposing specific measures to address the stated problems.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/report\\_internal\\_market\\_legislation\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/dg/files/evaluation/report_internal_market_legislation_en.pdf)

## 04 – Employment and social affairs

### Assessing the effectiveness and the impact of the Social OMC in preparation of the new cycle

<b>ABB activities:</b>	04 04 Employment, social solidarity and gender equality
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	May 2011
----------------	----------

#### Background, scope and focus

This is the first comprehensive, external evaluation of the Social OMC, with a twofold purpose:

1. To develop a reference methodology for evaluation of the effectiveness and the impact of the Social OMC which can be used by the SPC and the European Commission and
2. To apply this methodology in an assessment of the Social OMC 2006-2010 which can inform decisions about its role and shape after 2010.

The evaluation was carried out by a consortium led by PPMI, in association with AEIDL, the Austrian Institute for SME research, CSES and Tarki social research institute, between November 2009 and May 2011.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

The first part of the evaluation provided an overview of existing evaluation methodology and results since the start of the OMC's in the social field around 2000, and included the development of a draft framework of analysis. The second part applied this framework of analysis to the evaluation of the effectiveness and impact of the social OMC since 2006 (till 2009). Effectiveness is defined as the extent to which the complex institutional mechanism of the OMC (agreeing on common objectives, regular reporting at the EU and national level, evidence-based mutual learning, monitoring of progress based on a set of commonly agreed indicators) functioned successfully; whereas impact is the extent to which the Social OMC has actually influenced policies and policy-making processes at the domestic level.

Main evaluation findings

##### **Effectiveness of the institutional framework**

- Several changes in the political environment contributed positively to the effectiveness of the social OMC: the continuous improvement of the set of common indicators, including the extension into the fields of pensions and health/long-term care after the streamlining decision in

2006; the extension of the reporting cycle (decreasing the administrative burden) and the introduction of thematic focus years (deemed as a success by most stakeholders); improvements in the format of various mutual learning processes (notably by linking them better to the preparation of the Joint Report).

– Paradoxically, the social OMC is still seen as a process by and for "insiders", with low public visibility, and limited awareness among some of the key stakeholders.

#### **Likelihood of impacts on policy decisions**

– The social OMC lacks binding targets, does not lead to compulsory recommendations and does not provide for legal sanctions in case of non-compliance.

– However, it is an important and innovative component of EU governance which accepts normative and institutional differences among Member States and provides a framework for coordination based on comparison and mutual learning. It works in combination with other frameworks of cooperation (initiated by OECD, World Bank, ILO etc.) and influences policies by drawing attention to particular issues, at a particular moment in time (such as child poverty), by offering formats for discussion, procedural templates and concepts for reflection. Very often, actors use concepts and themes with clear linkages to the social OMC (such as active ageing), but often without recognising such linkages.

#### **Substantive impacts of the social OMC**

– The cognitive and discursive impacts may lead to impacts on decisions, depending on whether they already pre-existed, were made available for mutual learning and used in the way which was politically and economically feasible in their contexts. The eleven in-depth country studies provided a wide range of examples where the social OMC has influenced policy thinking which led in turn to policy decisions (e.g. in Denmark, where it triggered the formulation of a national homelessness strategy for 2008-2011).

– Overall, the social OMC can be credited with developing a conceptual and procedural toolbox that helped the social policy actors (especially in inclusion) to assert a more balanced position with regards to policies which have been traditionally viewed as growth-oriented and thus more important (e.g. linking the struggle against poverty to the wider debate on social protection, and providing a reference point for the discourse on adequacy as well as financial sustainability of pensions).

#### **Procedural impacts of the social OMC**

– The social OMC clearly defines a concept of good governance which is a combination of a genuine involvement of all actors at all levels and across the policy spectrum and decision-making based on data and evidence which is comparable across Member States.

– The social OMC has the clearest procedural impacts on the involvement of non-state actors (in particular at the EU level) during the National Strategy Report process and on strengthening statistical capacities. The actual evidence on the success of such interaction with non-state actors is mixed, even if it had a positive influence in building their capacity. The collection, availability and usage of data has especially improved in countries with less developed national (or sub-national) structures for data collection.

– The impact on vertical co-ordination across all levels of government has been limited, as in most countries the social OMC remains very much a central government process, even if there are some countervailing examples of good practices.

– The impact on horizontal coordination was probably greater than on vertical coordination, as it was normal practice to ask non-social ministries to provide their inputs into the National Strategy Report, mostly as a formality, but in some cases providing opportunities for interaction that would otherwise not have taken place.

### **Streamlining between the three strands**

- The social inclusion strand has been the most advanced in terms of stakeholder activism and development of common indicators. During 2006-2010, the two strands (pensions and health/LT care) caught up, by developing common indicators, integrating into the mutual learning programme, creating the ASIP network and building a stronger stakeholder basis, but much still remains to be done in all these fields. There have been important developments in the pension strand during this period, while the health/LTC strand remains the weakest, not least because the policy field is institutionally more fragmented and consequently more heterogeneous.
- The policy rationale for putting together the three strands in 2006 has been contested by many policy actors, and as a result there is little evidence that streamlining has led to joined-up approaches and synergies between the three strands at domestic level.
- However, some evidence of positive effects starts to materialise, notably through the awareness of actors of the possible connections and aims of the other policies.

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

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=701&langId=en>

## **Evaluation of ESF support to gender equality**

<b>ABB activities:</b>	04 02 European Social Fund
------------------------	----------------------------

<b>Timing:</b>	January 2011
----------------	--------------

### **Background, scope and focus**

The aim of the study was to provide an assessment of the ESF's (2007-2013) support to gender-equality policy by examining the gender sensitivity of ESF programmes, on the basis of available evidence on the programming process and initial implementation. Specific findings on each Member State are presented in 27 country reports and focused thematic analysis is presented in 6 thematic reports on "Enhancing women's access to employment", "Vertical segregation", "Horizontal segregation", "Reconciliation", "Participation of women in enterprise creation and growth", "Education and training". The synthesis report highlights similarities and differences in Member States' approaches and concludes on the main ways in which the ESF intervention generates or is expected to generate European added value. The study was carried



out by consortium GHK Consulting Ltd and Fondazione G. Brodolini.

## Summary of findings and conclusions

There is undisputed European Added Value in the ESF's support to the gender equality policy, mostly acknowledged as *support for the creation of a recognized and autonomous policy space for gender equality* (e.g. the ESF has 'pushed' gender equality on the policy agenda in most Member States) and *capacity building*. For some Member States, the ESF contribution has been very important also from a budgetary point of view, as it has allowed implementing actions for which funds would otherwise not be available.

The gender equality theme has been considered by all Member States in ESF Operational Programmes but with important differences in the *level of consideration*. A comprehensive policy effort analysis (using a composite index developed specifically for this evaluation) shows unsatisfactory levels of consideration of gender issues, especially in the Member States with more severe gender gaps. The *dual approach* requirement was in practice translated into a significant decrease of gender-specific actions (comparing to the previous period) and over-dependence on gender mainstreaming, which is however not appropriately/effectively applied; alarmingly, there is not yet a common clear understanding of its theoretical underpinnings and operational implications. Member States are still not investing sufficiently to increase their internal capacity in this field. This is a serious matter of concern as the contribution of the ESF to gender equality in the current cycle will be crucially dependent on how well the gender mainstreaming principle is applied.

ESF impact in this field will also be determined by how the relatively limited resources for gender equality specific actions are focussed on critical issues. Worryingly, the actions devised remain overly geared to the supply side (e.g. helping women to access jobs) while many crucial aspects and causes of gender inequality are not sufficiently addressed (e.g. educational segregation, cultural and social stereotypes) limiting the ESF's potential to contribute to the objective of better employment for women by influencing critical issues such as the way jobs are created (which and where) and the way work is organised.

Progress of implementation has been slower for the gender equality specific actions (than for other types of actions) and in some cases resources have been diverted towards other objectives as a response to the economic crisis. This indicates a relatively weak status of the gender equality objectives which, in the absence of a formally funded priority, are easily overcome by other policy objectives or weakened by administrative difficulties.

Whilst the ESF is still able to produce added value in relation to this policy field, there are some signals of diminishing returns or steps backward. In addition to what has been mentioned above, in most Member States the ESF is reinforcing already funded strategies instead of complementing and innovating. Innovative and effective approaches previously encouraged through the ESF funded EQUAL, have been abandoned in this period (e.g. partnership among women's organizations and institutions) and this is openly regretted by stakeholders.

On the basis of these findings the evaluation addressed a number of recommendations to Member States and to the European Commission. Most of the recommendations to the European Commission have already been adopted and have influenced the Commission's proposal for the new regulations on the Structural Funds and the ESF.

## Availability of the report on Europa

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?type=0&policyArea=0&subCategory=0&country=0&year=0&advSearchKey=evaluationofesf&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en>

## Evaluation of ESF Support for Enhancing Access to the Labour Market and the Social Inclusion of Migrants and Ethnic Minorities

**ABB activities:** 04 02 European Social Fund

**Timing:** May 2011

### Background, scope and focus

The Europe2020 Strategy gives priority to ‘empowering people in inclusive societies’ and sets a headline target of increasing overall employment rates to at least 75%. This will require a substantial increase in labour participation rates and the better integration of migrants and minorities in the workforce, which is especially crucial in the context of demographic ageing. The Europe2020 target of reducing poverty and social exclusion by 25% is also pertinent for migrants and minorities, and especially the Roma, Europe’s largest minority and most disadvantaged social group.

#### The evaluation aims were:

1. Assess the European Social Fund's contribution to enhancing access to the labour market and the social inclusion of migrants and ethnic minorities;
2. Identify the most effective means of tackling barriers to the social and labour market integration of migrants and ethnic minorities;
3. Provide guidelines for the Member States on the implementation of ESF Operational Programmes (OPs) in the 2007-2013 programming period in order to target beneficiaries from these target groups more effectively;
4. Make recommendations looking ahead to the role of the ESF in promoting access to the labour market for migrants and ethnic minorities post-2013.

The evaluation scope included core ESF in the 2000-2006 and 2007-2013 programming periods respectively, and the ESF-financed EQUAL Community Initiative 2000-2006. The evaluation was carried out by the Centre for Strategy & Evaluation Services (CSES).

## Summary of findings and conclusions

EU Added Value: The ESF has addressed an important funding gap by providing resources to promote access to the labour market and the social inclusion of migrants and minorities (*'volume effects'*). The ESF has brought additional targeted funding support to these groups that would not otherwise have been available through national support. The ESF in general (and EQUAL in particular) have had important *'scope effects'* by extending coverage to wider target groups that had not previously been addressed through national programmes, or had only received limited attention.

– There is increased attention promoting the labour market and social inclusion of migrants and minorities in ESF in the 2007-2013 period compared with 2000-2006. This is reflected in higher levels of expenditure on these groups and in further attention to these groups in ESF OP strategies: Participation by migrants and minorities in ESF appears to be significantly higher in the 2007-2013 period. In total, 1.19 m people with a migrant or minority background have taken part. This equates to approximately 8.7% of all ESF beneficiaries.

– Achievements regarding ESF support to Individuals: the ESF made a positive contribution in helping people with a migrant and minority background to overcome barriers to labour market access, to improving language skills and strengthening basic skills for employability such as ICT skills, basic literacy and communication skills. Moreover, the ESF has promoted workforce adaptability for migrants through activities to strengthen their professional qualifications and in industrial areas undergoing restructuring. Migrants and minorities have been encouraged through the ESF to take the 'first steps' into further education and training through non-formal learning. ESF has also addressed an important gap in vocational training and apprenticeship provision in some EU countries for migrant youth. ESF has strengthened the recognition of qualifications from third countries. Entrepreneurship has been promoted among migrants and minorities. ESF also promoted the social inclusion of individuals with a migrant and minority background, for example, by fostering pathways to employment and promoting a reduction in the numbers of early school leavers among young people with a migrant and Roma background.

– Regarding systems and structures, the capacity of public institutions to promote the integration of people with a minority background has been strengthened as a result of both core ESF and EQUAL. Knowledge has been gained and experiences shared between public institutions and migrant and minority NGOs. The ESF has helped to improve the quality of initial integration services, such as the reception of migrants from third countries (e.g. development of online information portals about relevant services in the most common immigrant languages). The ESF has promoted the modernisation of public employment services (PES), developing intercultural competences among staff working there and increasing awareness about the specific needs of job-seekers with a migrant and minority background and how to tailor support services accordingly. Moreover, the ESF has promoted the creation of new networks and organisational structures to promote the integration of migrants and minorities, as well as the establishment of vertical coordination mechanisms to strengthen joint working on Roma inclusion between the national, regional and local levels.

– Migrants and minorities in the ESF Programme lifecycle: Through multiannual programming, the ESF has encouraged the development of a long-term approach to promoting the integration of migrants and minorities, and in tackling the multifaceted barriers to their inclusion. While the ESF strengthened the capacity of migrant and minority representative NGOs and self-organised associations to design and implement projects, their ability to take part in national programming processes was often limited. More positively, in project delivery, migrant and minority NGOs often played a key role, sometimes working to implement packages of support; The direct participation of migrants and minorities in ESF project implementation was found to be effective in reaching groups at a distance from the labour market.

The ESF has also strengthened horizontal coordination mechanisms to promote greater cooperation in Structural Funds management and implementation structures. The ESF has promoted an 'integrated approach' to the social and labour market integration of migrants and minorities that links employment with education, and housing with health. This was more evident in 2007-2013 than 2000-2006, suggesting EQUAL played a positive role in this regard. With regard to financial implementation, there do not appear to have been absorption problems in relation to ESF support to migrants and minorities in 2000-2006, although some problems were identified in 2007-2013.

Monitoring and evaluation: In 2000-2006, there was a lack of participation data on migrants and minorities. In 2007-2013, following the introduction of Annex XXIII of the Implementing Regulations, there have been improvements in data availability, however, the quality of data still varies for ethnic minorities, with evidence of under-estimates due to data protection issues and a reluctance to self-ascribe ethnicity (especially among the Roma). There was insufficient emphasis at Member State level on assessing the real achievements of ESF support to migrants and minorities. In particular, there was too great a focus on outputs and a lack of attention to results indicators.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?type=0&policyArea=0&subCategory=0&country=0&year=0&advSearchKey=evaluationsocialinclusion&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en&orderBy=docOrder>

### European Year 2010 for combating poverty and social exclusion - Ex-post evaluation

<b>ABB activities:</b>	04 04 Employment, social solidarity and gender equality
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	November 2011
----------------	---------------

#### Background, scope and focus

In recent years the European Union has organised a series of 'European Years', designed to draw attention to a particular theme of interest to people and organisations at large, as well as to policy makers and professionals. 2010 was designated the European Year Against Poverty and Social Exclusion. The goal was to raise awareness, build new partnerships, create a momentum and get a strong political commitment to fighting poverty in Europe.

An evaluation was carried out by ECORYS and assessed how the EY2010 played out and what

impacts it has had and may have in future. The research included review of background documentation and data; surveys and individual consultations as well as in-depth studies of the results of the Year in Bulgaria, Italy, Lithuania, Sweden and the UK; and attendance at events and several activities.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

The Year proved **highly relevant and topical** to a wide audience, notably as it took place against the background of persisting economic and financial crisis. This meant added impact but at the same time posed challenges in terms of communicating messages on what can sometimes be a sensitive topic. The Year complemented existing EU initiatives in the field and increased the visibility of people experiencing poverty and social inclusion. By involving NGOs, social partners and other stakeholders, the Year addressed the need to expand participation in the design and implementation of social inclusion policies. In individual countries, EY2010 funding allowed a range of small-scale activities to take place, which could not otherwise have been implemented. In most countries activities to address the needs of all the main groups at risk were organised (children, youth, women, elderly, homeless people, migrants and ethnic minorities).

In terms of the **effectiveness and impact** of the EY2010, progress was made on all four of the EY2010 objectives. At EU level in particular commitment and concrete actions featured high in the evaluator's assessment of achievements (also because of a final Declaration of the Council on the Year). Key players at national level however remain cautious about the extent to which similar commitments and concrete actions will take root, especially given current constraints on public spending. EY2010 activities in the majority of countries attracted strong participation by stakeholders, particularly NGOs and associations. At EU level too, the Year afforded valuable opportunities for stakeholders to come together, make connections and identify areas of common interest. In terms of the impact on the general public, evidence suggests that information on the Year may have reached about one tenth of Europeans through the broadcast media. One of the goals of the EY2010 was to involve actors that are not traditionally involved in social inclusion policies, and this was achieved to a certain extent at national level; perhaps less so at EU level. Notably, a number of innovative approaches were tested during the Year: using social media for communication, engaging with journalists and participatory approaches to events. Examples of policy innovation were identified in a few countries: advanced participatory approaches to policy planning, evidence-based social policy, social entrepreneurship. Links with other policy themes were made by some initiatives, notably in relation to health, justice and finance.

The Year should have **lasting effects** at national level in terms of visibility and capacity of the participating stakeholders and the development of fresh approaches to communicating and promoting social inclusion. At EU level there is cautious optimism about high-level developments in EU policy (specifically the headline targets on reducing poverty), which were helped by the momentum and interest in poverty and social exclusion created by the Year. In addition, the final Declaration of the Council represented a firm commitment of the EU and Member States to go beyond awareness-raising and give the Year 'a strong political legacy that delivers concrete results.

It took some time to set up the system at EU and national level, largely because of the decision to use administrative structures that were already accredited by the EC for managing EU funding. However, on the whole, the **management of the Year by the European Commission** was judged satisfactory by National Implementation Bodies (NIBs) and stakeholders. The Consultative Committee supporting the NIBs and the EU expert stakeholders group were considered both valuable instruments. Procedures were judged clear, although there were

requests for more guidance at an earlier stage. Cooperation between NIBs and the EY2010 task force worked satisfactorily, although for communication activities the division of tasks between EU and national levels was not always clear and smooth. Cooperation with the national correspondents of the communication contractor was satisfactory in most countries, despite some initial uncertainty on their roles. EC representations were involved and in certain countries also active in organising their own events.

Although the EY2010 is now over, it succeeded in injecting new momentum into the fight against poverty and social exclusion in Europe. As a result, those involved in the field have been energised and inspired to step up their efforts, collaborate across themes and look at new ways to tackle the challenges ahead. This mobilisation has increased the capacity of a range of key players to make a difference and a very strong policy lead from the EU has re-focused the future agenda. At an especially challenging time for the economy and society, the EY2010 opened many people's eyes to the reality of poverty and social exclusion in Europe; recognised the current and potential contributions of stakeholders and policy-makers, and reinforced the importance of listening to the voices of those experiencing poverty and social exclusion themselves. Maintaining the momentum started by the Year must now become the focus of attention.

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

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=22>

### **Evaluation of the capacity of the ESF delivery systems to attract and support OP target groups**

<b>ABB activities:</b>	04 02 European Social Fund
------------------------	----------------------------

<b>Timing:</b>	March 2011
----------------	------------

#### **Background, scope and focus**

The purpose of the evaluation was to analyse the capacity of the delivery systems put in place in the Member States to attract and support OP target groups as foreseen by the ESF Regulation Articles 2, 3 and 10 (including the target groups that are difficult to reach). The attraction and support of target groups requires a diversity of implementing bodies (IBs) and/or beneficiaries with sufficient knowledge of the needs of target groups, as well as appropriate powers and capacity.

The evaluation covered EU27 in the programming period 2007-13, elaborating 18 case studies from 14 MS. The following methods were used: desk research, interviews with Member States

representatives of ESF Managing Authorities, case studies and group discussions with stakeholders and experts. The evaluation was carried out by Eureval in consortium with Rambøll and Ecorys between December 2009 and March 2011.

## Summary of findings and conclusions

The **main findings** of the evaluation are:

1. The definition of clearly-identified, simply-defined and easily-monitored target groups within the OP, accompanied by appropriate indicators for those groups is a key factor of success.
2. Existing national or local policies for supporting target groups significantly reinforce the capacity of ESF delivery systems to reach those groups. Moreover, attracting and supporting target groups requires interventions on different levels.
3. Genuine representation of or dialogue with the target groups in the design and implementation of the OP can be a key success factor in attracting and supporting such groups.
4. Flexibility in the formal management arrangements can assist the attraction and support of target groups.
5. The attraction and support of target groups requires a diversity of IBs and/or beneficiaries with sufficient knowledge of the needs of target groups, as well as appropriate powers and capacity.
6. Some MAs have not taken sufficient steps to simplify or reduce the administrative burden, creating the risk that some small organisations or NGOs are unable to participate in an activity, but there exist ways to better adapt application and payment procedures to those organisations.

The report contains a set of **10 recommendations** and a policy proposal based on these recommendations and also taking into account the on-going policy discussion:

1. A clear statement is needed that a main objective of the ESF is to contribute to the European Employment Strategy (EES) in a strategic way. For the EES to be a strategic European document, guiding the spending of the European Social Fund will require some changes. Those changes need to keep in mind that national priorities and the link between the OP, the NSRF and the NRP are taken into account. The required changes are addressed by the following recommendations.
2. The Integrated Guidelines have a catch-all nature that makes them less appropriate for ensuring strategic contribution. It is therefore recommended that the OPs should be based on the NRP. Furthermore the ESF should contribute to specific measures of the NRP (and not to the overall priorities or objectives).
3. One of the main reasons for lack of strategic linkage was that processes around the NRP and the OP are coordinated, but in various MS only to a small extent integrated. It is therefore recommended that a country specific procedure or structure is designed for coordination and communication purposes, linking the NRP and the OP processes.
4. Member States should be encouraged to use the ESF to fund the implementation of country specific recommendations when relevant.
5. It should be assessed whether the NSRF becomes unnecessary as a strategic document for the OP if the OP is to contribute strategically to the NRP. In general it will be necessary to choose whether the OP should strategically be linked with the NSRF or the NRP.
6. and 7. The different cycles of the EES and the ESF make a strategic linkage difficult. It is

therefore recommended, that:

- The policy cycles of the NRP and the OP are synchronised;
  - The OP and the NRP are more directly linked, to avoid unnecessary bureaucracy.
8. ESF should mainly contribute to the EES through the results of activities and less through the transfer of ideas.
9. The transfer of innovative ideas from EES and ESF is especially weak when it comes to ensuring that new ideas from EES are integrated in and funded by the ESF. It can therefore be recommended that clear strategies for and systems to support a transfer of ideas are designed. Specific procedures can be designed at MS level, in order to identify ESF relevant EES ideas, transfer these to the ESF and ensure implementation with or integration into ESF activities.
10. It is quite unlikely that “bottom up” transfer of ideas and innovations from ESF to EES are easily organised and it is therefore recommended not to invest too much energy and effort into it.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?type=0&policyArea=0&subCategory=0&country=0&year=0&advSearchKey=evaluationesf&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en>

### Impact of enlargement and the functioning of transitional arrangements on labour mobility within the EU

*Evaluation related study*

<b>ABB activities:</b>	04 04 Employment, social solidarity and gender equality
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	July 2011
----------------	-----------

#### Background, scope and focus

The overall objective of the study was to firstly, assess the functioning of the transitional arrangements, the impact of enlargement and effects of workers' mobility on the economy, labour markets and social situation in the EU; secondly, prepare country-specific assessments in order to provide in-depth information on the impact of enlargement and mobility from Bulgaria and Romania; thirdly, estimate the mobility potential from the candidate and potential candidate countries.

The study was carried out by the National Institute of Economic and Social Research (NIESR).



## Summary of findings and conclusions

The main focus of this study is an assessment of the macro-economic impact on both host and home countries of the increased labour mobility that has resulted from the two recent EU enlargements. The estimates to end-2009 suggest that:

- Since the 2004 enlargement, about **1.8 per cent of the EU-8 population has moved to the EU-15**, raising the host country population by 0.3 per cent. Of this, approximately 75 per cent can be attributed to the enlargement process itself.
- Since 2007, about 4.1 per cent of the EU-2 population has moved to the EU-15, raising the host country population by a further 0.3 per cent. Of this, just over 50 per cent can be attributed to the enlargement process itself.
- The potential level of output in **Bulgaria, Romania and Lithuania** may be permanently reduced by 5-10 per cent as a result of the population shifts towards the EU-15 since 2004. **Latvia and Estonia** can also expect a permanent scar of at least 3 per cent on the potential level of output in their economies. While **remittances can partially offset the negative effects** on growth in sending countries in the short- to medium-term, they cannot fully address the loss of labour input on capacity output in the longer-term.
- The impact on GDP per capita is much smaller than the impact on total GDP, but also tends to be negative in the sending countries, especially given the age structure of migrants, who are predominantly of working age.
- As for the receiving countries, the macro-economic impact of the population shifts from the EU-8 and EU-2 to the EU-15 since 2004 is expected to be small, possibly raising the long-run level of potential output by about ½ per cent. The impact on Ireland is expected to be more significant, perhaps raising the potential level of GDP by 3 per cent in the long-run. The UK may also benefit from a rise in potential output of just over 1 per cent.
- The long-run impact on GDP per capita is expected to be negligible in the EU-15, but may be slightly positive, depending on the productive capacity of inward migrants. Outflows of remittances are expected to have only a marginal negative effect on host countries.
- There is clear evidence that the pattern of transitional restrictions in place at the beginning of the 2004 enlargement diverted mobile workers away from traditional destinations – namely Germany – and towards the more easily accessed labour markets in the UK and Ireland. However, we should not over-emphasize the magnitude of this impact, as macro-economic developments and demographics have also played a role in the location decision, and in many cases appear to have played the dominant role. Transitional restrictions may have also played a certain role for the EU-2 economies, although the rise in the unemployment rate in Spain can explain about half of the nearly 10 percentage point loss of EU-2 migrant stock share between 2006 and 2009.
- As of June 2011, workers from the EU-2 still faced some restrictions on access to labour markets in Belgium, Germany, Ireland, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Austria, the UK and Malta. The second phase of the transitional arrangements for the 2007 enlargement came to an end on 31 December 2011, at which point the governments in these countries decide on whether or not to extend the restrictions for a further two years.
- The findings suggest that, due to network effects, **transitional arrangements can have permanent effects** on the pattern of migration. This may be of particular importance in host countries where the working age share of the population is in decline. Countries that retain restrictions are expected to have a lower level of potential output in the long-run as a result.

Allowing full labour market access has not been found to have significant adverse effects on the host economy.

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

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=89&newsId=1108&furtherNews=yes>

Direct access to main report: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7120&langId=en>

Direct access to country case studies:

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7191&langId=en>

Direct access to executive summary:

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7193&langId=en>

## 05 – Agriculture and Rural Development

### Evaluation of income effects of direct support

**ABB activities:**

05 02 Interventions in agricultural markets

05 03 Direct aids

**Timing:**

May 2011

**Background, scope and focus**

The evaluation analysed the effects of the direct support schemes laid down in Council Regulation (EC) 1782/2003 (later Council Regulation (EC) 73/2009) on the income of farmers. The effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation of direct support with respect to achieving the objective of ensuring a fair standard of living for the agricultural community was also analysed, as was the coherence of direct payments with measures under the Single Market Organisation and rural development measures.

The evaluation covered the EU-27 over the period 2005-2008. The analysis distinguished between seven agricultural sectors (field crops, dairy, grazing livestock, granivores, horticulture, permanent crops, mixed farms), the choices of implementation of the direct payment schemes in different Member States/regions, different farm size classes and the types of farm organisation, and the geographical location.

**Summary of findings and conclusions**

The evaluation concluded that direct payments have contributed to enhancing the income of farmers and have played an important role in generating farm income. This is particularly true for grazing livestock farms (beef, sheep and goats), field crops, mixed farms and dairy farms.

The study underlined the role of direct payments in strengthening the cohesion between regions, in particular in the sectors of field crops, milk, grazing livestock (other than dairy farms) and mixed farms. It also showed that direct payments have contributed to reducing the existing gap between the average farm income per labour unit of small and large farms.

The evaluation indicates that direct payments have made a positive and robust contribution to the stability of the income of farmers, in particular on field crop, grazing livestock and mixed farms. The stability of farmers' income was fostered by direct payments to a larger extent on smaller farms in comparison to medium and large farms.

For the purpose of the evaluation, the regional GDP/employee was used as benchmark for a fair

standard of living of the agricultural community. The analysis showed that direct payments have helped reduce the existing gap between farmers' income and the regional GDP/employee.

The conclusions indicated that direct payments have been crucial in ensuring the economic viability of farms, in particular those specialised in field crops, grazing livestock, mixed farming and, partly, dairy farming.

The evaluation showed that in the years analysed (2004, 2006 and 2007) the efficiency of direct payments in terms of providing income support to farmers was quite high. Yet, notable differences across regions were also indicated.

The results of the statistical analysis pointed out that direct payments have been coherent with the measures under the single Common Market Organisation (CMO) and rural development measures in relation to the objective of enhancing farmers' income and also in terms of stabilising farmers' income.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/eval/reports/income/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/eval/reports/income/index_en.htm)

### **Evaluation of CAP measures applied to the sugar sector**

<b>ABB activities:</b>	05 02 Interventions in agricultural markets 05 03 Direct aids
------------------------	--

<b>Timing:</b>	December 2011
----------------	---------------

## Background, scope and focus

The evaluation examined the effects of the 2006 sugar reform (Council Regulations 318/2006<sup>1</sup>, 320/2006 and 1782/2003<sup>2</sup>) on the sugar supply chain, including the farm sector and sugar producers, refiners and isoglucose producers.

The evaluation covered the period from 2006 until the present time. The period between 2001 and 2005 served as a reference. In principle, all EU Member States were covered with a focus on six Member States that were analysed in more detail: Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Poland and UK.

## Summary of findings and conclusions

**Impacts on production and geographical distribution of the sugar beet sector.** As a direct impact of sugar quota renunciations, the average volume of beet produced in the EU-27 in 2008-10 was 19% lower than in 2003-05. After the reform the trend of improvements in yields accelerated as did the concentration of production in larger farms. These changes were different among Member States and led to a further geographical concentration of production in the beet belt<sup>3</sup>.

**Impacts on market orientation and competitiveness of sugar beet producing farmers.** Due to the reduction in the beet minimum price, the distortive effect of CAP support greatly decreased. The evaluation confirmed that farmers' production choices were more linked to the beet price level. The competitiveness of beet production improved, mainly because the reform led the least efficient growers to give up beet production.

**Impacts on sugar producers.** The sugar quota renunciations reached 5.8 million tonnes, which is almost the initially established target for the EU quota reduction. The quotas were largely reduced in Member States outside the beet belt, and sugar production was abandoned in five Member States. The reform directly contributed to a decrease of quota sugar prices as a result of the reduction of the sugar reference price. However, since the end of 2009, the EU price level remained well above the reference price because of exceptionally high world market sugar prices. The reform significantly accelerated the restructuring process of the sector with altogether 41% of the 179 factories operating in 2005/06 closing down, mostly those with low and medium capacity. The evaluation concluded that on average, the competitiveness of sugar producers improved, although this improvement was not equal among Member States.

**Impacts on isoglucose producers.** Since isoglucose is made from cereals, the reform had an indirect negative effect on its relative profitability compared to the beet sugar (due to the

<sup>1</sup> Later integrated into Council Regulation 1234/2007

<sup>2</sup> Later replaced by Council Regulation 73/2009

<sup>3</sup> EU sugar production is concentrated in regions considered the most competitive for sugar production. These are located in a zone ranging from the UK, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany to Poland, generally referred to as the "beet belt".

reduction of sugar beet minimum prices). The reform therefore increased isoglucose quotas as compensation, whilst maintaining the possibility for isoglucose producers to renounce quotas<sup>1</sup>. As a result of the reform, the isoglucose quota increased from 0.5 to 0.6 million tonnes in the EU-25. Half of the existing isoglucose production units were dismantled within the restructuring scheme. Isoglucose production is now concentrated in five Member States (instead of fifteen before the reform).

**Impacts on sugar refiners.** The removal of the strong protection, which used to benefit the traditional full-time refiners, together with the decrease in EU sugar production and the expected increase in raw sugar imports, led to an increase in the number of full-time refiners, with new refineries in Member States that had no such activity before. However, after the transitional period, supplies of raw cane sugar to the EU market decreased. Indeed, the attractiveness of the EU market for raw sugar exports depends on the price gap between the EU and other markets.

**Social aspects.** The closure of 41% of the sugar factories inevitably led to job losses. However, the evaluation underlined that a significant proportion of these jobs would have been lost even without the reform, as the restructuring was an ongoing process in the sector. The evaluation concluded that although the sugar restructuring scheme intended to limit negative social impacts, the requirements imposed by EU legislation did not go beyond national labour market legislation. Yet, the existence of restructuring aid received by the companies weighed in the negotiations between the companies and employees, in favour of the employees.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/eval/reports/sugar-2011/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/eval/reports/sugar-2011/index_en.htm)

### Evaluation of CAP measures applied to the dairy sector

<b>ABB activities:</b>	05 02 Interventions in agricultural markets
	05 03 Direct aids

<b>Timing:</b>	November 2011
----------------	---------------

#### Background, scope and focus

<sup>1</sup> In the EU-25, 0.3 million tonnes of quotas were distributed for free while 0.2 million tonnes were renounced.

The evaluation of CAP measures applied to the dairy sector covered the measures of the CMO for dairy (later integrated into the Single CMO) and direct payment schemes as far as these schemes are used by beneficiaries in the dairy sector. The evaluation addressed the effect of these measures on the prices and the production of milk and the impact on dairy farmers. It also looked further downstream on the consequences for the price of dairy products, market balance, competitiveness and industry structure. The evaluation covered the EU-27 over the period since 1 July 2004, when first cuts in intervention prices were implemented.

## **Summary of findings and conclusions**

### **1. Raw milk**

In the period evaluated, the domestic supply became less determined by quota ceilings and more responsive to milk prices, with quotas no longer being always filled for most Member States. The dairy policy contributed to a falling structural excess supply (from 2004 onwards), to a better balance of demand and supply and to a gradual convergence of the EU prices towards world market prices during 2004-2006.

In 2007-2009, the effects of the CAP measures on internal prices were masked by the price turbulence originating from the world market commodity boom. During 2007/08, which was a period of abnormally high world market prices, export refunds and intervention buying were no longer operational in the months when the world prices exceeded the intervention price levels. In 2009, on the downside of the price spike, although intervention buying-in was activated, the (average) EU-27 raw milk price fell significantly

The evaluation showed that during the time covered by the accounting data available (up till 2007) trends in dairy farm income and profitability of dairying relative to other commodity sectors, were maintained. Market orientation improved; cost-competitiveness, however, did not improve.

### **2. Milk products**

EU dairy product prices remained stable until 2006 due to export refunds and public intervention. Volatility increased after 2007 due to the commodity boom on world markets.

Generally, the EU was not competitive at world market prices. During the evaluation period, however, the price gap relative to the world market declined due to lower intervention prices for milk products (butter, SMP), and increasing world market prices.

The evaluation did not allow to draw strong conclusions with respect to the impacts of policies on the structure of the processing industry. However, it was noted that concentration and consolidation of firms increased in most Member States.

### **3. Efficiency, coherence and relevance of the policy**

Policy efficiency generally increased. The total cost of the dairy support policy declined whilst the market balance improved and producer income levels were maintained.

Overall, the evaluation found a good degree of coherence between the CAP dairy measures, rural development measures and state aids. Pillar 1, rural development and national aid measures operate at different levels and scales, giving them a complementary character.

Milk producers' concerns over income, production flexibility and expansion were met, but at the

cost of a heavier administrative burden and more exposure to price risk. Processors now also face more price and market risk.

Society benefits from increased efficiency and a greater focus on sustainability. Consumers are potential beneficiaries of lower product prices, but these benefits are conditional on the transmission of lower milk prices along the supply chain.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/market-and-income-reports/dairy-sector-2011\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/market-and-income-reports/dairy-sector-2011_en.htm)

### **Evaluation of CAP measures applied to the sheep and goat sector**

<b>ABB activities:</b>	05 02 Interventions in agricultural markets
	05 03 Direct aids

<b>Timing:</b>	November 2011
----------------	---------------

#### **Background, scope and focus**

The evaluation examined the impacts of the direct aids implemented in the framework of Council Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 and of the market measures laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 (formerly laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 2529/2001) in the sheep and goat sector.

The impacts examined concerned sheep and goat production, the supply of sheep and goat meat to the processing industry, profitability, competitiveness and market orientation, farmers' income, efficiency, relevance and coherence. The evaluation covered the period 2005-2009.

The geographical scope was the EU-27. In-depth analyses covered the main producing Member States: Spain, Italy, Greece, France, the United Kingdom, Ireland and Romania for the sheep sector, and Spain, France and Greece for the goat sector.

#### **Summary of findings and conclusions**



Sheep livestock decreased especially in the four Member States oriented exclusively or predominantly towards meat production (UK, Ireland, France and Spain). Decoupling accelerated a trend existing before the 2003 CAP reform and led to a greater reduction of livestock in economically vulnerable areas (e.g. Scottish Highlands and Islands, Epirus in Greece). The sector was negatively affected by external factors (rising fodder prices, epizootic outbreaks). The payments granted in Italy and Greece in the framework of Article 69 of Council Regulation (EC) 1782/2003 were low and, therefore, had little impact.

The milk sector was neither affected by the change in the CAP measures nor by the negative external factors which influenced the meat sector. The number of milking ewes remained stable in Italy, Greece, France, Spain, and grew in Romania.

The number of goats tended to decrease in Greece and Spain and grew in France. The drivers were not policy-related; they were linked to the market.

Meat production decreased in the evaluation period in the analysed Member States (with the exception of Romania), following the diminishing number of sheep. After the implementation of the 2003 CAP reform, the decreasing trend accelerated.

The quantity of sheep and goat milk used for processing increased during the evaluation period under the influence of market-related factors.

In the sheep meat sector, the average profitability contracted or remained stable (Ireland) in the main meat producing Member States. The reform did not prevent the profitability of sheep meat farms from deteriorating.

In the sheep milk sector, in all five Member States analysed, price competitiveness and profitability were negatively affected by increased production costs, especially for fodder.

In the goat sector, profitability improved due to milk price increases, despite the significant increase in production costs. These trends have no link to the reform.

In all Member States and sectors studied, direct aids contributed to increasing, maintaining or limiting the decline in farmers' income. In the sheep meat sector, the support offered through the rural development programmes is considered critical to maintaining the sector.

The administrative burden decreased with decoupling; however, cross-compliance increased the control workload.

Electronic identification was introduced in the sheep and goat sector in order to help prevent and/or quickly contain epizootics. However, its effects vary widely between Member States due to different conditions of implementation.

Promotional measures contributed to the improvement of the competitiveness, to increasing consumption and to a better marketing of farmers' products.

The reform did not contribute to improving the competitiveness of the sheep and goat sector. The adaptations that were implemented by some farmers (depending on Member State and production type: extensification, concentration, improved feed self-sufficiency) were facilitated by decoupling, but did not offset the effects of external factors (epizootics and fodder costs) on production costs, which have increased in most cases.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/evaluation/index_en.htm)

## Evaluation of promotion and information actions for agricultural products

<b>ABB activities:</b>	05 02 Interventions in agricultural markets
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	November 2011
----------------	---------------

### Background, scope and focus

The evaluation examined the relevance and effectiveness of the EU information and promotion policy for agricultural products<sup>1</sup> with respect to achieving the objectives laid down in Council Regulation 3/2008, as well as its coherence with other promotion measures applied under the CAP, notably in the fruit and vegetable and the wine sectors and under the rural development policy.

The examination covered the period between 2002 and 2010. In principle, all EU Member States benefitting from EU co-financed promotion programmes were covered. The Member States that were the main beneficiaries of promotion programmes and the Member States which took part in multi-country promotion programmes, were examined in more depth<sup>2</sup>.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

The evaluation concluded that while the scope of the products and themes, and the list of third countries eligible for the scheme are adequate for achieving the objectives of the policy, there is a lack of prioritisation and strategy behind them.

The themes of the Commission initiatives<sup>3</sup> organised within the examination period (organic farming campaign and campaign to promote European quality schemes in third countries) were judged to be of Community interest and corresponded to the main priorities of the Regulation.

---

<sup>1</sup> The main objectives of EU information and promotion scheme is to improve the image and raise awareness of the quality and the specific production methods of EU agricultural products in order to reverse their declining consumption, expand the demand or open new markets, depending on the case.

<sup>2</sup> France, Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Spain, UK.

<sup>3</sup> The Commission may launch initiatives on themes and products that are of Community interest where appropriate proposal has been submitted by proposing organisations.

Although the EU promotion policy framework has encouraged multi-country programmes and multi-product programmes, these programmes have not been widespread so far. The number of multi-country and multi-product programme proposals was limited by the specific difficulties in their design and implementation.

As regards the evolution of the effectiveness of promotion programmes, there was widespread use of good practices amongst proposing organisations. Market analysis, SMART objectives, clear targets, well adapted actions and good monitoring methods were widely supported and adopted practices among the proposing organisations. This was reflected in an improving standard of the selected proposals and it seems that the performance of programmes was improving, as a result of good practice, leading to better attainment of the objectives.

Concerning management aspects, the evaluation revealed that while the overall framework for managing promotion programmes is clearly defined, the two-step selection process and the implementation procedures affected the management of the policy, in particular in the case of multi-country programmes.

The evaluators concluded that EU promotion programmes have an important leverage effect on generic, multi-country and multi-product promotion programmes. Without EU co-funding, promotion programmes would have a much smaller scale and would be funded mainly by the private sector, and would thus be brand-oriented and not generic.

The evaluation examined the coherence of the information and promotion actions with other promotion measures applied under the CAP, in particular measures applied in the wine sector and in the fruit and vegetable sector, as well as measures under the rural development policy. The promotion and information scheme is coherent with these other CAP measures in terms of objectives, messages conveyed, groups targeted and channels used. However, it was noted that the coexistence of an increased number of promotion measures resulting from recent CAP reforms may limit the overall efficiency of the EU promotion policy.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/eval/reports/promotion/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/eval/reports/promotion/index_en.htm)

### **Evaluation of the exceptional market support measures in the poultry and egg sector**

<b>ABB activities:</b>	05 02 Interventions in agricultural markets
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	November 2011
----------------	---------------

## **Background, scope and focus**

The evaluation of the exceptional market support measures for poultry and eggs dealt with the seven measures taken under Commission Regulation (EC) No 1010/2006 in 2006 to tackle the strong market disturbances, such as plummeting demand and prices, caused by a lack of consumer confidence due to Avian Flu. These disturbances occurred despite hardly any outbreaks of the disease among domestic birds. This was the first experience of use of exceptional measures in response to a perceived lack of EU consumer confidence.

The evaluation covered the period from autumn 2005 to spring 2007. It included all Member States that requested payments under the scheme. Case studies were carried out for the main recipients of the scheme: Greece, Spain, France, Italy, Hungary, the Netherlands and Poland.

## **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The evaluation concluded that the common approach at the EU level where Member States could choose from a menu of seven measures, created a European added value and proved to be adequate as a response.

The long preparation time of the measures - a legal base had first to be created which took several months - prevented that the measures had a direct influence on the short-run stabilization of the market. However, already the announcement of the measures may have had an indirect stabilizing impact via market expectations.

The measures were certainly effective with respect to covering a substantial part of the severe income losses that occurred in the sector, with farmers in non-integrated systems considerably more impacted than those in integrated systems. The measures were coherent with the actions taken by the industry in the Member States.

According to the evaluation, the exceptional measures were coherent with the actions taken by the industry, and helped maintain the Internal Market by avoiding national interventions.

The exceptional measures were also coherent with export refunds. While export refunds targeted existing surplus production, the exceptional measures were used to prevent future production adding to this surplus.

The evaluation provided also the conclusion that in case of consumer confidence collapse the Commission should have in place instruments, for this and other agricultural sectors, that can be used swiftly without delay to increase the stabilizing effect on the market.

Furthermore the evaluation concluded that the availability of data to assess market disturbances during a crisis and to adequately monitor and evaluate the measures, should be reviewed.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/eval/reports/poultry-eggs/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/eval/reports/poultry-eggs/index_en.htm)

## 06 – Mobility and Transport

### Evaluation of Regulation 881/2004 establishing the European Railway Agency

**ABB activities:** 06 02 Inland, air and maritime transport

**Timing:** April 2011

#### Background, scope and focus

Regulation (EC) No 881/2004 of 29 April 2004<sup>1</sup> as subsequently amended by Regulation (EC) No 1335/2008 of 16 December 2008<sup>2</sup> ("the Regulation") specified the creation of the European Railway Agency ("the Agency", "ERA"). Established in 2005 in Valenciennes (France), ERA helps to build an integrated European railway area by reinforcing rail safety and promoting interoperability. It develops common technical standards and common approaches to safety, working closely with stakeholders from the rail sector as well as with national authorities, the EU institutions and other interested parties. Featuring a dedicated Safety Unit, ERA also monitors and reports on rail safety in the EU.

Article 43 of the Regulation provides for an evaluation of the implementation of the Regulation five years after the Agency takes up its duties.

The main objectives of the evaluation study were:

- to assess whether and how the main objectives of the Regulation were effectively attained (implementation of the Regulation),
- to assess how the instruments and procedures provided by the Regulation have been implemented (the functioning of the Agency),
- and to identify areas of improvement (including possible future roles of the Agency).

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

The main findings of the evaluation study are the following:

1. Positive steps towards the completion of the initial objectives of the Regulation, however many of them are likely to continue to remain valid for the longer term.
2. The Agency has made reasonable progress as regards its contribution to the fulfillment of

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 164, 30.4.2004, p. 1–43

<sup>2</sup> OJ L 354, 31.12.2008, p. 51-59

policy objectives (they relate to the overall effectiveness of the railway regime for which the Agency has only a contributory role).

3. The effectiveness of the instruments laid down by the Regulation for the fulfillment of the objectives (such as registers and databases) was assessed as useful to stakeholders, but use or awareness of some of them seems limited.

4. The costs incurred for the fulfillment of the objectives are broadly in line with comparable EU agencies.

5. The performance of the Agency is overall satisfactory; however, there are areas of opportunity for improvement, like introduction of key performance indicators or increasing the effectiveness of the working parties.

6. The effectiveness and functioning of the Agency and its working practices as regards the structures created by the Regulation is overall assessed positively, nevertheless there are areas where the functioning of the Agency could be improved (such as quality control, more effective governance structure, greater flexibility regarding staff contracts).

7. As regards potential future roles of the Agency, provision of advice and support, dissemination of railway-related information and training and involvement in international cooperation and promotion of EU standards were identified as the most supported.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/transport/evaluations/doc/2011\\_era-evaluation-881-2004.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/evaluations/doc/2011_era-evaluation-881-2004.pdf)

### Evaluation of the Marco Polo Programme

<b>ABB activities:</b>	06 02 Inland, air and maritime transport
------------------------	--

<b>Timing:</b>	18/04/2011
----------------	------------

#### Background, scope and focus

The evaluation of the programme was foreseen in the Regulation (EC) No 1692/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council, establishing the second 'Marco Polo programme for the granting of Community financial assistance to improve the environmental performance of the freight transport system ('Marco Polo 11) (OJ L 328, 24.11.2006). As required by the abovementioned Regulation, the evaluation covers the period 2003 - 2010 and represents both the ex-post evaluation of the Marco Polo I programme and the mid-term evaluation of the Marco Polo II programme. The evaluation has been commissioned in order to provide information on the results delivered by the programme and to

contribute to the development of new funding and policy instruments supporting transport services.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

1. Marco Polo was conceived as a key programme for promoting sustainable transport. It supports the shift of freight traffic from the road to other modes of transport, such as sea, rail and inland waterways. There have been two Marco Polo programmes: Marco Polo I with the budget of €102 million which ran between 2003 and 2006 and the ongoing Marco Polo II, established for the period 2007 – 2013 with a substantially increased budget of €450 million and extended scope.
2. The most important features of the programme are its transparency and high accuracy with which the achieved results can be measured and quantified as well as the direct relationship between the EU funding and the results.
3. The outsourced management of the programme has strengthened its implementation and allowed the Commission to concentrate on the key policy issues.
4. While Marco Polo I has realised a significant modal shift (21.4 billion of tonnes-kilometre shifted off the road), which can be quantified into substantial environmental benefits expressed in hundreds of million euro, the ambitious objectives established for the programme before coming into being, have not been fully achieved (45% for Marco Polo I)<sup>1</sup>.
5. A significant modal shift is also forecasted for Marco Polo II, but as the programme is still on-going, the final results are not yet available.
6. The economic recession, which was reported over the period 2008 – 2009, may have had an adverse impact on the success rate of projects financed under Marco Polo I and Marco Polo II programmes.
7. There is a budgetary underperformance of the programme both in terms of commitments and payments.
8. Majority of projects continue after the funding period, which demonstrates that a short term funding may lead to a long term change.
9. There is likely some deadweight in the programme, in the meaning that a certain proportion of supported projects would have gone ahead in the absence of Marco Polo funds, whereby MP allowed either to accelerate the set-up or to increase the scale foreseen.
10. Some concerns have been expressed about the possible distortion of competition in the maritime sector as a result of Marco Polo funding; however there has been no evidence about any significant adverse effects on competition in the maritime transport.
11. Marco Polo programme is currently the only financial instrument at the EU level which aims at improving environmental efficiency of freight transport along with reducing greenhouse gas emissions from freight transport and reducing congestion on European road networks. Therefore, in the next financial framework funding should also be provided to support sustainable freight services while consideration need to be taken of whether modal shift shall remain the main criterion of support.

---

<sup>1</sup> Results achieved at the end of 2010



## Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/transport/evaluations/doc/2011\\_marco-polo-programme-2003-2010.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/evaluations/doc/2011_marco-polo-programme-2003-2010.pdf)

## Ex post evaluation on EU Passenger Ship Safety Legislation

### ABB activities:

06 02 Inland, air and maritime transport

### Timing:

April 2011

### Background, scope and focus

This set of legislative measures was formulated essentially in response to the Estonia ferry disaster in 1994 and the technical basis for the legislation is over 10 years old. The review included identifying, in consultation with Member State experts, what areas should be addressed further. In parallel, it was considered prudent to undertake a separate external ex-post evaluation of the EU passenger ship safety legislative framework. The Directives concerned were:

- Directive 2009/45/EC on safety rules and standards for passenger ships (a codification of Directive 98/18/EC and its amendments);
- Directive 98/41/EC on the registration of persons on board;
- Directive 99/35/EC on mandatory surveys for ro-ro ferry and high-speed passenger craft services; and
- Directive 2003/25/EC on specific stability rules for ro-ro passenger ships (making the intergovernmental 1996 Stockholm Agreement regulations applicable throughout the Union).

The main objectives of the study were (1) to identify any aspects of the current regulations that were not efficient, effective, useful or relevant; and (2) to identify areas where action at EU level could address potential safety gaps and related obstacles to the internal market.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

As they stand, the Directives are considered to be relevant, efficient, effective and have utility. The aim pursued by the Directives is achieved at a reasonable cost.

There is a significant consensus amongst stakeholders that amendments to Directives 009/45/EC and Directive 99/35/EC are necessary.

*Directive 2009/45/EC:*

1. The scope of the Directive should be expanded to cover ships made of material other than steel; historic/traditional ships; and sailing ships;
2. A more tailored approach should be taken to regulating safety standards for small ships;
3. Clarification of certain definitions (port areas; High Speed Passenger Craft (HSPC)); and guidelines for carrying out annual surveys were necessary; and
4. A Member State reporting obligation on the implementation of the Directive would ensure an on-going overview.

*Directive 99/35/EC:*

1. A reduction in the number of standard surveys; and
2. Harmonisation of procedures with Directive 2009/16/EC on port state Control.

The following constitute the **main recommendations** of the evaluation report.

*Directive 2009/45/EC*

1. Extension of scope to include ships made of material other than steel – adapting the Directive to market trends and technological improvements;
2. Adoption of well-targeted standards for small ships of below 24 m, perhaps considering an application to below 12 passengers;
3. Elaboration of a comprehensive solution to address the needs of the niche market for transport of passengers by historic/traditional and sailing ships;
4. Elaboration of new standards (adopting and adapting those to be made at IMO level) for particular passenger ships: cruise tenders; offshore workers (e.g., to service windmill farms);
5. Incorporation of the IMO Polar Code, once agreed, into EU acquis for domestic voyages;
6. Consideration of an extension of the current regulatory framework to intra-EU traffic;
7. Publication of guidelines on: the meaning of 'port area'; definition of HSPC; survey work, in particular timeframes and coordination amongst a Member State's competent authorities; and
8. Biennial implementation report requirement.

*Directive 99/35/EC*

1. Inclusion of provisions to increase unscheduled 'surprise' inspections and to reduce standard inspections;
2. Harmonisation of inspections with those in Directive 2009/16/EC; and
3. Biennial implementation report requirement, along with better use of current data uploaded to EMSA's central database by all EU competent authorities.

**Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/transport/evaluations/doc/2011\\_passenger\\_ship\\_safety.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/evaluations/doc/2011_passenger_ship_safety.pdf)

## Mid-term evaluation of TEN-T programme

**ABB activities:**

06 03 Trans-European networks

**Timing:**

March 2011

### Background, scope and focus

In order to give financial support to the implementation of the TEN-T guidelines, the Parliament and Council adopted [Regulation No 680/2007/EC](#) specifying general rules for the granting of Community aid in the field of trans-European networks.<sup>1</sup> The Regulation required a mid-term review of the TEN-T Programme by end 2010.

The mid-term evaluation aimed at assessing the relevance and effectiveness of the TEN-T Programme (2007- 2013) in the context of the Trans-European Transport Network. The period evaluated was 2007-2010. The main objective was to formulate overall conclusions and possible recommendations on the implementation of the TEN-T Programme with a view to providing input to the revision of TEN-T Programme and policy.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

The main findings of the mid-term evaluation study are the followings:

Since the start of the current financial perspective (2007-2013), the Programme governance had improved: the TEN-T Executive Agency is providing more control over the public money that is spent, the selection of projects through proposal calls is more rigorous and leads to better project delivery. More than 90% of the Programme funds have been allocated and where the earliest projects since 2007 did not perform as required the funds have already been reallocated.

However the Programme is behind schedule on completion: a significant number of the largest projects in the Multi-Annual Programme will be completed after 2013, by 2015. The projects that have been completed to date tend to be projects of common interest because they are shorter and because they are less complex than the Priority Projects.

A number of the recent EERP (European Economic Recovery Programme) projects are already

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 162/1, 22 June 2007, pages 1-10

late whereas they had been specifically selected to be completed over a short period. This will mean that there is little chance that the TEN-T network can be fully operational by 2020.

The Priority Projects, the dorsal spine of the network, are not delivering the expected effects. A few Priority Projects are completed and numerous sections are finalised but some key parts - such as cross-border sections - are missing and explain why the TEN-T network is an assembly of largely national sections, often poorly interlinked, rather than a proper physical and interoperable network.

Most Priority Projects focus on rail: eighteen address rail and two address inland waterways, without achieving a coherent network. In spite of the focus given to rail, these projects have not resulted in a Single European Railway Areal and are still experiencing bottlenecks and significant interoperable obstacles.

The ex-post and mid-term review reports conclude therefore that there is a sub-optimal, economic, social and territorial cohesion, sub-optimal functioning of the internal market and sub-optimal use of infrastructure and resources.

Horizontal Projects contribute to the removal of "soft" but nonetheless real barriers and bottlenecks and therefore contribute to the achievement of the objectives of the Programme. Compared to "hard" infrastructure projects, the time requirement for interoperability effects can be shorter, however changes to behaviour and standardisation of tools or vehicles takes time and this needs to be recognised by the Programme.

Although there are many examples of what bottlenecks are on the European transport network, there is still no clear definition of what they are: a physical lack of infrastructure, a lack of common operating procedures, or a lack of smooth operations at the borders? This needs to be addressed in a revision of the Guidelines.

The objectives of the Programme are so general that it makes any evaluation of the Programme successes difficult. The Programme has been the catalyst to a number of key pieces of transport infrastructure in Europe, and has been playing a part in the structuring of the transport network by allowing transport investments to be focussed. Its political leverage is high but its financial leverage is poor. The Programme has clearly made a positive contribution to the mobility needs of the European citizens and goods. However some aspects of the Programme need to be improved which requires a revision of the Guidelines and Regulation and of some internal aspects of the Programme practices.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/transport/evaluations/doc/2011\\_ten\\_t.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/evaluations/doc/2011_ten_t.pdf)

## 07 – Environment

### Mid-term Evaluation of the Sustainable Consumption and Production and Sustainable Industrial Policy Action Plan

**ABB activities:**

07 03 Development and implementation of EU environmental policy and legislation

**Timing:**

September 2011

#### Background, scope and focus

The objective of this evaluation is to provide the Commission with key findings and lessons of experience from the implementation of the Commission's Sustainable Consumption and Production and Sustainable Industrial Policy Action Plan. The evaluation will present those findings and lessons, along with a set of detailed recommendations, in a report designed primarily to provide the Commission's policymakers and managers with a valuable aid both for the on-going implementation of the current Action Plan and its review due in 2012. The evaluation will also assess whether the evolution of the general environmental, economic, and social context is being properly addressed, and if the elements included in the Action Plan are still relevant.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

*Strength of rationale has grown and detailed prioritisation remains a subject of (helpful) debate*

There is a clear and increasing rationale for action relating to sustainable consumption and production and the instruments grouped under the AP do address the majority of the issues involved. There is some inevitable (given the breadth of issues) discussion of the prioritisation between the objectives, but apart from an under representation of social and possibly competitiveness issues the balance appears satisfactory.

*The AP has made a positive start on improving Commission policy making but there remains more to be done*

The AP has improved coordination between the DGs most involved in SCP/SIP, this is a very useful and positive outcome but these efforts need to be maintained and potentially widened to include other DGs. There are some instruments (see recommendations for examples) outside the AP which could usefully be more formally aligned with it.

*Striving for consistency of approach between instruments is sound but achieving this in practice*

*is proving difficult*

The objectives of the AP related to improving cooperation and alignment between EU and MS instruments, e.g. between Ecolabel and MS level labelling schemes are recognised as worthy, with some, albeit limited, progress being achieved. This limited progress relates to a combination of the complexity of the compromises involved and possibly a lack of resourcing.

*The AP has helped present a coherent policy picture but is somewhat stuck in Brussels*

Some MSs have been helped by both the high level statement of objectives (and collation of instruments) that the AP offers and there are some good examples of instrument specific progress in MSs. However the AP is more influential on Commission policy making than MS policy making.

*The AP and its instruments lack targets and data, making evaluation difficult*

The lack of firm targets for the AP and for most of the instruments it covers is a weakness. This, combined with a lack of data, has made quantified evaluation difficult. Monitoring requires a combination of high level indicators and instrument specific outputs.

*The breadth of issues involved in this area make it a true cross DG activity*

Overall control of the AP and its instruments under one DG would simplify implementation, however the fundamental issues involved are genuinely cross DG so this approach (which would inevitably exclude the non lead DGs to a certain extent) would not be recommended.

*Satisfactory progress in adding value*

The AP has helped its constituent instruments become more than the sum of their parts, but there remains significant scope (and need) for more

*Faster progress is needed and there are opportunities to address this*

From a review of high level indicators, it appears that the rate of improvement in a selection of key issues is slow and mixed between MSs (though the most recent data only covers part of the AP's life). Therefore there is a case for more ambitious policy instruments to increase the rate of positive change in this area. The development of the Resource Efficiency initiative offers the opportunity to address this.

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

<http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eussd/pdf/14.%20SCP-SIP%20AP%20Mid%20Term%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf>

## 08 – Research

### Assessing the Effectiveness of Simplification Measures under FP7

*Evaluation related study*

<b>ABB activities:</b>	08 AWBL 02 Policy strategy and coordination
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	08/2011
----------------	---------

#### Background, scope and focus

The overall objective of this study was to provide a well-founded and robust assessment of the effectiveness of the simplification measures and initiatives implemented under FP7. As such the study is part of the work contributing to FP7 evaluation exercises. The study was also part of the evidence base for the Ex-ante Impact Assessment of the Rules for Participation for the Horizon 2020 Programme.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

The study concludes that stakeholders - while understanding that a programme such as FP7 is complex *per se* - still see significant room for improvement. Simplification remains a key challenge in their minds. According to stakeholders, the most successful FP7 simplification measures introduced under FP7 are:

- The introduction of the Unique Registration Facility (URF);
- A major reduction in the number of certificates related to financial statements that must be provided with periodic claims;
- A considerable reduction in ex-ante controls and revised protective measures for financially weaker participants;
- The extension of lump sum financing for subsistence and accommodation costs.

Measures that were considered as potentially important by stakeholders, but are not perceived as having been successfully implemented include:

- The introduction of the possibility of ex-ante certification of the accounting methodology for recurring participants;
- A clearer definition of eligible costs, and improvements to the services and guidance documents for applicants;
- A simpler cost reporting system;

- A simplified support rate per type of activity.

As regards the administrative burden (time spent on scientific tasks not included) and according to the study results, the most time-consuming project life cycle step for participants is project management, followed by application/selection, negotiation and audit. The absolute administrative effort depends on a number of factors including participants' experience with Framework Programmes, participants' size and profile, participants' internal organisation, the degree of centralisation of tasks by project coordinators, and the project size.

In addition to these findings, the study identified a number of simplification areas meriting attention by the Commission and provides corresponding recommendations, for instance to make better use of communication as a powerful simplification tool. The study also recommends to monitor the simplification effects continuously and to measure simplification impacts.

### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/pdf/archive/fp7-evidence-base/evaluation\\_studies\\_and\\_reports/simplification\\_study\\_report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/pdf/archive/fp7-evidence-base/evaluation_studies_and_reports/simplification_study_report.pdf)

## Long-Term Impact of the Framework Programmes

*Evaluation related study*

### ABB activities:

08 AWBL 02 Policy strategy and coordination

### Timing:

09/2011

### Background, scope and focus

This study was intended as an initial exploration of the long-term impacts of the Framework Programmes through a number of six selected areas, and of the usefulness of coupling scientometric techniques with a case-based approach to impact.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

1. In Quantum Information Processing Computing, the Framework Programme picked up the emergence of a new field of science and technology, helped it establish scientific and



technological agendas, organise and grow in Europe to such an extent that the EU appears fully competitive with the other world R&D leaders. Europe has the technological basis and has started to develop standards for doing so and for continuing to maintain strong positions in the global computing and communications industries.

2. In brain research, the FP has made important contributions in imaging and helped support and integrate the European research community. The FP has been important in keeping Europe ‘in the game’ in this field.

3. In Stratospheric Ozone research, the Framework Programme has made a major contribution by growing and helping coordinate the European research community, not least through organizing multinational research campaigns to provide a better evidence base for policy. It has helped the European research community move from lagging far behind the USA to working at the global frontier. Research results have shaped the evolving Montreal Protocol requirements and have been so influential at the policy level that Europe has achieved the Protocol’s 2020 targets ten years ahead of schedule.

4. In Solar Photovoltaics (PV), the Framework Programme has expanded the European research community and enabled it to work at the technological frontier – not only in first- but also in second- and third generation Solar PV. Demonstration projects and complementary renewable energy policies have helped develop markets for Solar PV and establish a significant European presence in the supply industry.

5. In automotive, the Framework Programme’s role has been to sustain longer-term research and research in areas such as fuel efficiency, emissions and safety that create not only private advantages for the industry but significant public goods. Exploiting the industry’s desire to self-organise to define R&D directions and road maps has been a powerful way to coordinate the longer-term R&D effort and has supported a long series of product and process innovations that help maintain Europe’s position among the global leaders in this industry.

6. The Manufacture Technology Platform is of interest more for its potential than for any socioeconomic impacts achieved at this point. It underlines the importance of coordination and self-organisation as mechanisms to integrate research.

7. The most important commonality among these stories is to do with coordination by enabling self-organisation.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/pdf/archive/other\\_reports\\_studies\\_and\\_documents/long\\_term\\_impact\\_of\\_the\\_fp.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/pdf/archive/other_reports_studies_and_documents/long_term_impact_of_the_fp.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none)

## Impact Assessment of the Regions of Knowledge Programme

**ABB activities:**

08 14 Capacities - Regions of Knowledge

**Timing:**

04/2011

### Background, scope and focus

The study aimed to evaluate the impact of the "Regions of Knowledge" (RoK) programme regarding:

- Transnational cooperation of clusters
- Regional growth and competitiveness
- Regional investment in research and innovation, incl. potential synergies with Structural Funds, Competitiveness and Innovation Programme and any other source of funding
- Inclusion of more regions into the ERA.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

1. A targeted programme playing a non-negligible role in the smart specialisation of regions
  - Most projects focus on areas of regional strategic importance
  - Development of sectoral's regional innovation strategies through the couple 'state of the art analyses / Strategic Research Agendas + Joint Action Plans in regions which have often already carried out 'generalist' regional innovation strategies.
2. Outcomes are to a large extent 'intangible' including:
  - Improvement of clusters' strategic management, enhancement of expertise and competence in regional authorities, strengthening of collaboration within and between the clusters
3. The five most potential impacts of the participation to a "Regions of Knowledge" project according to the survey are:
  - An improved strategic vision in the cluster area;
  - The formation of new, long-term relationships with clusters at the EU level;
  - More knowledge transfer between research organisations and enterprises;
  - Access to a pool of complementary competencies;

- Improvement in the strategy making process.
- 4. "Regions of Knowledge" sets the fundamentals for future impacts to occur in terms of an enhanced regional economic competitiveness through R&D activities.
- 5. Balanced partnerships in terms of 'triple helix' and newly established regional linkages
  - Public bodies are the main partners followed by private partners and universities and research organisations.
  - Long-lasting effects esp. in terms of inter-regional collaboration but also strengthening of intra-regional links & communication channels between the triple helix
  - Progressive up scaling of the programme over the years to increase the level of cooperation between regional research-driven clusters
  - Fundamentals for gaining a critical mass & the potential for international competitiveness
  - A facilitator was the mentoring dimension of the RoK programme

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/pdf/archive/other\\_reports\\_studies\\_and\\_documents/assessment\\_of\\_the\\_impact\\_of\\_the\\_regions\\_of\\_knowledge\\_programme.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/pdf/archive/other_reports_studies_and_documents/assessment_of_the_impact_of_the_regions_of_knowledge_programme.pdf)

### Review of S&T Cooperation between the European Union and the Republic of Argentina (2006-2010)

*Evaluation related study*

#### ABB activities:

08 AWBL-02 Policy strategy and coordination

#### Timing:

05/2011

#### Background, scope and focus

1. Analyse the S&T cooperative activities 2006-2010 under the EU Research Framework Programmes (FP) so as to draw up a pattern both in terms of areas/topics and types of research (science led, technology led, trade led, global issues led), if possible;
2. Identify success factors as well as bottlenecks and obstacles for on-going activities or their further development;

3. Broadly review EU Member States' bilateral activities with Argentina;
4. Assess complementarities/synergies and overlaps between different EU-Argentina activities;
5. Analyse the extent to which the EU-Argentina S&T cooperation is mutually beneficial;
6. Identify S&T areas/actors/instruments for which there are promising prospects for developing the cooperation.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

- The review identified a number of useful opportunities for future cooperation, e.g. through:
  - Increased EU focus on large and complex, autonomously managed and adapted 'projects' such as ETPs, JTIs, JPIs, and the European Innovation Partnerships.
  - Converging of EU-RTDI- and EU-LAC-RTDI-cooperation policies in terms of priorities and approaches
  - Increased EU focus on leveraging national funds (of the Member States)
  - Increased EU efforts to better use resources through more coherence and synergies between different programmes, and through better priority setting, helped by the EU Delegation in Buenos Aires.
  - ABEST, the EU-AR Liaison Office, is actively involved in political work and dissemination activities, e.g. via 10 National Contact Points (NCP) and an NCP network throughout the country.
  - A growing interest of Europe for Latin American countries in general as exemplified e.g. by an increased propensity of students and young researchers to be internationally mobile, and ability to host young European researchers having difficulties to get appropriate positions and conditions in their home countries.
  - The global necessity to share research facilities to share costs, therefore creation and development of international platforms.
  - Attraction of European centres of excellence to set up joint centres in Argentina
  - Strengthened connections to the activities of the Ministry of the Economy and its programmes could enhance the uptake of research for innovation in SMEs and elsewhere
  - Simplification for making cooperation more attractive.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/iscp/pdf/review\\_eu-argentina\\_s&t\\_coopagree.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/iscp/pdf/review_eu-argentina_s&t_coopagree.pdf)

## Interim Evaluation of the Innovative Medicines Initiative Joint Undertaking

**ABB activities:** 08 02 Cooperation - Health

**Timing:** 07/2011

### Background, scope and focus

To assess the quality and efficiency of the IMI Joint Undertaking and progress towards the objectives set (set in Council Regulation (EC) 73(2008), Article 11.2).

### Summary of findings and conclusions

The overall result of the evaluation of the Innovative Medicines Initiative Joint Undertaking (IMI JU) is positive.

- Through the IMI JU, Europe has succeeded in establishing a new business model between public and private sectors, which unites research strengths across European pharmaceutical industry, academia and small to medium enterprises (SMEs). The consortia formed carry out focussed research addressing problems of immediate relevance to industry and future public health. To have formed and embedded this new, applied, research environment is a significant achievement for Europe.
- By facilitating enhanced cooperation between academic, SMEs, patient organisations, regulatory authorities and the pharmaceutical industry, the IMI JU enables mutual learning and the opportunity to build understanding of respective rationales and approaches, with benefits to all parties. This is powerful.
- The scientific scope of the initiative is well targeted, embodied in the IMI Research Agenda, and the IMI JU has had the foresight to ensure that the Research Agenda is updated regularly.
- The financial resources available to the IMI JU, totalling € 2 bn, make this the largest public private partnership in health research in the world.
- IMI constitutes a novel model for implementing the concept of “open innovation”. No other European programme has enabled cross-company collaboration within the pharmaceutical sector on the scale that has been achieved with IMI.

Having identified many positive points, the Panel also identified certain weaknesses:

- Internal governance structures are not yet working optimally;

- Proactive communication activities have been lacking;
- The advisory potential of several stakeholders, such the European Medicines Agency (EMA), is not exploited fully by the IMI JU;
- The lack of identified and used key performance indicators by the IMI JU risks making the output of the whole initiative diffuse.

The Panel therefore came up with seven recommendations:

1. Continuously improve stakeholder involvement in IMI supported research projects.
2. Continuously ensure EFPIA and Commission commitment to IMI's success and sustainability.
3. Ensure excellence and exploit new ways to support IMI scientific objectives.
4. Improve IMI communication.
5. Reinforce and streamline decision making and well-functioning processes.
6. Ensure best use of IMI results and IMI sustainability.
7. 7. Develop monitoring and evaluation processes.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index\\_en.cfm?pg=archive](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index_en.cfm?pg=archive)

### Ex Post Evaluation of NMP FP6 - Project Level

<b>ABB activities:</b>	08 22 Completion of previous Framework Programmes and other activities
------------------------	--

<b>Timing:</b>	08/2011
----------------	---------

#### Background, scope and focus

To get further in-depth information and insight into:

- the factors that affected the extent and range of impacts of NMP projects at individual, organisational, societal, economic and environmental levels across both Europe and more globally;

- the programme aspects and policy angles that should be retained (or altered) in future NMP programmes.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

1. The FP6 NMP programme attracted most of the top EU research institutions and companies.
2. The programme participants underlined that the FP6 NMP programme was a strategic tool to elaborate novel RTD activities that they would not have been able to perform otherwise. The main strength of the programme was the ability to bring together the best European, and in many cases, international research groups, raising the visibility of individual participants and improving trans-European networking.
3. The participants considered S&T goals as the most important reason for participating in the programme, followed by economic and health/environment goals.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index\\_en.cfm?pg=archive](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index_en.cfm?pg=archive)

## **Meta-analysis of "Bio-Technology", "Agriculture", "Food", "Marine and Maritime", and Horizontal themes**

<b>ABB activities:</b>	08 03 Cooperation - Food, Agriculture and Biotechnology"
------------------------	--

<b>Timing:</b>	05/2011
----------------	---------

### **Background, scope and focus**

The aim of the above evaluation study was to assess the impact of all Framework Programme projects from 2000-2010 in the areas of:

- Sustainable production and management of biological resources from land, forest and aquatic environments;
- Food, health and well-being;

- Life sciences, biotechnology and biochemistry for sustainable non-food products and processes.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

Results: The projects in this theme have increased the body of knowledge, delivered innovation and supported EU policies, thus helping Europe address global societal challenges. According to a survey, 64% of coordinators believe that their projects enhance the competitiveness of the participants, close to 5% of projects have directly led to the creation of new companies; 82% of projects created temporary jobs during the project's implementation and 35% created new posts after the end of the project.

Impacts: Overall, FP projects have had a substantial impact on improving the knowledge base in Food, Agriculture, Fisheries and Biotechnologies, through high scientific productivity combined with novel technological output. 340 firms in the manufacturing sector of food and beverages that have introduced a new product or new process have received funds from FP5 and FP6 programmes. Impacts on policies have also been high: according to the survey, more than 60% of FP projects have provided inputs to European policies, 56% to national policies, and 25% to international agreements. 49% of FP funded project coordinators stated that their project had positive environmental impacts. The impact of projects on the development and consolidation of the ERA is also found to be very high: 84% of coordinators consider that participation in FP projects has consolidated their permanent network of partners, and half of them stated that their participation has contributed to launching new European projects.

EU2020 and Innovation Union: The bio-based economy, addressing the key societal global challenges of limited resources, food security, health and climate change contributes to Europe 2020 on a broad front.

Competitiveness and international comparison: Biotechnology publications in 2010 'Nature' journals cited US and Canadian authors in 486 cases and European authors in 641 cases, while Europe accounted for 35% of worldwide biotechnological patent applications in 2006, compared to 40% for the USA.

European-added value: Research and innovation in Food, Agriculture and Fisheries and Biotechnologies has an intrinsic high European added value. The sectors address pan-European challenges which require pan-European research and innovation. Moreover, almost 70% of coordinators confirm that their participation in an FP-funded project has delivered leverage effects. Co-ordination and synergy with national R&I policies and investments is another important aspect of European added value.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index\\_en.cfm?pg=archive](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index_en.cfm?pg=archive)



## First Interim Evaluation of the Fuel Cells and Hydrogen Joint Undertaking (FCH JU)

**ABB activities:** 08 05 Cooperation - Energy

**Timing:** 06/2011

### Background, scope and focus

The objective of this evaluation was to assess the effectiveness, efficiency and quality of the FCH JU operations, both with regard to the Joint Undertaking and its operating bodies and the technical activities carried out by its members and project participants. In particular, emphasis was put on the progress of the FCH JU towards its objectives as set up in article 2 of the Council Regulation establishing the FCH JU.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

The FCH JU is an achievement on its own and represents a valuable instrument for the European Union that should be maintained and supported to implement its work as originally envisaged.

However, the experts have also identified a number of issues encountered by the FCH JU as well as some areas where its operation could be improved:

- the current legal framework as a “Community/Union body” is not best-suited to industry led public-private partnerships like JTIs and should be streamlined;
- funding rates for FCH JU projects have proved variable from year to year and, in addition, always considerably lower than those of FP7;
- inadequate resources of the Programme Office for effective project monitoring and management;
- insufficient collaboration with Member States’ related programmes;
- lack of a robust project monitoring and assessment;
- lack of an international cooperation strategy.

In order to address these issues the experts' panel made a series of recommendations, grouped in five broad categories:

1. Reinforce portfolio management
2. Ensure high agility of operations and adaptability to changing competitive forces
3. Improve visibility, communication and outreach

4. Improve collaboration and alignment with Member States
5. Ensure high efficiency of operations.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index\\_en.cfm?pg=archive#results](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index_en.cfm?pg=archive#results)

### Impact Assessment of the Research Potential Programme

<b>ABB activities:</b>	08 15 Capacities – Regions of Knowledge
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	09/2011
----------------	---------

#### Background, scope and focus

The study aimed to address the following considerations regarding the Research Potential programme:

- Impact oriented analysis of projects
- Innovation and I.P. capacity building measures
- Analysis of the implementation per thematic domain and for the whole activity
- First thoughts for the next period (2014-2020)

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

1. Programme considered to be simple and well understood by applicants:
  - High numbers of proposals received (despite low success rate)
  - Many proposals scored 14 and above and were rejected
2. All FP7 thematic domains are well represented among funded projects
  - Excellent geographical distribution

3. Goods links with partnering organisations
  - Average of 7 partnering organisations per project
4. Increased participation in the European Research Area
  - Increased recognition of research quality
  - Increased publications
  - Increase attention to patenting
  - Improved cooperation with end-users
  - Increased involvement in regional social and economic development
  - Improved relationship with S&T policy makers

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index\\_en.cfm?pg=archive#results](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index_en.cfm?pg=archive#results)

### Review of S&T Cooperation between the European Union and the Republic of Chile (2007-2011)

*Evaluation related study*

#### ABB activities:

08 AWBL-02 Policy strategy and coordination for Research Directorate-General

#### Timing:

11/2011

#### Background, scope and focus

1. Analyse the S&T cooperative activities 2006-2010 under the EU Research FP so as to draw up a pattern both in terms of areas/topics and types of research (science led, technology led, trade led, global issues led), if possible;
2. Identify success factors as well as bottlenecks and obstacles for on-going activities or their further development;
3. Broadly review EU Member States' bilateral activities with Chile;
4. Assess complementarities/synergies and overlaps between different EU-Chile activities;
5. Analyse the extent to which the EU-CL S&T cooperation is mutually beneficial;

6. Identify S&T areas/actors/instruments for which there are promising prospects for developing the cooperation.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

1. The staff of CONICYT's International Directorate is highly qualified and motivated. However, given its broad spectrum of tasks regarding bilateral, multilateral, regional and EU-S&T cooperation, it seems not well endowed in terms of personnel and of budget. It is difficult to harness fully the potential of international S&T cooperation.
2. The NCP network would benefit from more resources.
3. 'Institutional liaison offices' could be established, supported from Chile's S&T budget and, if needed, twinned with successful offices in EU MS.
4. The low enterprise participation could be improved through a broader dissemination and hands-on training, and systematic links of the SME NCP with national innovation actors.
5. The increased EU focus on leveraging national funds of the MS could provide indications and incentives to further develop instruments or approaches to open ERA to the world.
6. In addition to aiming at more programme synergies, the synergies inherent in well designed and well implemented projects could be increased through strengthening national and institutional contact points and support throughout the project cycle.
7. More training of administrators at universities and research institutions could be a good way to accompany researchers in consortia building.
8. Strengthening connections between FP projects with Chilean participants and bilateral cooperation projects with EU MS and other countries could be driven by CONICYT and/or the EC delegation in Santiago.
9. A national programme to accompany the preparation of EU project proposals could help, as well as any activity of institutional actors to disseminate the information about opportunities for collaboration with the EU.
10. This summary couldn't be complete without mentioning the big obstacle to opening ERA to the world – procedures, administration, cost eligibility (e.g. VAT) and late payment in EU projects. Already difficult for European participants, this is even more difficult for researchers from 'over the oceans'.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index\\_en.cfm?pg=archive#results](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index_en.cfm?pg=archive#results)

**Interim Assessment of the Research Public Private Partnerships in the European Economic Recovery Plan: Energy-efficient Buildings, Factories of the Future, and European Green Cars Initiative**

**ABB activities:**

08 04 Cooperation — Nanosciences, nanotechnologies, materials and new production technologies

**Timing:**

05/2011

**Background, scope and focus**

The overall objective is to assess the progress achieved in the first two years from the launch of the public private partnerships (PPPs), including the effectiveness and efficiency of the PPPs mechanisms and structures and how the PPP implementation has contributed to the objectives set in the European Economic Recovery Plan and, as appropriate, bring forward proposals for how to further develop the PPPs.

**Summary of findings and conclusions**

1. The research PPPs are seen as a useful scheme for organising Research and Innovation topics with direct industrial utility and the model could be developed further.
2. The PPPs have all been successful in engaging top industrial companies, SMEs and research organisations within Europe, increasing significantly the large industry and SME participation.
3. The three research PPPs were targeted at providing research and innovation support to strategically important industries at a time when industrial funding of such actions was in danger of being cut back due to the economic crisis. However, while the review found that the research PPPs have been an effective response to the crisis, it is unlikely that they will achieve the aim of making a difference to the competitiveness of European industry unless they are given longer term support. One criticism from industrial stakeholders is that the current level of funding is not sufficient given the economic importance of the industries they are targeting. To make a significant impact on the world stage in terms of European competitiveness, the total combined public and private expenditure in this area would need to be considerably increased.
4. The three research PPPs have facilitated a closer working relationship between the Commission and industry in the setting of goals and longer-term research programme objectives. This has allowed industry to commit to longer-term strategies for research investment.
5. Further work needs to be undertaken to streamline the processes associated with PPPs, maintaining the efficiency of the calls and unifying the procedures across the various participating themes.
6. To properly address the industrial needs relating to global competitiveness, the research

PPPs need to support activities relating to the “Valley of Death”, in particular issues where proven concepts and prototypes fail to progress to successful wealth creating products and services. While some of the Valley of Death issues require commercially sensitive, proprietary actions, others, such as proving of concepts for European added-value on an industrial scale and the development of early markets, can be issues that can be tackled precompetitively. The research PPPs need to include innovation actions that address these near market issues.

7. Dissemination activities associated with research PPPs need to be strengthened.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index\\_en.cfm?pg=archive#results](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index_en.cfm?pg=archive#results)

### Interim Evaluation of EU FP7 Transport Research, notably within Theme 7 of the Cooperation Programme "Transport (including Aeronautics)"

<b>ABB activities:</b>	08 07 Cooperation – Transport (including Aeronautics)
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	02/2011
----------------	---------

#### Background, scope and focus

The interim evaluation of the Seventh European Framework Programme (FP7) Transport research aims to contribute to the overall FP7 interim evaluation.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

1. The FP7 Transport programme exhibits a strong European added value
2. The approach adopted for the FP7 is an outstanding improvement compared to the previous FPs
3. The Transport programme demonstrates stronger ambitions with regards to cross-modal and cross-cutting activities, yet allows them to materialise more concretely

4. The procedures for priority-setting and Work programme design are well-defined
5. European Technology Platforms (ETPs) add value to the FP7 Transport programme
6. European Technology Platforms contribute to gear Member States public and private research towards common goals
7. The FP7 Transport programme strengthens and broadens the 'ERA in Transport'
8. The capacity of the FP7 to attract the most important players in research and innovation in transport is uneven among sectors
9. All necessary conditions are set for projects to deliver their expected results
10. FP7 funds applied mid-term research for projects that will need follow-ups to lead to innovation
11. FP7 funds research with high additionality
12. The role of the Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in the projects is important
13. The cooperation with ICPC partners is still limited

**Recommendations:**

1. The EC should reaffirm and strengthen its integrated, holistic and systemic approach in future FP7 work programmes and in FP8
2. The EC should reinforce and modify the modalities of its support to multi-modal research activities
3. The EC should redefine its approach of cross-cutting issues
4. The EC should increase the development of new means of communication and diffusion of FP7 Transport programme results
5. The EC should enhance the internal human resources and budget assigned to the management of the FP Transport programme in order to maintain sufficient project and programme coordination
6. The EC should identify the lessons-learned from the Clean Sky Joint Technology Initiative and reflect upon possible replication in other transport modes
7. The EC should explore ways and instruments to reinforce European exploratory research
8. Increasing articulation between the Framework Programme and the national programmes of the Member States

**Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/pdf/archive/fp7-evidence-base/evaluation\\_studies\\_and\\_reports/interim\\_evaluation\\_of\\_eu\\_fp7\\_transport\\_research.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/pdf/archive/fp7-evidence-base/evaluation_studies_and_reports/interim_evaluation_of_eu_fp7_transport_research.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none)

## 09 – Information Society and Media

### CIP ICT PSP Final (Second Interim) Evaluation

<b>ABB activities:</b>	09 03 ICT Take-up
------------------------	-------------------

<b>Timing:</b>	20/07/2011
----------------	------------

#### Background, scope and focus

The final (second interim) evaluation of the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme ICT Policy Support Programme (CIP ICT PSP) focuses on the effectiveness of the new intervention instruments and on their relevance to the needs and problems in diffusing and deploying Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) particularly in public sector-related activities. This includes efficiency of resource use, effectiveness in engaging organisations that can meet the objectives of the programme, emphasis on tangible outcomes and sustainable follow-up, and the extent to which the programme is contributing to wider EU strategic objectives.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

Based on a review of available evidence and detailed project analysis the expert panel notes and recommends:

1. **The positive, unique and innovative role of the ICT PSP.** The ICT PSP has a range of positive attributes (a unique and pioneering innovation instrument, directly policy-related, complementary portfolio of instruments, wide stakeholder participation) that contributes to its strengths and differentiates it from research support programmes.
2. **Continuing the ICT PSP as an innovation deployment policy instrument.** The unique features of the ICT PSP are its focus on deployment of ICT innovations and addressing systemic and organisational risks, and these features should be maintained in any follow-up..
3. **Differentiating the ICT PSP from the Framework Programme in any post-2013 follow-up.** There are major differences between support for generation of new knowledge and support for diffusion and deployment of innovative services. These differences need to be reflected in policy design and delivery.

Within the overall context of the expert panel's positive appraisal of the role and importance of this kind of programme, its innovative nature and efficient administration, the following Recommendations are made to improve the functioning and increase the impacts of the Programme in terms of developing longer-term sustainable cross-border public interest services:



- Tightening selection processes, strengthening project reviews and making them more systematic.
- Sustaining sustainability.
- Developing a strategic approach to critical mass.
- Expanding stakeholder involvement.
- Paying more attention to end users.
- Overcoming hurdles to SME participation.
- Rethinking Thematic Networks.
- Linking with other programmes.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/cip/files/cip/docs/cip\\_ict\\_psp\\_interim\\_evaluation\\_report\\_2011\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/cip/files/cip/docs/cip_ict_psp_interim_evaluation_report_2011_en.pdf)

### Safer Internet Evaluation

<b>ABB activities:</b>	09 02 Regulatory framework for the Digital Agenda
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	01/11/2011
----------------	------------

#### Background, scope and focus

The overall aim of the Safer Internet Programme is to promote safer use of the Internet and other communication technologies, to educate users — particularly children, parents and carers — in this regard, and to fight against illegal content and harmful conduct online.

As an interim evaluation, the exercise gives an analysis of the relevance of the programme concerning its design, efficiency and effectiveness. In addition, the evaluation indicates the sustainability and impact the programme has had with a special emphasis on the coherence of the programme.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

The evaluation results are positive. They show that the programme has evolved to keep up with the technological and sociological considerations surrounding the safer use of the Internet by minors. It responds well to changing demands in the external environment as evidenced by the current emphasis on social media and cyber-bullying. However, to ensure the inclusion of new issues the programme needs to continue to explore new issues and have a long-term strategic vision.

The evaluation results further show that the programme is influential in relation to other national and international activities; literature, research and results from the programme are widely used and quoted. In addition, recommendations from the last programme evaluations have been broadly incorporated into the programme.

The programme was run efficiently. There are good levels of communication between the related EU programmes at policy level. The programme is also effective according to the evaluation. The achievements of the programme concerning the existence of hotlines, helplines and awareness centres in the majority of Member States are highlighted in the evaluation. The evaluation also concludes that the current focus and structure of the programme is appropriate and does not call for significant change in the next period. The support and funding from the programme is crucial for the projects to exist, especially considering the current economic constraints.

The overall picture of the programme is very positive; there is however room for improvements concerning some matters according to the evaluation findings. According to some stakeholders there still needs to be done further work to ensure that there is direct involvement of children. The projects call for longer funding periods to ensure better continuity and periods of reflection. There is a need for the programme to keep up to date with technological advances – through market intelligence, knowledge enhancement projects and general knowledge exchange. The programme must also be able to follow the developments in national contexts concerning issues related to legislation. The risk with national budget cuts and subsequent change of priorities implies that there is a need to ensure that national and regional priorities are coherent with European priorities to maximise the effect in the time to come.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

- The programme should not broaden its objectives but maintain its current ones. It is recommended to maintain a long-term strategic vision on the programme and its issues.
- The efficiency of the programme could be improved through longer funding periods for the projects and fewer restrictions on the internal allocation of funds.
- The networks of the hotlines, helplines and awareness centers should be further coordinated through joint events and working groups. In addition it is recommended to look at measures for increasing the consistent commitment of industry as well as further increase the international networking opportunities of key stakeholders.
- Concerning effectiveness it will be advisable to increase awareness of the work of the Safer Internet Programme to address a potential reduction in national/regional political support.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/activities/sip/docs/prog\\_2009\\_2013/FINAL%20REPORT%2020120124.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/sip/docs/prog_2009_2013/FINAL%20REPORT%2020120124.pdf)

## eContent Plus Final Evaluation

**ABB activities:**

09 03 ICT Take-up

**Timing:**

9/9/2011

### Background, scope and focus

The objective of the Programme was to make digital content in Europe more accessible, usable and exploitable, facilitating the creation and diffusion of information, in areas of public interest, at Community level.

In order to achieve the overall aim of the Programme, the following lines of action were addressed:

- (a) facilitating at Community level access to digital content, its use and exploitation;
- (b) improving quality and enhancing best practice related to digital content between content providers and users, and across sectors;
- (c) reinforcing cooperation between digital content stakeholders and awareness.

Via those lines of action, the Programme targeted areas which had a public interest and which would not have developed, or would have developed at a slower pace, if left to the market: geographic information, educational content and cultural and scientific/scholarly content digital libraries.

Pursuant to Article 5(3) of the Programme Decision, the Commission was to submit a final evaluation report at the end of the Programme. This evaluation has been carried out with the assistance of a panel of external experts who evaluated the effectiveness of the Programme, its achievements, its impact, its sustainability and its complementarity with other initiatives within and beyond the European Union, as well as with national initiatives. The findings of this final evaluation are based on available documentation, Commission data, a survey questionnaire, and follow-up interviews with selected project participants.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

The evaluators found that the Programme has been successful in achieving the objectives set out in the Programme Decision and in the annual work programmes adopted for its implementation. It has contributed to making digital content in Europe more accessible, usable and exploitable, facilitating the creation and diffusion of information, in areas of public interest. More specifically, the evaluation gave rise to the following conclusions:

- The Programme achievements are in line with its objectives: The Programme succeeded in creating better conditions for accessing, using, re-using and exploiting digital material, thus making it possible to build added-value products and services across Europe in the target areas selected. It helped content stakeholders (providers and users) realise the full potential of digital

content, and users are now able to access and use such content, irregardless of location or language;

- The Programme was managed efficiently;

- The impact on organisations participating in the Programme can only be estimated, since many projects are still running or have just ended. Indicatively, most organisations already recognise that participation in eContentplus projects has increased international and cross-border collaboration and made them more aware of the economic and cultural value of the digital content they own. In the area of digital libraries, the eContentplus Programme is the first programme whose main impact has been to make material directly available to individual citizens on a very large scale. In the area of educational content, a significant increase in the use of the underlying content is expected as a result of programme support. In addition, the involvement of national Ministries of Education in many of the projects is also likely to have an impact on the inclusion of eLearning in curricula. With regard to geographic information, programme support is expected to increase interoperability within a number of thematic areas under the INSPIRE Directive.

Challenges that have to be addressed are the following: Increased public funding is needed to finance large-scale digitisation, alongside initiatives with private partners provided that they allow a general accessibility of Europe's common cultural heritage online. Fragmentation and complexity in the current licensing system also hinders the digitisation of a large part of Europe's recent cultural heritage. Rights clearance must be improved, and the role and responsibilities of private and public organisations for digitising orphan works as well as material that is incopyright but no longer commercially available should be clarified.

#### MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

There is an increasing demand for quality digital content in Europe from citizens, students, researchers, SMEs and other business users or re-users wishing to exploit digital content resources to create services. This calls for continued support at European level to increase the availability of European digital content, in particular in areas of public interest where progress is likely to be slow and where access to content is limited by language and cultural barriers in particular.

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

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0548:FIN:En:PDF>

## 11 – Maritime Affairs and Fisheries

### Interim evaluation (study) of the European Fisheries Fund (2007-2013)

<b>ABB activities:</b>	11 06 European Fisheries Fund (EFF)
------------------------	-------------------------------------

<b>Timing:</b>	February 2011
----------------	---------------

#### Background, scope and focus

The European Fisheries Fund (EFF) is the financial instrument of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) for 2007-2013. The EFF total budget amounts to € 4.3 billion and seeks to grant financial support to the European fisheries sector for the period 2007-2013 to help it adapt to changes required within the sector.

The objective of this interim evaluation is to perform an up-to-date assessment of the uptake and first impacts of EFF measures implemented in the Member States as well as underpin impact analysis of the future financial instrument. It is also worth to mention that the evaluation took place at an early stage in the implementation of the programme.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

Partnership principle is generally well applied, despite under-representation of women's and environmental organisations. Partnership between EC and MS is satisfactory, but coordination is slightly too formal.

National Strategic Plan is a broad document which enables a better strategic view on the development of the sector in line with the CFP, but it entails a time-consuming process and is disregarded once the OP is in place.

Although useful in enhancing the reliability of Operational Program (OP) management, the set up and assessment of the Management Control System (MCS) was a lengthy and costly process (for both EC and MS). In certain MS, human resources were focused more on the closure of the FIGG programme(s) rather than the launch of the EFF programme. The shift towards one single OP has mainly benefited the EC whilst, on the whole, it has increased the management costs for most MS. Only some of these costs

Shift to one single OP has significantly increased the programme complexity as well as administrative burden in Federal States (and more generally MS having a decentralised management). The workload in terms of the audit function has significantly increased since FIGG. Although enabling better control and lowering financial risks, the administrative burden is too high for small MS that have to establish the same structures and systems regardless the programme size.

Administrative burden for the final beneficiaries has generally been reduced. It remains higher in new MS where the required paperwork to accompany applications may prevent potential beneficiaries from applying.

Some good practices are observed in assisting and reaching potential beneficiaries which is a key factor for fostering new projects. This is all the more important as OP are increasingly focused on developing innovative projects, which require more technical assistance to potential beneficiaries.

Regarding monitoring systems, existing indicators required by the EC are focused on output. They are numerous, not relevant for all MS, lack a common definition of the units to be measured, and are therefore not completely reliable. Indicators are not reported upon systematically nor verified, so they may be incomplete and contain errors

Finally, the program effectiveness has been undermined by low commitment rates under some measures linked with the issue of access to private co-financing. The list and organisation of current EFF measures requires review, so that the fund can be tailored in the future to avoid overlapping and respond to the most relevant needs. Whilst simple 'replacement' measures have been effective in terms of commitments, their focus is too individual and short term. This might limit the expected impacts in terms of environmental sustainability of the sector.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/eff\\_interim\\_evaluation\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/eff_interim_evaluation_en.pdf)

### **Interim evaluation of DG MARE external communication activities**

**ABB activities:**

11 04 Governance of the common fisheries policy

**Timing:**

February 2011

#### **Background, scope and focus**

In view of an increased demand at the political level from both EU institutions and Member States to communicate more often and effectively, the European Commission views its mission of communicating about the EU and its policies as a high priority. DG MARE has launched an evaluation that covers the external communication activities relating to both the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) and the Integrated Maritime Policy (IMP) performed over the 2007-2010 period.

## Summary of findings and conclusions

DG MARE is currently facing important policy challenges, especially with regard to the reform of the CFP. They are also linked to communication challenges considering on the one hand the extension in the scope of the types of stakeholders that goes together with the Integrated Maritime Policy (IMP) development and on the other hand the “going local” trend of the CFP which takes more and more into account the regional concerns. Means are limited, but areas for concrete action may be easily identified.

The following recommendations may be formulated. They are presented by priority:

1. Revise the strategy framework to build a strategic document with clear objectives, actions and target audiences declined into a real communication plan.

The communication is composed of four axes: target audiences, objectives, messages and tools. DG MARE should define a communication plan with a matrix view that shows the articulation between target audiences, objectives, tools and messages. A better targeted strategy in terms of audiences may help better address all communication objectives.

2. Refine the target audience definition and classification to better adapt the strategy to their needs

This recommendation consists of two priority tasks: Refine the definition of target audiences and classify them in a more detailed manner to be able to better take their needs into account and better analyse the needs of each target audience and reflect upon a process or tool that may enable to collect and update the needs analysis.

3. Adapt some of the key messages to improve CFP image and develop confidence and acceptance among the priority target audiences, i.e. the fishermen

4. Better manage existing communication tools to develop accessibility, readability and understandability of key information regarding CFP and IMP. Improving knowledge and understanding among the different target audiences could be easily achieved by improving the existing communication tools.

5. Put in place new strategic tools to improve efficiency

The development of an effective performance management of communication tools could be achieved through the development of an appropriate monitoring system with SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound) indicators. These indicators would be used to follow up the implementation of communication activities and to assess the effectiveness. A set of useful indicators could include both output and result indicators (no. of participants at an event per target audience, etc.)

6. Establish a newsletter tailored to the needs of each individual (good practice and expectation from most stakeholders)

One main recommendation from the stakeholders met during the evaluation process relates to the creation of a newsletter with content tailored to their specific needs. Indeed, they often complain about the fact that the information they search for is hard to find on the one hand, while they are overwhelmed with information (from DG MARE and other sources) that they do not need and do not have time to read on the other hand.

## Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/external\\_communication/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/external_communication/index_en.htm)

## Interim evaluation of the European Fisheries Fund (2007-2013)

Synthesis of the 26 national evaluation reports

### ABB activities:

11 06 European Fisheries Fund (EFF)

### Timing:

December 2011

### Background, scope and focus

The purpose of this report is to summarise the contents of the national interim evaluation reports on the European Fisheries Fund (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, which should also focus more widely on the content and progress of the implementation of national strategic plans, and develop the exchange of best practice among Member States, as prescribed in Article 16 of the EFF regulation.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

Since 2007, the sector was mainly impacted by the financial / economic crisis and 2007/2008 fuel crisis which resulted in reduced access to private finance, stronger public expenditure control increased financial and economic pressure on the sector (rising fuel costs, fish feed costs increase, rising unemployment), a decline in demand for fisheries products, and prices that have stagnated/ fallen. A few MS however highlight a rather limited or very temporary impact of fuel crisis on the sector. The crisis was sometimes seen as an opportunity to promote innovation and higher productivity in the sector, to switch to more economical methods of fishing and to restructure the fleet.

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.

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.



From a priority axis perspective, at 31 December 2010, the commitments by axes amounted to 47% of total EFF budget (M€ 575) for Axis 1, 43% (M€ 518) for Axis 2, 40% (M€ 451) for Axis 3, 6% (M€ 34) for Axis 4 and 21% (M€ 35) 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, FLAG group projects are generally still in the very early stages of implementation.

Generally speaking, sustainable development is effectively taken into account by EFF programmes, whilst the consideration given to gender and equal opportunity issues is more variable. The overall contribution of EFF programmes to the promotion of equal opportunity is neutral or marginally positive. The overall contribution of EFF programmes to environmental sustainability is improving, although it remains unclear.

#### 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)

### Mission d'évaluation à mi-parcours du Plan Régional de Surveillance des Pêches dans le Sud-Ouest de l'Océan Indien

#### ABB activities:

11 03 International fisheries and law of the sea

#### Timing:

November 2011

#### Background, scope and focus

La Commission européenne a décidé conformément à ses engagements internationaux de lutter contre la pêche INN, notamment au travers de son "Plan d'action communautaire en vue d'éradiquer la pêche INN"<sup>1</sup>. A ce titre, et suite aux engagements des Chefs d'Etat de la COI en 2005, et à la déclaration de 2007 des Ministres de la COI en charge de la pêche, une convention-cadre de partenariat intitulée "COI – Plan régional de surveillance des pêches dans le sud-ouest de l'océan Indien" a été signée le 24 janvier 2007 à Mahé, Seychelles, entre la CE et le Secrétariat général de la COI. Cette convention cadre fixe les modalités de mise en œuvre du projet intitulé "Projet régional de surveillance des pêches dans le sud-ouest de l'océan Indien." (PRSP). Le PRSP est structuré autour d'un objectif politique et d'un environnement législatif

<sup>1</sup> [COM\(2002\)0180 final](#) Communication from the Commission - Community action plan for the eradication of illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing

défini par la réunion ministérielle de Mahé, d'une méthode et d'une liste d'actions détaillée dans la convention cadre et les conventions spécifiques.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

Pertinent, le projet s'inscrit pleinement dans les orientations générales de l'UE en matière de pêche responsable et durable et de coopération régionale ainsi que dans la politique de la COI. Le projet dispose d'une forte cohérence interne. Le délai entre l'engagement des Etats membres de la COI à se doter d'une stratégie régionale de pêche et de lutter conjointement contre la pêche IUU et la mise en œuvre du projet aura été exceptionnellement court (24 mois) pour un projet de cette envergure. Le dispositif organisationnel construit et le fonctionnement sur un mode "réseau" a particulièrement bien fonctionné. Il y a eu adéquation entre la nature des actions engagées par le projet et les procédures financières imposées. Les résultats obtenus par le projet sont conformes aux résultats attendus à l'origine du projet. En termes d'efficience des moyens engagés par la CE et les Etats membres, les résultats doivent être considérés comme très satisfaisants. Il y a une unanimité des administrations nationales et du Secrétariat Général de la COI à considérer ce projet comme un succès et à le voir se pérenniser sans interruption, y compris au prix d'une sollicitation financière plus grande des Etats membres.

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

Not yet published.

## **An ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the European Union and Madagascar (2007-2012)**

**ABB activities:**

11 03 International fisheries and law of the sea

**Timing:**

November 2011

### **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 Madagascar (2007-2012). The evaluation considers the Protocol in terms of its relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The ex-post evaluation of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between Madagascar and the European Community in terms of effectiveness indicates that the agreement reaches most of its goals.

The reference tonnage has been set at a level close to the actual catch, which does not entail a disproportionate cost for the agreement. For the European fleets, the access costs are advantageous, especially for the surface longliners. The agreement has an important economic leverage. The agreement can therefore be qualified as efficient.

The FPA relevance has been verified. The European tuna seiners fleets fishing in the Indian Ocean need access to fishing grounds that represent a significant share of their total catch, allowing them also to land their catch close to their fishing grounds. The surface longliner fleet targets a resource in the Malagasy waters it could barely find in any other area where it could operate. The agreement allows Madagascar to monetize an under-exploited natural resource which is not currently targeted by its own industry and which feeds into an important processing industry in Madagascar. On this particular point, the surface longliners has less impact than the tuna seiners. Support for SCS and sanitary control meets Madagascar's needs to perform their duties at a satisfactory level.

The agreement contributes to the viability of the European tuna supply chain by granting access to the Madagascar fishing zone under a multiannual stable legal framework. It reinforces the implementation of management measures at the national and regional level and contributes to maintaining fishing activities in the region. The European fleets do not fish on the continental shelf and therefore do not compete with local traditional fishermen. FPA sectoral support is allocated to actions which contribute strongly to the Malagasy fishing sector viability

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

Not yet published.

**An ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the European Union and Cape Verde (2007-2011)**

**ABB activities:**

11 03 International fisheries and law of the sea

**Timing:**

October 2010, published on 22/7/2011

**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 Cape Verde (2007-2011). It covers the period of 1 September 2006 to 31 August 2011. The evaluation considers the Protocol in terms of its relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability

**Summary of findings and conclusions**

For the EU the Fisheries Partnership Agreement has provided access to fishing opportunities for EU fleet segments from fishery dependent areas, created employment, and provided for additional supplies to the EU market. There is a realistic potential to link catches by EU vessels to Cape Verdean processing and export activities. Although it has had no impact on IUU fishing until now, the Agreement has potential to achieve this in future. The Agreement provides an additional dimension to the Special Partnership between the EU and an important Peripheral Region Nation, and could complement a future Atlantic dimension to the EU's Integrated Maritime Policy. There are specific synergies with a number of EDF regional development programmes (ACP Fish II, SFP and the forthcoming regional MCS programme implemented by CSRP). The Agreement may therefore be considered coherent with the EU's fisheries, maritime and development policies.

For Cape Verde the Agreement has provided about 24% of the financial means for public investment in fisheries, thus contributing towards economic development and sustainability of the sector. It has had a particular impact (along with donor support) on building institutional capacity, providing facilities for small scale fisheries and improving compliance with EU sanitary conditions for trade in fishery products, all important conditions for increasing the economic contribution of the fishery sector.

Overall the Agreement has also allowed the EU and the Cape Verde Authorities to maintain a policy dialogue, with a view to promoting responsible fishing, although the success of the partnership approach has so far been limited by the low level of engagement, a sub-optimal intervention design and weak integration with linked donor programmes. Nevertheless, despite the under-performance of some aspects of the Agreement, **it appears that it is strongly in the interest of both parties to conclude a new protocol that would prolong this partnership between Cape Verde and the European Union.**

### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/cape\\_verde\\_2010/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/cape_verde_2010/index_en.htm)

### An ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the European Union and Guinea Bissau (2007-2011)

#### ABB activities:

11 03 International fisheries and law of the sea

#### Timing:

September 2010, publication on 22/7/2011

#### 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 Guinea Bissau (2007-2011). It covers the period of 16 June 2007 to 15 June 2011. The evaluation considers the Protocol in terms of its relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

The Fisheries Partnership Agreement has provided access to fishing opportunities for EU fleet segments from fishery dependent areas, created employment, and provided for additional supplies to the EU market. The Agreement accounts for about one quarter of all transfers from the EU to Guinea Bissau, and the Agreement therefore provides an important supplementary pillar of support. The Agreement has started to deliver important developmental outcomes in terms of reduced IUU fishing, as well as the prospects of increased trade in fishery products and is therefore coherent with the EU's national and regional development approaches. Its support for fisheries MCS means that the Agreement is coherent with the EU's approach to reducing IUU fishing. The Agreement has also allowed the EU and the Guinea Bissau Authorities to maintain a policy dialogue, with a view to promoting responsible fishing. As a conclusion, it appears that it is strongly in the interest of both parties to conclude a new protocol that would prolong this partnership between Guinea Bissau and the European Union.

## Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/guinea\\_bissau\\_2010/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/guinea_bissau_2010/index_en.htm)

## An ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the European Union and Mauritania, and an ex-ante evaluation and analysis of impacts of a potential future Protocol on sustainability

### ABB activities:

11 03 International fisheries and law of the sea

### Timing:

March 2011

### Background, scope and focus

This evaluation provides a retrospective ex-post evaluation for the existing Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the EU and Mauritania. It covers the period of 1 August 2008 to 31 July 2012. The evaluation considers the Protocol in terms of its relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. It also provides a prospective analysis of impacts and ex-ante evaluation of a future Protocol, in order to provide sufficient data and information for the negotiation and implementation of a new Protocol.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

The scientific advice should be reinforced, both on the level of Mauritania and of CECAF/COPACE. It would be appropriate that COPACE become an independent body being able to deliver high quality scientific advice. On the other hand, the Joint scientific Committee EU/Mauritania should be provided with a permanent secretariat.

Related to the pelagic fishery, Member States concerned have to find a distribution key as the management of the global quota appears not to be efficient. Parallel to that, it would be appropriate to suppress the mechanism of additional catches, paid exclusively by the EU budget.

In terms of sectoral support, the monitoring of the expenses should be substituted rather by indicators of results. Moreover, a conditionality related to the achieved progress has to be introduced (payment in tranches).

There is a need for a better synergy between development policy instruments (EDF) and the FPA. EDF could possibly build up some fisheries actions, supporting more infrastructure

projects.

It is desirable to maintain an annual rhythm to organise Joint Committee sessions which are an important tool to smoothly manage the Protocol.

Presence of scientific observers on board of EU vessels should be more emphasized and EU ship-owners should get more involved.

Concerning the cross-border management of the pelagic stocks, there is a need for coordination between the FPA with Morocco in order to introduce a regional approach.

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

Not yet published.

## **An ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the European Union and Gabon, and an ex-ante evaluation and analysis of impacts of a potential future Protocol on sustainability**

### **ABB activities:**

11 03 International fisheries and law of the sea

### **Timing:**

June 2011

### **Background, scope and focus**

This evaluation provides a retrospective ex-post evaluation for the existing Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the EU and Gabon. It covers the period of 2005 to 2011. The evaluation considers the Protocol in terms of its relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. It also provides a prospective analysis of impacts and ex-ante evaluation of a future Protocol, in order to provide sufficient data and information for the negotiation and implementation of a new Protocol.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The relevance of the agreement is verified for both parties. EU distant-water tuna fishing vessels need an access to a fishing zone that represents about 10% of their catches in the Atlantic. The

agreement gives to Gabon the opportunity to derive income from their fishery resources present in the remote parts of the EEZ in the absence of national fishing vessels able to exploit them. The agreement does not have any particular impact on the sustainability of exploitation of fishery resources in the EEZ of Gabon as the European vessels exploit fishing possibilities within the rules set by the Regional Fisheries Management Organisation in charge of management and conservation of this shared tuna resource. The agreement is likely to contribute indirectly to the biological viability of exploitation through the financial support allocated to control and surveillance and research, but the contribution cannot be evaluated in more detail. Several recommendations are proposed to improve the performances of a new protocol of agreement. These recommendations concern the level of fishing possibilities, improving the transparency of the agreement at national level, a revision of the implementing modalities of the sectoral partnership to take into consideration input indicators as opposed to output indicators, and a proactive role of the EU in the monitoring and coordination of interventions of external donors in the fisheries sector.

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

Not available until end of the negotiation. It is confidential at the moment.

### **An ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the European Union and Mozambique (2007-2011)**

#### **ABB activities:**

11 03 International fisheries and law of the sea

#### **Timing:**

June 2011

#### **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 Mozambique (2007-2011). The evaluation considers the Protocol in terms of its relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability



### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The first Protocol of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the EU and Mozambique has clearly benefited the mutual interests of both parties. For the EU, it has proved to be highly relevant to the Common Fisheries Policy (since it provides access to fishing opportunities for EU vessels, supporting their regional presence in the SW Indian Ocean), with associated (albeit modest) financial and economic benefits to the EU. For Mozambique it has allowed the generation of financial income from national fisheries resources which at present the country does not have the capacity to exploit.

The issue of piracy has impacted severely on the utilisation of the Protocol, but it should also be noted that vessels which have continued to use the opportunities have experienced increasing catch rates in throughout the 4 years. The FPA provided about 60% of the income generated by Mozambique from this fishery and has therefore clearly been in Mozambique's interest. Mozambique has elected to apply all of this to the fishery sector budget, thus delivering general benefits to the sector. However it derives no other economic benefits from the presence of the EU vessels. Until now, the policy support measures adopted by the parties to the FPA have not been specifically linked to the Fisheries Master Plan. The Agreement has had less relevance to Mozambican fisheries policy as set out in the poverty reduction strategy and Fisheries Master Plan II, although it has contributed indirectly via the sectoral support measures which have helped to promote sustainable exploitation of resources, to strengthen the fight against IUU activities, and to strengthening institutional capacity of the sector. In conclusion, although there are concerns regarding the efficiency of the Agreement and the effectiveness so far of the partnership component, it has proved overall to be a useful tool for furthering the mutual policy objectives of the parties.

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

Not available until end of the negotiation. It is confidential at the moment.

### **An ex-post evaluation of the current Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the European Union and Mozambique (2007-2011)**

#### **ABB activities:**

11 03 International fisheries and law of the sea

#### **Timing:**

September 2011

## **Background, scope and focus**

This evaluation provides a retrospective ex-post evaluation for the existing Protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the EU and Greenland and Denmark (2007-2012). The evaluation considers the Protocol in terms of its relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

## **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The ex-post evaluation of the FPA between the EU and indicates that the agreement has clearly been of immense mutual benefit to the parties.

It is highly relevant to the policy objectives of both. The FPA has been effective, with a good level of utilisation of the fishing opportunities provided with associated financial and economic benefits, and has allowed the implementation of a much strengthened policy framework for sustainable fisheries by Greenland (particularly in terms of research and fisheries control).

The FPA has not been as efficient as it could have been, due to the inclusion of some quotas which are not available, or not commercially viable, all of which have contributed to underutilisation of some fishing opportunities.

Given the major achievements in ensuring the functioning of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement, and the goodwill and mutual benefits this has generated, all efforts should be made to keep it in place by renewal of the Protocol, and to ensure a more sustainable implementation of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement in future.

FPA sectoral support is allocated to actions which contribute strongly to the Greenlandic fishing sector viability.

The parties are therefore recommended to consider establishing a renewed protocol for a period of three years from 2013. This will also allow for new measures within the reformed Common Fisheries Policy to be reflected in the design of a new Protocol, and also allow adjustment to achieve coherence with other emerging EU policy areas, including the EU's Arctic Policy in relation to maritime and environmental matters.

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

In the process of preparation for publication.

## 12 – Internal Market

### Evaluation of the Professional Qualifications Directive

<b>ABB activities concerned:</b>	12 02 Single Market Policy
----------------------------------	----------------------------

<b>Timing:</b>	5/07/2011
----------------	-----------

#### Background, scope and focus

The Professional Qualifications Directive (Directive 2005/36/EC) is aimed at facilitating mobility within the EU: it defines a set of rules allowing professionals qualified in one Member State to exercise their profession in another Member State.

The purpose of the evaluation was to assess how the rules for the recognition of professional qualifications work in practice and whether there is scope for improvement. The evaluation covered the various situations in which the Directive applies (establishment and temporary mobility), the different regimes set out in the Directive (general system and automatic recognition) and the most relevant horizontal provisions (assessment of language skills, recognition of third country diplomas, administrative cooperation and assistance to citizens).

The evaluation of the Directive was undertaken with a view to modernising the rules for the recognition of qualifications and facilitating the mobility of workers, as announced in the Communication on the Single Market Act in October 2010. The findings of the evaluation were used to prepare the impact assessment for the legislative proposal modernising the Professional Qualifications Directive (proposal adopted on 19/12/2011).

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

The main findings of the evaluation are presented below:

- The legislation on the recognition of professional qualifications has been effective in facilitating labour mobility within the EU, in particular for the professions benefiting from automatic recognition. The mobility of professionals is determined by a variety of factors (language, family situation, education, remuneration) and in most cases, the recognition of professional qualifications does not constitute an obstacle but rather supports access to the profession in another Member State. The experience gained by competent authorities in the recognition of qualifications will be particularly helpful in tackling the decline of the active working population in the EU and the increasing demand for highly-qualified jobs.
- The *acquis* on professional qualifications constitutes a pragmatic approach to the differences

existing between Member States in the regulation of professions and in education systems. The procedures set out in the Directive offer guarantees for professionals seeking the recognition of their qualifications, including in cases where the profession is not regulated in the host Member State. However, the objective of establishing transparent, uniform and quick recognition procedures has not been achieved: the findings of the evaluation show that there are still concerns about access to information and the complexity and length of procedures, in particular under the general system.

- The new system introduced for the free provision of services constitutes a first simplification for professionals moving on a temporary basis. The outcome of the evaluation shows that there is still space for further simplification of the administrative requirements under this regime.
- The legislation on the recognition of professional qualifications has not undermined the quality of professional services. Some provisions of the Directive need to be further examined in order to reach the right balance between the need to facilitate mobility and the public interest (e.g. provisions on language skills to be clarified in the view of strengthening patients' safety; minimum training requirements to be reviewed in order to adapt to the evolution of the professions).

**Availability of the report on Europa :**

[http://ec.europa.eu/internal\\_market/qualifications/docs/news/20110706-evaluation-directive-200536ec\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/qualifications/docs/news/20110706-evaluation-directive-200536ec_en.pdf)

**Impact and Effectiveness of EU Public Procurement Legislation**

<b>ABB activities concerned:</b>	12 02 Single Market Policy

<b>Timing:</b>	26/06/2011
----------------	------------

**Background, scope and focus**

Under the Community rules public sector procurement must follow transparent open procedures ensuring fair conditions of competition for suppliers (apart from exempted sectors and for purchases below thresholds).

The current legislative package of public procurement Directives approved in 2004 (DIR 2004/17/EC and DIR2004/18/EC), aimed at simplifying and modernising procurement procedures, for example by facilitating electronic procurement in the public sector or by

introducing more scope for dialogue between contracting authorities and tenderers.

After almost four years from the deadline for transposition of the above Directives into the national legislation (31.1.2006), there is the need to get an interim evaluation of the effects of such Directives in fostering the internal market

The evaluation provides an overview of the current functioning of EU public procurement legislation in MS in order to assess the progress that has been made in applying the EU rule and to provide indications as to whether the desired objectives have been achieved.

This will help the Commission respond to concerns about the relevance or cost-effectiveness of the current legislative rules, and identify areas where the Directives are subject to improvement. The evaluation could also serve as the starting point for preparing the modernisation of EU procurement legislation.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The evaluation draws on a comprehensive body of evidence and new independent research. It finds that EU public procurement Directives have helped to establish a culture of transparency and outcome-driven procurement in the EU. This has triggered competition for public contracts, and generated savings and improvements in the quality of procurement outcomes. Open and competitive public procurement has driven down costs by around 4%, generating savings of approximately €20 billion. This far exceeds the costs generated by the regulatory framework, which are estimated to be €5 billion.

While responses to the consultation reveal diverging views on the priority that should be given to each of the different objectives of the reform there is strong support for simplification, improving market access, notably for SMEs and fostering innovation. There is also a certain consensus that streamlining the procedures and making them more flexible is particularly important and that all actors of the procurement world could greatly benefit from it.

The Commission will draw on the evidence collected in the evaluation, and the insights obtained from stakeholder consultation, to prepare its legislative proposals before the end of 2011. The priorities for legislative reform will be debated at a landmark public procurement conference in Brussels on June 30th.

Additionally, the evaluation reveals scope for efforts to strike a better balance between the costs of the regulatory system and the resulting benefits – particularly for lower value purchases. The average public procurement procedure takes 108 days and costs €28,000 - 3/4 of which is accounted for by the costs of preparing tenders (5.4 tenders received on average) and 1/4 for the contracting public authority. The worst performing Member States take 3 times longer to complete a purchase than the best-performing.

The feedback statement on the Green Paper consultation reveals that all different stakeholder groups (public authorities, business, civil society organisations, legal experts as well as individual citizens) have a strong interest in the upcoming reform.

The findings from the evaluation and the responses to the Green Paper provide a substantial body of evidence and opinion on the functioning of existing legislation, as well as identifying some scope for improvement. They will be invaluable in the preparation of the legislative proposal, which will be published by the Commission before the end of 2011.

The next step in this legislative reform process will be a Commission-hosted conference on June 30th. This will give leading policy-makers, procurement practitioners and civil society the opportunity to discuss the priorities for the legislative reform. The evaluation and responses to

the Green Paper set the scene

**Availability of the report on Europa:**

[http://ec.europa.eu/internal\\_market/publicprocurement/modernising\\_rules/evaluation/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publicprocurement/modernising_rules/evaluation/index_en.htm)

## 13 – Regional Policy

### Policy analysis on the performance of cohesion policy 2007 – 2013

Task 1: Policy Paper on Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency of Residential Housing

Task 2: Country reports on achievements of cohesion policy

**ABB activities:**

13 04 Cohesion Fund

**Timing:**

December 2011

#### Background, scope and focus

There are 27 papers delivered by the network of experts whose role is to synthesize evidence on the performance of Cohesion policy in the 2007-2013 period by examining the physical and financial performance of the operational programmes and evaluation and other evidence available. Every year the expert network produces country reports on the achievements of cohesion policy and on a selected theme. All reports look at the physical and financial performance of the operational programmes and analyses evidence coming from evaluations undertaken in the Member States.

For 2011 the network of experts produced for every Member State a report on the achievements of cohesion policy and a policy paper on renewable energy and energy efficiency in residential housing. The network also identified examples of good practice in evaluation (interesting methods, good data, etc.). The main findings from all country reports are summarized in the synthesis reports which contain comparative analysis and trends across the EU (the synthesis report has been delivered in February 2012; therefore there is no specific reference to it in this document).

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

The findings emerged from the 27 analyses for **Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency of Residential Housing** are:

- Substantial amount of support provided by national governments across the EU for renewable energy, even if difficult to estimate in practice, and far exceeds the resources allocated from the ERDF and Cohesion Fund to this;
- There is need to clarify the role of Cohesion policy, if it is used to supplement the support given by national measures or it has a relevant contribution in funding it;
- Scale of support for increasing energy efficiency in housing is also difficult to estimate; however, it is small as compared with the support going to renewables;

- There is a clear role for Cohesion policy to provide support to investment to energy efficiency, so contributing to social cohesion and territorial balance through helping to even up housing and, therefore, living conditions across the Union, especially in the EU12 countries where the need for improvements in the energy efficiency of housing is considerable, though also in some of the more depressed parts of the EU15

The findings emerged from the 27 analyses of the **achievements of cohesion policy** are:

- delays in implementing programmes have expanded the funding remaining to be spent over the remainder of the period and increased the risk that priority will be given to absorption instead of to the most effective way of pursuing development objectives;
- the austerity measures implemented in many countries together with tight budget constraints mean that the EU funds are likely to be the major, and in some countries almost the only, source of finance for development expenditure over the next few years;
- though constraints on government expenditure give an incentive for the authorities concerned to increase the effectiveness of the spending which does take place, in a number of countries there is a question-mark over their capacity to do so in practice;
- the information in the Annual Implementation Reports is, in general, in a form which makes it difficult to assess progress in implementing programmes in a meaningful way and to identify what has tangibly been achieved through the expenditure so far carried out;
- the greater freedom given to Member States with regard to evaluation has resulted in the number and scope of those carried out varying widely across the EU, with some countries making little effort to evaluate policy outcomes, but with most undertaking more focused evaluations than in the past.
- at the same time there are signs of progress in implementing programmes, much more evidence of achievements from the expenditure carried out and clearer indications that the change in approach to evaluations for the current programming period is having the intended effect. In many Member States, therefore, more relevant and more detailed evaluations of specific measures and issues are being carried out.

These reports are being used to communicate the results of Cohesion Policy programmes. DG Regio is using them in its dialogue with the Member States to ensure action is taken to improve the quality of current programmes. They are also feeding into the position papers of the future policy.

#### **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)



## **Enterprise support: support to SMEs and large enterprises in Italy, including a comparison of grants and other financial instruments**

*Evaluation related study*

<b>ABB activities:</b>	13 03 European Regional Development Fund and other regional operations
------------------------	--

<b>Timing:</b>	June 2012
----------------	-----------

### **Background, scope and focus**

This study examined two cases of enterprise support – an investment grant available throughout Italy (Law 488) and various SME schemes in the region of Piemonte.

A particular advantage of the study was the access to several detailed administrative data sources from the Statistical Archive of Active Enterprises (ASIA) assembled by the Italian Statistical Agency (ISTAT). This, along with the availability of a clear control group in both cases (narrowly rejected enterprises for Law 488, almost random allocation between different forms of support in Piemonte) gives a high degree of confidence in the results.

In addition, a beneficiary survey was conducted to allow a comparison with more traditional methods of estimating impact.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

- Both monitoring data (reporting 82,000 jobs supported) and the beneficiary survey (reporting 36,000 jobs created) proved to be very poor estimators of actual jobs created under Law 488 (12,000). This adds weight to the argument to use counterfactuals (not monitoring or beneficiary surveys) to assess impact.
- Impacts under Law 488 are confined to SMEs – large enterprises are using the money for projects they would have carried out anyhow. Interestingly, this is where the size effect ends – results are remarkably consistent and positive over the subgroups of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises.
- Even allowing for firm size, smaller grants are much more cost-effective than larger ones: cost per jobs averaged €79,000 for the smallest grants (less than €125,000), rising to €489,000 for the largest grants (above €500,000).
- The study provides a first indication of the relative merits of soft loans and grants: the loans had a cost per job around half that of grants plus a surprisingly high impact on investment – EUR 5 per euro of gross grant equivalent.
- The quality of the jobs created (using productivity and payroll costs as a proxy) is usually

similar to average jobs in the enterprises concerned. And, in the case of the loans, the quality is actually slightly higher than average.

This report has provided the evidence base for the Commission proposal to exclude large enterprises from general ERDF support schemes.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/information/evaluations/impact\\_evaluation\\_en.cfm#1](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information/evaluations/impact_evaluation_en.cfm#1)

### **Counterfactual impact evaluation of cohesion policy** Work package 2: Examples from Support to Innovation and Research

**ABB activities:**

13 04 Cohesion Fund

**Timing:**

December 2011

#### **Background, scope and focus**

This study examined publicly available beneficiary and commercial databases in various Member States. The goal was to see where data allowed a counterfactual impact evaluation of innovation support.

Of 10 cases examined, 5 were eliminated from the analysis because of small numbers of ERDF innovation projects and hence small sample size (Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Flanders, London and Wales). Spain was eliminated because of poor beneficiary data, France was eliminated because, although beneficiary data was otherwise complete, it was not possible to tell the year in which the support had been given. A counterfactual analysis was therefore conducted for the Czech republic (impact on patents) and Germany (impact on R&D investment and a wide range of innovative behaviours, as measured by the Community Innovation Survey).

#### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The study noted a range of problems encountered in the beneficiary data. It therefore made a series of specific recommendations for reporting in the future programming period, including a

clear and unique firm identification as well as a description of assistance which makes clear both purpose and timing.

During the financial crisis, patent applications fell by 63% in non-supported enterprises in the Czech republic but only 14% in supported enterprises.

The subsidized firms in the German sample show a median R&D intensity of 6.2%. Without a grant from the ERDF, they would have only achieved an estimated R&D intensity of 4.4% - an increase of just over 40%.

In fact, the representative firm would have had R&D expenditure of 213,000 EUR without ERDF. The grant increases R&D expenditure to about 300,000 EUR. Thus, the treatment effect in terms of EUR amounts to 87,000 EUR, on average, for a typical grant size of up to 51,000 EUR. Although there is a margin of uncertainty here, this suggests that each euro of public money is additional and levers in more than half a euro of extra private money.

In addition, R&D grants in Germany impacted on a wide range of measures from the Community Innovation Survey, from product and process innovation to initiating new innovative projects (and not abandoning old ones).

This effect was mostly additive when considering national grants, however there was only a weak correlation with grant size (suggesting smaller grants, repeated in later years if necessary, would be particularly effective – further research would be necessary to validate this finding).

This evaluation provides rigorous evidence on the performance of Cohesion Policy investments in R&D. It further tests the use of the counterfactual method and it helped define the requirements for publication of beneficiary data in new regulation for 2014 – 2020.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/information/evaluations/impact\\_evaluation\\_en.cfm#2](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information/evaluations/impact_evaluation_en.cfm#2)

### **Data-Linking and Impact Evaluation in Northern Ireland**

*Evaluation related study*

#### **ABB activities:**

13 03 European Regional Development Fund and other regional operations

#### **Timing:**

November 2011

#### **Background, scope and focus**

This study tracked 480 firms (253 Invest NI clients and 227 non-assisted firms) for which annual GVA, turnover and data were available. The goal was to estimate the impact of assistance using counterfactuals. This was not straightforward, since supported firms can be quite different to non-supported firms (making it more difficult to find similar "matches").

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The main findings and conclusions of the study were:

- There was a significant positive impact on GVA and turnover.
- Impact on employment was not statistically significant, but positive at around 2% per annum. Over the period 2001-2007, employment in non-assisted manufacturing firms fell by 3.9% per annum - for assisted firms the drop was only 1.9%. There was a similar boost in the business service sector, where non-assisted firms grew by about 4.9% per annum, while assisted firms grew by 6.9%.

This study provides a further input to the accumulation of evidence in relation to enterprise support.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/information/evaluations/impact\\_evaluation\\_en.cfm#3](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information/evaluations/impact_evaluation_en.cfm#3)

## **Ex post evaluation of cohesion policy interventions 2000-2006 financed by the Cohesion Fund**

Work Package B: Cost-benefit analysis of selected transport projects

<b>ABB activities:</b>	13 04 Cohesion Fund
------------------------	---------------------

<b>Timing:</b>	20 June 2011
----------------	--------------

### **Background, scope and focus**

This study contains an ex post evaluation of a selection of ten transport projects in EU countries benefitting from EU Cohesion and ISPA funding during the period 2000-2006. The method used was ex post cost benefit analysis. The study is one of three studies commissioned by DG REGIO to assess the effects of the Cohesion Fund and ISPA on economic and social cohesion and draw

lessons for the future. These studies are package A (overall); package B (transport); and package C (environment).

### Summary of findings and conclusions

All projects delivered **value for money**.

The Cohesion Fund **contribution was needed** to unlock the economic benefits of these projects. **Benefits** from these projects come from 8 categories (travel time savings, vehicle operating costs, safety improvements, carbon emission, air and noise reduction and other). Generally, the **utilisation rates** found are compatible with the objective to build in sufficient spare capacity to give room for growth over a project's lifetime. It was difficult to establish a **direct causal link** between the transport infrastructure investments and the wider socio-economic impacts (especially relevant for GDP).

**Cost-benefit analysis (CBA) as a method:** The CBA framework used for the appraisal of these projects is both consistent with DG REGIO's guidelines and with good practice. However, the scope of the ex ante analysis has often been narrower than what would be ideal. Different EU Member States use different appraisal parameters. This in itself is not an issue, but there appears to be little similarity in some instances between the values used and other sources for these values, such as HEATCO. The study identified weaknesses in the demand modelling, the definitions of the counterfactuals and the modelling of network effects.

**Effectiveness of CBA in decision-making (supporting the project generation and project decision of the Member States and the Commission).** Whilst cost-benefit analysis is regularly used worldwide, it forms only part of a broader decision-making process – even in countries with a long history of using it. For many of the reviewed projects, the study found that CBA had been used mainly to confirm that the project offered value for money and to support the application to access EU funding.

**Utility of ex post CBA (from the point of view of the project promoters, Member States and the Commission).** Ex post CBA can add value to the planning process. It adds transparency, strengthens the evidence base and provides feedback on the methods and techniques used to design and appraise the infrastructure. For these reasons, active ex post CBA programmes have been in place for some time in the UK and in France, for example.

**Ex post CBA as a tool for evaluating project impacts.** Ex post CBA's main strengths are its holistic approach, that is, its ability to consider a project as a whole, as well as its ability to deliver an unambiguous indicator of a project's economic worth. A further strength of ex post transport CBA is that it focuses on the direct impacts of the transport project and their associated externalities.

### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/expost2006/wpb\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/expost2006/wpb_en.htm)

**Ex post evaluation of cohesion policy interventions 2000-2006 financed by the  
Cohesion Fund (including former ISPA)**  
Work Package C – Cost benefit analysis of environment projects

**ABB activities:**

13 04 Cohesion Fund

**Timing:**

May 2011

**Background, scope and focus**

The objective of the evaluation is to carry out ex post cost benefit analyses for 10 environment projects co-financed by the Cohesion Fund (including former ISPA) and to learn from these analyses for the current and future programming periods.

**Summary of findings and conclusions**

**General conclusions based on the ten Cost-Benefit Analyses:**

1. Many of the environment infrastructure projects were carried out to meet legal requirements.
  - Legal compliance in itself does not ensure positive impacts in economic welfare terms – in most cases this was achieved at costs that exceeded the benefits that could be monetised
  - Achieving positive ENPV may be impossible on project level; especially where the main objective of projects were to meet regulatory requirements
2. In the two cases with objectives other than compliance, the environmental focus was found to be relevant to the needs of the region
3. Generally, the projects generated positive side effects in terms of environmental awareness and institutional learning
4. Distributional effects are also important to be considered:
  - many projects benefit low-income regions, indirectly paid by higher income regions; however
  - CBA as a tool does not capture such distributional effects.

**How to improve ex ante CBA:**

1. CBA thinking should apply to the selection of alternatives, prior to the final design of the project, and integrated into the decision process.
2. Do the CBAs much earlier in the process. A solid CBA should precede the final technical design of the project, and examine individual components of projects.

3. CBA to be related to the Master Plan context.
4. Cost efficiency analysis could be considered for 'need to have' projects.
5. Clearer distinction between the financial and the economic CBA.

**Findings on ex post CBA:**

1. Timing matters: ex post analysis is too early right after project completion
2. Starting from individual components is the easiest way to identify the benefit elements
3. Concentrate on valorisation of the main benefit elements
4. Wider benefits are often important outcomes but which are difficult to quantify

**Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/expost2006/wpc\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/expost2006/wpc_en.htm)

**Ex post evaluation of cohesion policy interventions 2000-2006 financed by the  
Cohesion Fund (including former ISPA)  
Work Package D – Management and Implementation**

**ABB activities:**

13 04 Cohesion Fund

**Timing:**

April 2012

**Background, scope and focus**

The objective of the evaluation is to assess the building up of management capacity to deliver ISPA and Cohesion Fund projects in the 14 countries benefiting most from the Cohesion Fund and ISPA in the 2000-2006 programming period (not included are Malta, Cyprus and Croatia).

**Summary of findings and conclusions**

Capacity-building support has been long term and multi-layered. Technical Assistance approvals cover a broad spectrum, allowing an adaptive use of resources. The impact of experience on

capacity is evident in a number of areas, including: administrative structures culture; tools and procedures; managerial, technical and financial skills; the decentralisation of responsibilities; and better coordination.

Important steps have already been taken to improve the performance of the CF delivery system, such as flexibility in the period for eligible expenditure and in the context of the 2007-13 Regulations. In the context of the post-2013 reform of Cohesion policy, there is an opportunity to review procedures for the Cohesion Fund in the light of the reduced risk that exists in the post-enlargement environment, and as a result of the experience accumulated since 2000.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/expost2006/wpd\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/expost2006/wpd_en.htm)

### **Study on the relevance and effectiveness of ERDF and Cohesion Fund support to regions with specific geographical features – islands, mountainous and sparsely populated areas**

*Evaluation related study*

**ABB activities:**

13 04 Cohesion Fund

**Timing:**

February 2012

#### **Background, scope and focus**

This study analyzed the extent to which cohesion policy interventions have been appropriate and effective in the special territories for the 2000-2006 and 2007-2013 periods. It was carried out for both periods 2000–2006 and 2007–2013 and was based on analysis of ERDF/CF impact on fifteen NUTS2 regions, and six NUTS3 areas.

#### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

Main findings: ERDF and CF are appropriate tools for the development of regions with specific geographical features, providing the necessary funding, flexibilities and focus to encourage the realisation of effective projects.

A number of common characteristics emerged among these regions and areas, including:



- an outflow of young people, low natural birth rates and ageing local populations;
- reliance on particular ‘assets’, including natural resources, climate, landscapes and the development of tourism or related activities; and
- a lack of ‘critical mass’ in terms of the size of domestic markets, the number of skilled workers, access to training, and potential for inward investment.

The study found that ERDF and CF offer significant added value by:

- providing a long-term, stable financial framework in which regions can develop a range of projects;
- acting as an important catalyst to attract domestic funding for important projects;
- providing a flexible tool to meet specific needs and challenges, while remaining complementary to other domestic and EU Funds; and
- improving strategic focus, stakeholder involvement, and levels of ‘good governance’.

The study concluded that the two financial instruments could become even more effective by highlighting geographical specificities at each stage in the funding process and not perceiving them as ‘problems’. A further finding was that the policy should move beyond infrastructure development as the main funding objective, instead concentrating on a limited number of priorities that have already proven advantageous for the region – namely an asset-based approach. In addition, more supple multi-level governance arrangements would be advantageous for the success of regional policy in these regions and areas.

This study has provided evidence on the importance of the sub regional level in Cohesion policy. It has contributed to the decisions on the territorial dimension of the future regulation.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/information/evaluations/index\\_en.cfm#3](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information/evaluations/index_en.cfm#3)

### **Study on the contribution of local development in delivering interventions co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) in the periods 2000-06 and 2007-13**

*Evaluation related study*

#### **ABB activities:**

13 03 European Regional Development Fund and other regional operations

#### **Timing:**

22/12/2011

## Background, scope and focus

The study assesses the contribution of the local development approach to the effective delivery of Cohesion Policy. It covers interventions co-financed by the ERDF in the 2000-2006 and 2007-13 programming periods.

## Summary of findings and conclusions

Findings from the review of 38 Operational Programmes and the in-depth analysis of 5 regional cases – in Andalusia Region, Berlin Metropolitan Area, Czech Regional Northwest, Puglia Region and West Wales and the Valleys – serve as a base for operational recommendations on how and when local development could be used to deliver Cohesion Policy and how to monitor and evaluate the effects of local development interventions on economic, social and territorial cohesion.

- The main contribution of the Local Development Approach in the delivery of interventions co-financed by the ERDF is the dimension of policy integration.
- In adopting the local development approach, member states and managing authorities accepted and sometimes encouraged a large amount of variation. LDA comes in all shapes and ways and it is not possible to reduce it to a single model.
- Main models of Local development approach may be sorted out in terms of pure LDA - characterized by small territorial focus, integrated thematic approach and partnership as a goal - LDA as a corrective in sectoral policies - characterized by variable territorial focus, single thematic focus, partnership both as a tool and as a goal - LDA in regional policy - characterized by wide(r) territorial focus, integrated thematic approach, partnership as a tool and selective/strategic partnership (including multi-level governance).
- Common features for successful LDA have been showed to be the availability of time and the capacity issue. The continuity of the programmes from the territorial, thematic and governance points of view is of paramount importance. Pure LDA approaches are likely to deliver better results if capacity building – particularly administrative capacity – is one of its goals and one of its main types of intervention.
- Positive results achieved through the LDA model are mostly in the field of socio-economic development, improving the quality of life and the attractiveness of the territories, fighting unemployment, creating new business opportunities and new jobs.
- The main challenge facing the LDA approach is the aspect of **multi-level governance**. As no clear universal institutional models are available this is one of the main fields in which further study seems needed.

This study is providing an input to the policy discussions on local developments in the new regulation for 2014 – 2020.

## Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/information/evaluations/index\\_en.cfm#4](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/information/evaluations/index_en.cfm#4)

## 14 – Taxation and Customs Union

### Mid-term Evaluation of Fiscalis 2013

<b>ABB activities:</b>	14 05 Taxation policy
------------------------	-----------------------

<b>Timing:</b>	14/07/2011
----------------	------------

#### Background, scope and focus

The Fiscalis 2013 programme is the main instrument to facilitate the cooperation between tax authorities in the EU. It seeks, in particular, to improve the proper functioning of the taxation systems in the Internal Market by increasing cooperation between participating countries, their administrations and officials.

The programme finances different types of activities, notably (i) developing and operating centrally deployed and trans-European IT systems (ii) supporting joint actions between tax officials (such as seminars, working visits, working groups, steering groups, etc) to facilitate the exchange of good practice and (iii) developing common training tools for the use of tax officials across Europe.

The programme primarily targets tax officials of EU Member States, but candidate countries and potential candidate countries can also request participation in the programme. The financial envelope for the programme's duration (2008-2013) is EUR 156.9 million. At present, around 4 000 officials participate annually in 250 to 275 events organised per year.

The subject of the mid-term evaluation of the Fiscalis 2013 programme was to provide a review of the results obtained at the mid-term of the duration of the programme in terms of effectiveness and efficiency, relevance and EU added value.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

The evaluation findings indicate that the [programme is performing **very well overall**. The contribution of Fiscalis to improve the proper functioning of the taxation systems in the internal market is significant. The mid-term evaluation concluded that:

- Fiscalis 2013 has contributed to a large extent to improving information exchange and administrative cooperation. During the period 2008-2011, Fiscalis 2013 has supported the existing IT systems. According to the monitoring data on the use of the system and the findings on their utility in the midterm evaluation, IT systems have contributed to significantly improve the exchange of information in all tax areas which is an important instrument in the fight against

tax fraud. The joint actions also enabled the exchange of information and knowledge between national administrations in different taxation areas: indirect and direct taxes and mutual recovery assistance.

- Fiscalis was instrumental to ensure a high standard of understanding of the EU law and to enable the participating countries to acquire a better understanding of the practices and procedures in the different tax systems of the EU and to share their experiences in applying EU law.
- Fiscalis 2013 has contributed to the development and dissemination of good administrative practice between national administrations;
- Fiscalis has indirectly contributed to taking the necessary measures for accession by the candidate countries and potential candidates;
- All findings indicate that the programme management has been optimal for achieving the desired results with limited resources;
- Fiscalis offers high value for money. The combined outcomes of the Multilateral Controls and the communication and information exchange systems generate revenues that are significantly higher than the programme's expenditures;
- The specific objectives mentioned in the Fiscalis Decision correspond to the current challenges faced by the national administrations. The different types of activities and tools offered by Fiscalis correspond to existing needs to a high extent;
- The evaluation has also clearly shown that Fiscalis offers high EU added value. Findings indicate that the contribution of the programme to the functioning of the tax systems could not be sustained if the programme was to be discontinued. The stakeholders of the programme confirmed that many activities necessary to achieve progress in taxation cooperation would not have happened at all, or would have only happened much later and/or at a higher cost and with less optimal results if the cooperation framework of the programme had not existed;
- Another important value added, despite the fact that implementing tax policies remains predominantly a nationally reserved policy area, is that the programme has been instrumental in generating cooperation spirit and networking among Member States and between Member States and the Commission.

The evaluation data has been gathered via general surveys with the participants in the programme activities, targeted surveys with stakeholders with expertise in certain areas of the programme, interviews with programme managers in DG TAXUD and national administrations, case studies and desk research. About 2 000 former participants of the programme were surveyed. Furthermore, targeted surveys of the programme coordinators and tax experts in the participating countries were conducted. In addition the consultant used the results of a survey issued to tax and customs officials in Member States measuring their awareness of the programme and its perceived relevance for their daily work.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/taxation\\_customs/resources/documents/common/publications/studies/fiscalis2013\\_mid\\_term\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/common/publications/studies/fiscalis2013_mid_term_report_en.pdf)

## Mid-term Evaluation of Customs 2013

**ABB activities:**

14 04 Customs policy

**Timing:**

14/07/2011

### Background, scope and focus

The Customs 2013 programme was established by Decision 624/2007/EC as a multiannual action programme for customs in the EU to support and complement action undertaken by Member States in ensuring the effective functioning of the internal market in the customs field. The programme finances different types of activities, notably (i) developing and operating centrally deployed and trans-European IT systems (ii) supporting joint actions between customs officials (such as seminars, working visits, working groups, steering groups, etc.) to facilitate the exchange of good practice and (iii) developing common training tools for the use of customs officials across Europe.

The financial envelope for the programme's duration (2008-2013) is EUR 323.8 million. The programme Decision required Commission to conduct a mid-term evaluation assessing effectiveness and efficiency of the programmes activities, as well as the continued relevance of the initial objectives.

The mid-term evaluation covered the activities carried out under the programme from its start (2008) up to the half-way point of its duration.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

Based on the positive feedback from its target audiences (both national customs administrations and on an in-depth assessment of a sample of activities in selected thematic areas, the evaluation concludes that Customs 2013 has been very helpful with a view to the effective functioning of the internal market in the customs field:

- all of the programme's objectives are relevant and important, corresponding closely to the needs and problems of the national customs administrations, and in particular the objective of supporting customs administrations to act as one;
- Customs 2013 is very helpful with a view to the effective functioning of the internal market in the customs field, by contributing directly and significantly to support the uniform implementation and application of the EU customs legislation. In particular, Customs 2013 contributed to the harmonisation of the working methods of national customs administrations, thanks to the joint actions and IT systems that standardise approaches, bring together national customs officials and facilitate the exchange of information and best practices;

- Customs 2013 helps Member States to protect the economic and financial interests of the EU;
- the programme helps Member States' customs administration to facilitate trade and improve competitiveness, by, amongst others, involving trade community in joint actions or supporting introduction of the Authorised Economic Operator scheme;
- Customs 2013 contributes to helping national administrations to increasingly act as if they were one administration, in particular through activities aiming to harmonise working methods, development of IT systems and common training. Harmonisation effects are generated by the vast majority of programme activities whether this is an explicit goal or not;
- the programme contributes significantly to strengthening safety and security, for example through supporting development of common risk criteria and security risk rules as well as facilitating coordination and exchange of information and best practice;
- Customs 2013 provides support to candidate countries and potential candidates, in particular by providing four of them the opportunity to participate fully in the programme, which supports adjustments of their customs legislation, working methods and IT systems to the ones practised in the EU;
- the programme is managed well and in a transparent way;
- with regard to joint actions, their generally high effectiveness and the fact that costs are mostly limited to participants' travel and subsistence expenses mean that the efficiency is very high. Further efficiency gains could be achieved by maximising the dissemination of the results of C2013 actions within national customs administrations;
- the programme provides significant EU added value by supporting a number of activities that are necessary to ensure the proper functioning of the Customs Union, and that could not have taken place (or would have been significantly more resource and/or time-intensive) without EU coordination and financial support.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/taxation\\_customs/resources/documents/common/publications/studies/customs2013\\_mid\\_term\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/common/publications/studies/customs2013_mid_term_report_en.pdf)

### **A retrospective evaluation of the elements of the VAT system**

**ABB activities:**

14 05 Taxation policy

**Timing:**

15/12/2011

## Background, scope and focus

The evaluation focused on the consequences, in economic terms, of the functioning of the most pertinent elements of the current EU VAT system. The need for this assessment was triggered by the on-going revision of the EU VAT framework and in particular by the 'Green Paper on the future of VAT – Towards a simpler, more robust and efficient VAT system' published in December 2010. This evaluation looked into the design and implementation of certain VAT arrangements, assessing their effectiveness and efficiency in terms of results (meeting objectives they were serving) and impacts (direct, indirect, expected and unexpected) they had created. It examined their relevance and their coherence with the smooth functioning of the single market and the requirement to avoid distortion of competition specified in Article 113 of the TFEU.

## Summary of findings and conclusions

1. **VAT exemptions** are the most obvious and probably the most economically damaging, creating significant distortion and deflection of trade of goods and services, increasing the compliance and administrative costs while reducing productivity, output and international competitiveness and generally impeding the Single Market;
2. **The extensive use of reduced rates** creates little desirable effects at a high fiscal cost and they add to the complexity of the system – thereby increasing administrative costs, litigation costs and compliance cost. Zero and reduced rates can be progressive and can be used to encourage use of socially desirable goods and services. But because of the structure of VAT, they are rarely well targeted tools to use for either of those aims. They also distort households' spending patterns, reducing welfare. The evaluation showed that it would be possible, in principle, to abolish zero and reduced rates of VAT and compensate all households and still have revenue left over;
3. There are far too many **differences in VAT procedures** across the EU Member States, which form a source of trade costs that hamper the development of the internal market and discourage cross-border trade. It is estimated that a 10% reduction in differences in VAT procedures could boost intra-EU trade by as much as 3.7% and GDP by up to 0.4%;
4. VAT requirements generate **high administrative and compliance cost** for businesses and administrations, in particular for the small businesses;
5. The level of **VAT evasion and fraud** is still worrisome - The '**VAT gap**' – the gap between actual VAT revenues and what they would have been with full compliance – is big, estimated at an average of 12% of liabilities in 2006. Besides tax avoidance and non-payment arising from insolvencies, most VAT is lost through transactions in the shadow economy that are fraudulently not reported, followed by frauds based on reducing the reported level of taxable sales or on exaggerating claims for refunds of VAT paid on business inputs.
6. **Contrived insolvency** fraud is also a problem, although recent measures have reduced its extent. It is unlikely that shadow economy fraud will be reduced by applying lower rates to the transactions that are not reported, because it remains attractive to evade the associated income tax.
7. While most VAT fraud is domestic, cross-border trade is associated with particular forms of fraud, notably **missing trader intra-Community** (MTIC) fraud. This arises because of the break in the VAT 'audit trail' that occurs at the border, and the zero-rating of exports;

8. A good measure of the extent of departures from a simple uniform VAT is the **VAT revenue ratio**, which tells us that actual VAT revenues in 2008 were only 58.1% of what they would have been if all consumption had been successfully taxed at the standard VAT rate, or 85.4% of what they would have been if all consumption by households had been successfully taxed and no government consumption had been taxed. This shows that, taken together, exemptions, reduced rates and various forms of non-compliance significantly reduce the amount of VAT that is raised;

9. Harmonising procedures and limiting differences in VAT rates, and more generally reducing compliance costs were considered to be desirable and recommended.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/taxation\\_customs/resources/documents/common/publications/studies/report\\_evaluation\\_vat.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/common/publications/studies/report_evaluation_vat.pdf)



## 15 – Education and Culture

### Ex-post evaluation of 2010 European Capitals of Culture and Interim evaluation of selection and monitoring procedures of ECOC 2010-2016

**ABB activities:**

15 04 Developing cultural and audiovisual cooperation in Europe

**Timing:**

12/08/2011

#### Background, scope and focus

##### 1. Evaluations subject

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".<sup>1</sup>

The current evaluation covers two subjects: 1) Ex post evaluation of 2010 ECOC; 2) Interim evaluation of selection and monitoring procedures of ECOC 2010-2016

##### 2. The scope of evaluations

Subject 1 covered the three cities designated as ECOCs in 2010: Essen for the Ruhr, Pecs and Istanbul. Each of the designated cities created a specific cultural programme for the year. The Cultural Programmes were required to have a European dimension, based principally on cultural co-operation. Each of the cities received Melina Mercouri Prize of up to €1.5m from Strand 1.3 of the Culture Programme (2007-13).

Subject 2 assessed the implementation of new selection and monitoring procedures introduced by the current Decision. It therefore covered the selection procedures that had been applied to the designation of the 2013-16 titles and the monitoring and EU co-financing procedures that had been applied to the 2010-15 titles.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

For **subject 1** the following results are to be mentioned:

*Relevance:* The ECoC Action has been consistent with and relevant to the objectives of Article 167 of the Treaty.

*Effectiveness:* All three ECoC were successful in implementing cultural programmes that were

<sup>1</sup> Decision No 1622/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 2006, establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2007 to 2109.

more extensive, innovative, diverse and high-profile than would have been their cultural offering in the absence of ECoC designation. All three cultural programmes were of European dimension, through highlighting European themes, including events featuring artists of European significance or transnational co-operation, and attracting European tourists and audiences. All three ECoC stimulated investments in cultural and other infrastructure that would otherwise not have taken place.

*Efficiency:* The 2010 ECoC featured different governance arrangements and experienced different degrees of efficiency. In Essen for the Ruhr, the delivery agency was largely successful in balancing the requirements for high-profile, international events with regional development objectives. In Pécs, some delays occurred due to a lack of clarity between the relative roles and responsibilities of different organisations, as well as by changes in key personnel; however this didn't affect the overall implementation of the programme. In Istanbul, whilst the agency succeeded in implementing a very extensive cultural programme and marketing campaign, certain features of the governance arrangements proved problematic and led to the overall impact of the ECoC being smaller than originally anticipated.

The EU funding did not significantly influence the cities decision to apply for ECoC designation and formed a modest proportion of the total expenditure on the cultural programme in all three cities. In view of the modest amount provided from the EU budget, the ECoC designation has a very effective leverage effect.

*Sustainability:* Across all three ECoC, there is evidence of new cultural activities that will continue beyond the title year. However, the evidence for sustained improvements in cultural governance varies; in Essen for the Ruhr, a number of ambitious long-term goals have been set and responsibilities have been transferred to regional partners. In Pécs, two legacy bodies have been created to manage new cultural facilities, though the municipality has yet to create its overarching “umbrella” structure to support cultural operators across the city. In Istanbul, the governance model introduced by the ECoC will come to an end once the agency ceases operation and it is not certain that stakeholders will coalesce around a shared strategy.

The purpose of the selection and monitoring procedures (scope of evaluation for the **subject 2**) can be seen as being, first, to enable the selection of ECoC in an efficient manner and, second, to strengthen the quality of the applications and of the eventual cultural programmes. Therefore the main results of this evaluation are presented in two main headings relating to the “efficiency of the processes” and the “effect on the quality of ECoC”.

#### *Efficiency of the processes*

1. The overall efficiency of the application and selection process is satisfactory. There are inevitable variations between the experiences in different countries, but no significant problems or delays were identified.
2. The documentary guidance provided to candidate cities, Member States and panel members is thorough and strong on administrative process.
3. The application form, whilst enabling the ECoC to provide the necessary information for the selection panel to make its decision, does not allow applicants to present their bids in the clearest and most attractive format and leads to the submission of an unnecessarily large volume of material.
4. The ECoC criteria are clear in principle and have generally been understood and applied by applicants and the Panel, though some selected ECoC have not performed particularly well at application stage against one or other of the categories of criteria and many cities still struggle to

---

<sup>1</sup> Compared to the previous procedure under which it considered only those applications nominated by the Member State in question – usually only one from each Member State.

achieve an appropriate balance between local and European components.

5. The Panel is mostly operating effectively and has been strengthened by the mixture of national and European appointees and by the fact that the European appointees hold a majority, with the chair being one of the European members; its role has also been reinforced by virtue of the fact that it considers all applications.<sup>1</sup> However, its credibility has been weakened by a small number of EU members either failing to attend meetings or giving the impression of being ill-prepared.

6. Providing EU funding in the form of a prize rather than a traditional grant has been welcomed by ECoC due to the reduced administrative burden and increased flexibility in the use of the funding. The "motivational effect" of the Prize could be increased by requiring cities to develop their applications and cultural programmes (up to the second monitoring point) without reference to the Prize.

#### *Effect on the quality of ECoC*

1. Candidate cities value the ECoC brand highly and recognise the benefits of applying as well as winning. As a result they are prepared to invest significant resources in their applications.

2. The open competition (within Member States listed in the Order of Entitlement) has increased interest in the ECoC, ensured an equitable distribution of ECoC across Member States and helped generate a high number of credible applications. However, the sustainability of the process beyond 2019 in its current format needs to be given careful thought.

3. The selection process is generally held to be fair and transparent and has enabled the selection of credible candidates in every Member State, in part due to the two-stage process which enables applicants to improve their applications on the basis of expert advice received from the Panel.

4. DG EAC provides guidance, advice and support that is highly valued by panel members, Ministries and designated ECoC. Ministries and cities would welcome additional informal support and there may be practical ways by which this can be provided without posing a substantial additional burden on DG EAC.

5. The monitoring process has played a key part in strengthening the ECoC, in particular their focus on the European dimension. The new informal "post-designation meeting" and informal visits by panel members have proved a valuable complement to the formal monitoring meetings and reports.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education\\_culture/evalreports/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/evalreports/index_en.htm)

## External Evaluation of the European Institute of Innovation and Technology

**ABB activities:**

15 02 Lifelong learning, including multilingualism

**Timing:**

May 2011

### Background, scope and focus

#### 1. Evaluation subject

Article 16 of the EIT Regulation asks for an examination of "...how the EIT fulfils its mission, covering all activities of the EIT and the KICs and assessing its added value, impact, effectiveness, sustainability, efficiency and relevance of the activities pursued and their relationship and/or complementarity with existing national and Community policies to support higher education, research and innovation". However, the EIT was set up only in 2008, which clearly limited the scope for this first EIT evaluation. The ToR requested the evaluator to "cover the set up of the EIT, its operationalisation and initial stages during the period 2008–10, and [to] seek mainly to assess the preliminary impact of the EIT and reflect on "lessons learned" to support the implementation of the future activities of the EIT". In 2011 the contract was amended to include an impact assessment study and a detailed assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of the negotiations between the EIT and the Knowledge and Innovation Communities leading to the signing of Framework Partnership Agreements and Annual Grant Agreements. It was foreseen that the evaluation results would provide an input into the development of the EIT's Strategic Innovation Agenda (SIA). The overall budget was EUR 268,556.77 (+ EUR 25,750.00 on reimbursable expenses). Further evaluations will follow every 5 years after the entry into force of a new financial framework.

#### 2. Scope of evaluation

Due to the timing of the evaluation its coverage could not fully meet the requirements set in Article 16 of the EIT Regulation, for details see point 1.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

The EIT has broadly met its key operational objectives. In terms of headline activities, the implementation of the EIT remains on track and was even ahead of schedule in the case of the selection of the first KICs. Given the constrained timescale and the novelty of the EIT this represents a significant achievement. Overall, the application and selection process for designating the first KICs was appropriate, fair and transparent. The efficiency of the process was broadly satisfactory, led to a good number of bids of a satisfactory standard. Negotiations with the designated KICs were a protracted process which took longer than anticipated, largely

because the complexity of the process had been underestimated. The negotiation process created tensions between the parties involved and was not efficiently undertaken. A number of tensions and challenges have been evident also in the process of establishing the EIT. Inter alia, these relate to the ‘learning by doing’ approach adopted by EIT staff, to the different expectations of partners in the process as to the balance between flexibility and guidance, to the approach taken to the ‘simplification’ of EU rules and regulations and to relationship between the involved partners. The Governing Board has taken a particularly operational role in the initial stages of the EIT. Ambitious timescales and perceptions of shifting requirements have contributed to the tensions reported.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education\\_culture/evalreports/education/2011/eitreport\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/evalreports/education/2011/eitreport_en.pdf)

### Interim Evaluation of External Cooperation Agreements in Higher Education, Training and Youth with the US and Canada

<b>ABB activities:</b>	15 02 Lifelong learning, including multilingualism
------------------------	--

<b>Timing:</b>	April 2011
----------------	------------

#### Background, scope and focus

The general objectives of both Agreements are to:

- promote mutual understanding between the peoples of the European Union and the United States / Canada including broader knowledge of their languages, cultures and institutions;
- improve the quality of human resources [US] / human resource development [Canada] in both the European Community and the United States / Canada, including [US] / by facilitating [Canada] the acquisition of skills required to meet the challenges of the global knowledge-based economy.

The agreements span the period of 2006-13 and support (a) Joint/double degree projects, (b) Joint mobility projects, (c) Policy oriented dialogue and projects, (d) an Alumni Association, and (e) the Schuman-Fulbright.

The EU-Canada Agreement also provides support to Youth Actions.

The actions funded under both Agreements are open to the 27 EU Member States, and Canada and the United States respectively.

Financing of bilateral EU-Canada and EU-US co-operation activities has to be, to the extent possible, on the basis of an overall matching of funds between the Parties.

For the eight-year period 2006-13, the European Commission allocate 15,6M€ to the EU-Canada Agreement, and 43,4M€ of operational credits to the EU-US Agreement.

The previous evaluation was delivered in March 2005.

The evaluation covered the first four years of implementation of all actions included in the current cooperation agreements with the US and Canada (2006-2013).

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

According to the evaluation, the Agreements are generally speaking relevant to the needs, effective in terms of the objectives set, and highly cost-effective. Main points of improvement are opportunities for policy discussion and exchange, the Youth cooperation (Canada). Furthermore, the publicity for the Agreements and the dissemination of the results could be improved, especially in the EU and in Canada.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education\\_culture/evalreports/education/2011/extreport\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/evalreports/education/2011/extreport_en.pdf)

## **Interim Evaluation of the Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP) 2007-2013**

<b>ABB activities:</b>	15 02 Lifelong learning, including multilingualism
------------------------	--

<b>Timing:</b>	18 February 2011
----------------	------------------

### **Background, scope and focus**

The Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP or the Programme) is based on articles 149 and 150 of the Treaty establishing the European Community. These articles stipulate that "The Community shall contribute to the development of quality education by encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, by supporting and supplementing their action, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content of teaching and the

organisation of education systems and their cultural and linguistic diversity" and "The Community shall implement a vocational training policy which shall support and supplement the action of the Member States, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content and organisation of vocational training."

The evaluation is carried out mid-term and covers the first three years of implementation (2007 – 2009). It covers all aspects of the evaluation subject.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

- Specific objectives are highly relevant to the EU strategic objectives, to policy developments in the MS, and to the needs of the beneficiaries. However, there are too many objectives, and often missing links between the different levels of objectives.
- The policy instrument chosen (i.e. a spending programme) is the most appropriate and cost-effective instrument to address the objectives as defined for the EU intervention.
- The integration of the three predecessor programmes into LLP increased efficiency and effectiveness of the programmes, as important synergies were exploited – particularly in the areas of administration and promotion of the programme. Furthermore, the integration made possible to avoid overlaps between the different sectors. However, the programme is highly complex with its around 70 actions, and the successor programme should be better focused.
- The Programme is well achieving its objectives.
- Judging from the results of the evaluated period, there is a certain risk – mainly relating to under-funding – that some of the programme's quantified targets will not be reached.
- The management structure works well.
- While the implementation of dissemination activities is satisfactory, less attention is paid to exploitation of results and mainstreaming into policy, which puts a limit to effectiveness. To address this issue the creation of an 'observatory' for the successor programme is recommended.
- Further efforts should be made to strengthen the links between the different Education and training sectors, in order to improve the Programme's contribution to making lifelong learning a reality.
- It is recommended to provide a better link between formal, informal and non-formal learning.
- The actions of mobility as well as the Grundtvig programme have insufficient funding. Their financial expansion would allow more people to benefit from mobility.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education\\_culture/evalreports/education/2011/llpreport\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/evalreports/education/2011/llpreport_en.pdf)

## Evaluation of Preparatory Actions and special events in the field of sport

### ABB activities:

15 05 Encouraging and promoting cooperation in the field of youth and sports

### Timing:

July 2011

### Background, scope and focus

The entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty (TFEU) in December 2009 conferred direct competence to the EU in sport for the first time. Following from this, a budget line was granted for three years of Preparatory Actions (from 2009-2011) and special events in the field of sport, with the general objective of preparing for future incentive measures in this area. The total budget for 2009-2011 amounted to EUR 25.5m and was used to fund transnational collaborative projects and non-commercial sport events of major importance (EUR 8.5m each) in addition to several studies, surveys and conferences on relevant topics (EUR 2.1m).

The evaluation assesses the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and EU added value of the activities carried out in 2009 and (to a minor extent) 2010.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

The 30 transnational projects funded in 2009 and 2010 facilitated co-operation between a wide array of sport organisations, local authorities, universities / research institutes and other actors. At both programme and project level, support for transnational projects can be considered relevant to the sport provisions of the Lisbon Treaty and other policies. The projects demonstrated EU added value on a number of levels, in particular through addressing issues with a cross-border element and / or challenges for which no one Member State has a complete solution. The projects achieved considerable success in meeting their own objectives and developing the European dimension in sport (a key aim of the Lisbon Treaty), in particular with regard to building and strengthening networks and kick-starting co-operation between organisations working on sport around Europe. This co-operation appears set to continue.

Unfortunately, the one-year duration of the projects, while ideally suited to the experimental nature of Preparatory Actions, somewhat limited their ability to translate project outputs (e.g. best practice guides) into tangible lessons for policy makers. Increasing the duration would likely increase the impact that individual projects are able to make. Similarly, all contractual responsibility for each network was placed upon one co-ordinating organisation. While simpler from an administrative view, this sometimes incentivised co-ordinating organisations to play too prominent a role in designing and rolling out network activities, reducing the potential for synergies and the benefits of funding to be spread across a network. The Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, which is likely to administrate future incentive measures, should



use its competence and expertise to encourage network partners to spread responsibilities more evenly across networks and Member States.

The budget available for the transnational projects was sufficient to test a limited number of network themes, types and sizes while employing a robust, but not overly restrictive selection process. In future, a larger budget would enable funding to be spread more effectively across a wider number of subject areas.

Support for five non-commercial sport events, which spanned competitions aimed at youth, disabled athletes and mainstream sport, made considerable progress in developing the European dimension in sport, in addition to making strides in health-enhancing physical activity and social inclusion. Clear evidence of progress in these areas was available for specific activities that took place alongside the main sport competitions (e.g. promoting sport among school children), but the Commission was unable to use a selective tendering process in order to privilege such activities, and to ensure that event organisers emphasise the EU's involvement. For future event support, it is therefore recommended that the Commission set up a more robust tendering process, with specific award criteria and competitive tendering.

The eight studies, surveys and conferences which received funding have largely fulfilled their role in providing the Commission and other actors with needed policy support in across a range of cross-cutting issues with a transnational element. Support for such activities should continue.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education\\_culture/evalreports/indexen.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/evalreports/indexen.htm)

### Youth in Action – Interim evaluation

<b>ABB activities:</b>	15 05 Encouraging and promoting cooperation in the field of youth and sports
------------------------	--

<b>Timing:</b>	February 2011
----------------	---------------

#### Background, scope and focus

The Youth in Action Programme (YiA) aims at promoting young people's citizenship (including European), solidarity, mutual understanding, tolerance, mobility, non-formal learning and intercultural dialogue; and at developing the quality of youth work in Europe. Furthermore, it encourages the inclusion of all young people regardless of their educational, social and cultural background. The Programme is implemented in the 27 EU member states and beyond, and has a

budget of 885 MioEUR (EUR 27) over a period of 7 years (2007-2013).

The evaluation assesses all Actions and sub-Actions of YiA, with a focus on the decentralised Actions (which represent 81% of the budget of the Programme). It takes into account management and content-related aspects over the period 2007–2009.

## **Summary of findings and conclusions**

### **1. PROGRAMME DESIGN, RELEVANCE, ADDED VALUE**

The intervention logic has improved in comparison to the previous Youth Programme, but it would be easier to understand if it was simplified by grouping and revising the objectives. The YiA Programme is well embedded in the wider EU strategies and policy objectives and is complementary to other EU programmes and to national initiatives. YiA is relevant to the needs of young people, youth workers and youth organisations. Increasing its already existing focus on employability would further improve a future Youth programme's contribution to EU strategies and its relevance to young people's needs. The added value of the Programme is mainly seen in that it facilitates international cooperation in the field of Youth.

### **2. EFFECTIVENESS**

YiA is successfully achieving its objectives addressed at young people and youth workers, and it actively targets young people with fewer opportunities, which is a unique feature of the Programme compared to other programmes. Although YiA only reaches a limited proportion of the total youth population, and there is room for improving its visibility, the reach is wider due to the support to youth support systems and youth workers, who will then apply the methods acquired also when working with young people outside a YiA project. YiA also contributes to the achievement of EU Youth policy objectives. The influence of the Programme on national legislation is limited, but is more promising in relation to national youth policy and practice. Furthermore, the Programme has a sustainable impact on participants and youth workers in terms of participation in events after YiA, continued work for NGOs, and increased mobility afterwards. If the EU did not have a Youth programme, it is felt that the type of activities it supports would probably not be financially sustained by other sources. The Youthpass certificate is a useful tool in defining and scoping learning activities and objectives.

### **3. EFFICIENCY**

The Programme has a high absorption rate. The management costs of the Programme as a whole appear relatively high but are justified by the character of the Programme. The division of the budget over the actions is appropriate. Youth organisations and National Agencies both experience a relatively high administrative burden, although management tools have been considerably improved. There is high participant satisfaction (which compares very positively to the level of satisfaction of participants in other (national) youth programmes and the implementation structures are considered to be efficient.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education\\_culture/evalreports/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/evalreports/index_en.htm)

## 16 – Communication

### Interim evaluation of Euranet – The European Radio Network

<b>ABB activities:</b>	16 02 Communication and the media
------------------------	-----------------------------------

<b>Timing:</b>	21/06/2011
----------------	------------

#### Background, scope and focus

A mid-term external evaluation was launched in November 2010 on the initiative of the operational unit in DG COMM. The main goal of this study was to assess the efficiency of the network by identifying strengths and weaknesses of the implementation of Euranet and to provide an overview of the results and the impact obtained by Euranet until now as well its effectiveness in reaching its operational objectives.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

The evaluation report showed that a main added value of the network was the increased level of production and broadcasting of news related to Europe and the production of new programmes, which is unlikely to be sustainable without funding. It was also found that Euranet has led to enrichment of editorial coverage – more in-depth coverage of EU affairs, comparative approaches, journalistic capacity-building, and mutual learning.

However, the evaluators identified a number of issues related in particular to (i) the development of the network; (ii) the content relevance of a significant share of the production, and (iii) the uneven distribution of production and broadcast from a language and audience point of view. The report also pointed out the governance problems that impacted the overall co-ordination of the network and its consolidation in the period 2009-2010, and caused one of the network co-leaders to leave in March 2009, while noting some recent improvements as reported by the members.

**Development of the network** – The evaluators criticised the lack of dynamism of the network and the small increase in the number of languages covered: 12 languages used in air broadcast at the end of 2010, instead of 17 indicated in the contractor's offer, and a slow progression in the number of members, with only two more members compared to the initial composition of the network.

**Volume and content relevance of the production** – the evaluators identified eligibility problems as regards almost two thirds of the production of one member (representing around one third of the network's total production). Due to consistent over-production – not subject to additional funding though – the network as a whole was found to meet the contract's objective of production when excluding the not-eligible production. According to the mapping drawn up on

the basis of one week production, at least one half of the programmes, not-eligible production excluded, was found to have a very limited link, if any, with the EU, and only 7% of the content was found to respond to the 'compared-views' approach – confronting points of view of different EU Member States, citizens, etc. – which was a major focus of the project.

**Production ratio by language, member radio, and country** – the ratio production/language and production/member was found imbalanced compared to the number of listeners speaking the respective language and listening to the respective radios. For example, a significant share of the production was in English whereas there was no member radio from English-speaking member states until March 2011.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat\\_general/evaluation/search/results.do](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/evaluation/search/results.do)

### Evaluation of the Management Partnership's Actions within the scope of the 2008-2010 Communication Plans in Portugal

<b>ABB activities:</b>	16 03 "Going Local" communication
------------------------	-----------------------------------

<b>Timing:</b>	22/09/2011
----------------	------------

#### 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 of functioning.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

The results of the evaluation show that 2008-2010 Management Partnership in Portugal reached very positive results. Positive and very positive assessments are predominant in Communication Plan of each evaluated year.

**Target group** - The initial goals of the Management Partnership as to target audiences (in quantity and diversity) have been met very positively. The number of citizens reached (directly and / or indirectly) by the Actions (around 1.8 million) is considered excellent.

The diversity of audiences reached during the term of the Management Partnership is also to be considered as very positive, although with areas for improvement with regard to the common citizen. The impact on the school community (including teachers) is considered excellent.

**Results and Added value** - Quantitative and qualitative results of the 2008-2010 Management Partnership are considered net gains in terms of value generated in comparison with the activities undertaken by the partners before its existence.

In the absence of the Management Partnership, it would not have been possible to run most of the 36 Actions reported here. This is due to the fact that many contractors submitted proposals only because they relied on the institutional framework of the Management Partnership as a way of valuing their image, their skills, their capacity for innovation, exploring new markets and audiences, etc.

The expected outcomes of interventions among target audiences are judged to have been attained. The average quality level of the Actions is very high. Only very few Actions registered levels of implementation below expectations, and were subjected to corrective actions by the Intermediate Body.

**Cooperation between MS and EC and functioning of MP** - The 2008-2010 Management Partnership proved very efficient in generating synergy and increased levels of coordination between the European Commission and Portugal.

The Management Partnership corresponded to a new reality on its creation, mechanisms were established (which proved to be effective) to coordinate the activities of the different partners involved to avoid redundancy in their performances.

The coordination between partners generated Communication Plans, Operations and Actions that led up to their target-groups content/activities/initiatives of great value and quality without redundancy to the other activities of European information usually carried out by the each partner.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat\\_general/evaluation/search/results.do](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/evaluation/search/results.do)

**Ex-post Evaluation of the Management Partnership  
concluded between the Republic of Austria and the European Commission  
for the period of 2008-2010**

**ABB activities:**

16 03 "Going Local" communication

**Timing:**

30/12/2011

**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 of functioning.

**Summary of findings and conclusions**

The results of the evaluation support the conclusion that the activities launched by the Management Partnership have made a substantial contribution to improve EU communication in Austria.

**Target group** - Individual projects were able to address special interest groups and multipliers such as teachers and local councillors and in this way provide interlinking and qualified information services. The projects realised in the period 2008-2010 and beyond reached a large number of people and raised interest in EU topics. Without the Management Partnership these projects would never have taken place.

**Results and Added value** - If the Management Partnership were to disappear in Austria, a major share of EU communication activities would not take place. Besides, the Management Partnership attempts to incentivise organisations and implement projects in co-operation in the hope that some activities will then be taken over by these organisations. In this sense, one can speak of a clear additional value of the Management Partnership.

Three projects were evaluated in more detail, and for this purpose the participants of these projects were interviewed. Their feedback suggests that the respective activities (teachers' conference, visit of the local councillors to Brussels, trips of young journalists) have generated a

considerable increase in knowledge. Particularly projects with a dialogue-oriented design succeeded in involving the participants and in providing an authentic image of the European Union.

**Cooperation between MS and EC and functioning of MP** - The interviews show that the co-operation within the Management Partnership (representatives of the EC, the EP, the Federal Chancellery, the Federal Ministry of European and International Affairs) was going very well. All persons interviewed stated that the Management Partnership with its concrete projects constitutes a communication platform that has resulted in an intensive information exchange which also involves EU projects and co-operations outside the Management Partnership. As meetings are held regularly, a continuous information flow is guaranteed, and important synergies are created between the representatives of the European Commission and the Austrian institutions.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat\\_general/evaluation/search/results.do](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/evaluation/search/results.do)

## 17 – Health and Consumer Protection

### Evaluation of the EU policy on animal welfare (EUPAW)

<b>ABB activities:</b>	17 04 Food and feed safety, animal health, animal welfare and plant health
------------------------	--

<b>Timing:</b>	May 2011
----------------	----------

#### Background, scope and focus

The evaluation was conducted by an external contractor: GHK Consulting of the Food Chain Evaluation Consortium. It covers all the main EU animal welfare initiatives performed by the Commission including the ones under the responsibility of other DGs (mainly DG ENV for experimental and wild animals and DG AGRI for the animal welfare aspects of the CAP).

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

The evaluation of the EU policy on animal welfare provided a good description of the current policy and its effects. It confirms a number of directions for policy reflections suggested in May 2010 by the European Parliament on the previous Community Action Plan (on animal welfare in 2006) like the need to increase our emphasis of our future strategy on enforcement, international activities and research.

##### Key messages:

1. Targeted EU animal welfare legislation has improved the welfare of many of Europe's farm and experimental animals, but more could be achieved with stronger and more consistent enforcement of existing rules. By extending the scope of EU welfare legislation, other groups of animals could benefit from higher welfare standards.
2. EU legislation to protect animals has, in general, helped to reduce competitive distortions in the internal market caused by differences in national standards, but in certain areas further action on enforcement and harmonisation is required.
3. EU funding for research and scientific advice on animal welfare, totalling about €15 million annually, has made a positive contribution to policy. Most funding has been for farm animals and the development of techniques to facilitate the replacement of in vivo animal testing.
4. The extent to which EU communication actions have raised stakeholder and public awareness and responsibility towards animal welfare is unclear. To maximise the impact of the limited resources available, a clear communications strategy and stronger monitoring and evaluation are needed.
5. The EU's international initiatives have helped to raise awareness and create a shared



international understanding of animal welfare issues and standards, particularly with trading partners in markets for food products, but there is much more to do.

6. The establishment of equivalent market conditions between EU businesses and those from third countries exporting to the EU is a long term project on which the Commission has been working via bilateral and multilateral channels. Foundations are being laid but there is more to do.

7. The financial resources and instruments at EU level have grown to meet the increasing resource needs of the EUPAW, though there is a need for further growth in funding as the policy continues to develop in the years ahead.

8. EU animal welfare policy appears to have succeeded in striking a balance between the varied needs and expectations of citizens, industry and other groups on an issue for which ambitions differ across Europe. There are widespread calls for more consistent enforcement but less appetite for a new wave of standards, suggesting an agenda defined by evolution rather than revolution for the next few years.

9. The various components of EU animal welfare policy are broadly complementary, mutually support and consistent, and have (thus far) avoided major conflict with other EU policies, such as on competitiveness, trade and the environment.

10. EU welfare standards have imposed additional costs on the livestock and experimental sectors, estimated at around 2% of the overall value of livestock output and a similar proportion of the annual costs of experiments using animals. There is no evidence that this has so far threatened the economic sustainability of these sectors.

11. Management of the EUPAW costs the Member States' public administrations an estimated total of around €105 million a year, with about €53 million on farm inspections, about €0.5 million for regulating welfare of experimental animals and about €13 million for administrative costs.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/actionplan\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/actionplan_en.htm)

### **1st interim evaluation of the Public Health Executive Agency (Executive Agency) (EAHC since July 2008)**

**ABB activities:**

17 03 Public Health

**Timing:**

December 2010

## **Background, scope and focus**

The overall purpose of the recently finalised evaluation of the Executive Agency for Health and Consumers (EAHC) for the period considered (spring 2006 to mid-2009) was to assess the management of the Public Health Programme (PHP) whilst implementation of the Consumer Programme and Better Training for Safer Food Programme fell outside the window period and scope retained. Overall, no major shortcomings were identified as regards the final deliverable. However, it was noted that the contractor had difficulties with taking guidance from the Commission on board in good time. It must be noted that this evaluation comes to complete previous cost-benefit analyses of the EAHC, carried out by other companies, such as Agra CEAS.

## **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The current public health programme runs until 2013 and the mandate of the Agency until 2015. The evaluation concluded against an early closure of the EAHC before expiry of its current mandate, as such an approach could result in programme continuity issues and in higher monetary costs than those that would be accrued by keeping the Executive Agency operational until 2015.

The main message from the evaluation is that the Agency has managed to improve procedures and increase the level of service provided to beneficiaries. Overall, no major shortcomings were identified as regards effective management of the PHP, though the increase in quality is not attempted to be measured in monetary terms. A relatively high level of staff turnover has nevertheless been noted. Another significant finding refers to communication between DG SANCO and EAHC regarding project result assessment and incorporation into future Annual Work Programmes. The evaluators therefore recommend that the latter be addressed and improved. The evaluation highlighted areas

where progress had been made – the cost benefit analysis shows a positive monetary benefit in favour of the EAHC when comparing programme management of the PHP in the Agency to programme management within the Commission – and aspects where room for improvement remains:

### **Recommendations for improvement of the EAHC**

1. Reduction of the number of programme priorities and funding of a lower number of projects with higher volumes

Currently, the Executive Agency is asked to fund projects in a wide range of topics. Reducing the number of programme priorities and funding of a lower number of projects with higher project funding could have a positive impact on the number of projects allocated per project officer as well as on the impact and sustainability of the project itself.

2. Communication between DG SANCO and EAHC

The evaluators concluded on the following:

- Communication between DG SANCO and the EAHC regarding project result assessment and incorporation into future AWP could be improved by I) common terminology and common document formats on outcome assessment, utilisation and integration into policy development, II) working sessions for outcome assessment, utilisation and integration into policy development with the participation of DG

SANCO policy officers and EAHC project officers.

– Another complementary analysis of projects would be to assess project results. This would be initiated by the Agency with the help of grant holders in order to inform SANCO on the value of projects.

### 3. Allocation of project monitoring to external experts

The involvement of external experts under the supervision of the Executive Agency project managers in project monitoring could facilitate managing periods of heavy workload in the Agency. It is important to note that the above mentioned solution should be applied selectively and only when there is no alternative as it might have an impact on the operating budget of the programme and requires checks of conflict of interest and allocation of time for supervision from the EAHC project officers. It is finally unclear from the experiences in other DGs whether this option really saves time and resources.

### 4. Overcoming the challenges of staff retention

It is concluded that the Agency faces challenges of staff retention, mainly attributed to the relatively unfavourable employment conditions for contractual agents in the Agency. Regrettably, these conditions such as the local purchasing power of the CAs income in relation with typical Luxembourg salaries have not been analysed further. Also reasons for leaving other than low income have not been mustered. Taking into account that other executive agencies are facing similar but less severe staff retention challenges and that employment conditions for contractual agents should be identical in all executive agencies, a possible option is that the Commission revises employment conditions in all executive agencies.

### 5. Enhancement of the capacity of the NFP network

Currently, the national focal points are an “unofficial” network linking Member States to the European health policy. There is still space for improving this network via a boost of capabilities and capacities for augmenting its programme literacy in relation to outputs at national level and interaction with potential applicants. Much of this is however not in EAHC hands but in Member States'.

## Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/docs/eahc\\_eval\\_dec2010\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/docs/eahc_eval_dec2010_en.pdf)

## Evaluation of the European Consumer Centres' Network (ECC-Net)

<b>ABB activities:</b>	17 02 Consumer policy
------------------------	-----------------------

<b>Timing:</b>	February 2011
----------------	---------------

## **Background, scope and focus**

The evaluation in subject started in February 2010 and was conducted by a Consumer Policy Evaluation Consortium.

It analyses the functioning of the ECC-Net since its creation in 2005 and recommending improvements for the future.

The European Consumer Centres Network (ECC-Net) was created in 2005 by merging two previously existing networks: the *Euroguichets* and the European Extra-Judicial Network (EEJ-Net). The Network comprises 29 centres which deal with cross-border business-to-consumer (B2C) issues in 27 EU Member States plus Iceland and Norway. The overall aim of the ECC-Net is to promote consumer confidence in the internal market.

## **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The evaluation shows that services provided by the ECC-Net are very relevant to the needs of the individual European consumers shopping cross-border. It improves their confidence in the internal market as well as their welfare. It presents a positive cost-benefit balance: 1,77 times its cost to tax payers. The demand for the services is constantly growing. It uses a wide variety of promotional tools and reaches hundreds of thousands of consumers across Europe each year. While the network is the best known of all EU networks, the overall awareness of the existence of the network remains low and efforts to increase its visibility are needed.

The evaluation stresses the importance of consumer education as well as consumer and business awareness campaigns highlighting the need for a more systematic coordination of the ECCs' promotional activities with relevant European and national stakeholders.

The evaluation points out the limited resources of some of the centres – not necessarily matching the demand and the funding instability that might limit the scope of action of the ECCs (not possible to plan the resources allocation over a one year period).

The quality of the services has been found to differ from one centre to another and evaluators proposed an effective case handling protocol as a management tool to handle issues such as overly long delays in handling cases.

The limited ECC-Net's authority to force traders to cooperate has been highlighted. Major constraints outside the centres' control have been listed as: lack of a well functioning ADR system across Europe; and a lack of willingness on the part of some traders to engage with the ECCs in a resolution of consumer complaints effort.

In respect to redress issues, the contractor is proposing the establishment of formal protocols and procedures formalising and improving cooperation between the ECCs and enforcement bodies.

Removal of an obligation to develop ADR functions from the objectives of the ECCs is also proposed – as it is a national competence.

On the other hand, stronger competence for the ECCs is proposed in what comes to guide consumers to the appropriate judicial action.

Apart from the financial redress benefits for the consumers, the centres bring further significant non-quantifiable benefits such as consumer detriment avoided and increased confidence in cross border shopping.

From a contractual and financial point of view, the evaluators proposed making the continuation of funding conditional upon individual ECCs demonstrating a positive benefits-cost ratio. Replacement of the current system of annual grants with a system of framework partnership agreements was also recommended.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/ecc/docs/final\\_report\\_cpec\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/ecc/docs/final_report_cpec_en.pdf)

### Evaluation of Consumer Education, Information and Capacity building actions

#### ABB activities:

17 02 Consumer policy

#### Timing:

October 2011

#### Background, scope and focus

The evaluation started in April 2011 and was conducted by ECORYS UK Ltd.

Its aim was to inform decision making on future EU actions in consumer education and capacity building

It examined four DG SANCO actions developed over the past 10 years, namely DOLCETA, Europa Diary, TRACE and European Integrated Masters programme, in total representing an expenditure of around € 27 M€.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

The evaluation concludes that the consumer landscape in the EU is quite dynamic and heterogeneous, and requires interventions with *variable geometry*, as opposed to the "one-size fits all models" of Dolceta, Europa Diary and, to a lesser extent, TRACE. It advocates to refocus actions towards building interactive community resources to facilitate best practice exchange between Member States, rather than passive resources built by the EC for the Member States.

The evaluation found that Dolceta, the Europa Diary and Trace had resulted in separate but partly overlapping information/education resources without sharing distribution channels and

intellectual capital, which hindered the overall coherence and efficiency of the EU consumer information and education effort.

In the case of the Diary and Dolceta, the evaluation further concluded that both actions may duplicate national resources in some Member States, and that they are not responsive enough to policy developments in relation to the frequency of updating.

In more detail, the evaluation concluded that:

*The 3 year start-up subsidies for setting up European Integrated Masters programme courses resulted in three consumer policy masters courses. As the funding from DG SANCO was limited in time, the sustainability of the courses was dependent on their capacity to find subsequent alternative funding sources, notably the Erasmus Mundus programme. The evaluation also recommends to apply for further funding from Erasmus Mundus, while DG SANCO should continue to give political support to the Masters courses that continue their offer to students. .*

The evaluators found that the *TRACE* training courses for national level consumer organisations are very positively viewed by the participants and stakeholders and support EU action to contribute to build capacity of staff in consumer organisations. However action should be taken to address the high cost per participant (€ 1,665.98 per person per day), to improve outreach to national audience and overcome language barriers. In addition,, the high turnover in the staff of consumer organisations, and the need to further disseminate the knowledge of trained staff within organisations, and the need to make the training materials publicly accessible were identified as issues for future action. The evaluation recommends increasing Trace impact significantly by going on-line and multilingual, as well as broadening the courses to a wider, more active and participatory training community, to facilitate sharing good practices between national organisations

The evaluation found that DOLCETA as set up in 2003 was not suitable to the current internet environment. Lack of baseline data made an assessment of progress over the years difficult. But Dolceta appears not to fulfil its objectives towards its multiple targets, neither as information nor as an education tool.

The evaluators considered Dolceta's usage level to low to justify the expenditure, its technological design obsolete and its content of very uneven quality and in many cases duplicating information that is already available at national level. Dolceta was further found to mix up different target groups, to overlap with the Europa Diary in the secondary education school group, to incur high translation costs, and to lack regular updating. Its cost-efficiency, with a cost per hit above 4 €, was found insatisfactory and the contractor recommended to discontinue this action as redesigning the site would require excessive resources.

The evaluators found that while the Europa Diary resources have clear value, the real use of the printed material for consumer education purposes is uneven across Member States, and the printed form does not address the needs of teachers across Europe.

The evaluation at the same time underlined the significant and critical role of teachers as strategic intermediaries for consumer education of young people. As embedding consumer issues in school curricula is a priority, the evaluation suggests that DG SANCO should continue to provide consumer education materials for teachers to use in classroom. The evaluators suggest to undertake research to identify the needs of teachers in each Member State and to find out which delivery channel (print, on-line or other) would be appropriate to satisfy such needs.

The evaluation recommends that the Diary content and accompanying teacher guide should in the meantime be made available on-line so as to stay in touch with the user community of teachers and not severing ties with them.

## Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/strategy/docs/evaluation\\_consumer\\_education\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/strategy/docs/evaluation_consumer_education_report_en.pdf)

## Evaluation of the EU-RLs in the field of food and feed safety and animal health and live animals

### ABB activities:

17 04 Food and feed safety, animal health, animal welfare and plant health

### Timing:

11/04/2011

### Background, scope and focus

There are currently 45 EURLs (27 in the feed and food area and 18 in the animal health and live animals area). This evaluation continued and finalised the assessment process of the EURLs and their network which began with the evaluation of twelve EURLs in the field of animal health and live animals completed in 2009. The *ad hoc* Inter-Service Steering Group for this evaluation was managed and chaired by SANCO Unit E5. Unit 01 participated in this group and assisted with contractual, methodological and operational issues in the support and steering given to the contractors. The evaluation assessed the functioning and performance of each EURL in the food and feed safety area and of their network as a whole (as well as of two remaining EURLs in the field of animal health), the effectiveness and efficiency of EU funding, the possible overlaps or synergy potentials between EURLs in particular fields and the appropriateness of their current mandates.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

It was found, based on a review method developed by the contractor and an assessment grading sheet adopted for this exercise, that the EURLs performed in general adequately and partly excellently. In spite of overall positive results, 19 EURLs underperformed on at least one evaluation indicator in the assessment grid. Most notably, a significant number of EURLs do not collect nor summarise feedback provided by participants in workshops or in *ad hoc* training activities. Some EURLs do not provide corrective actions and follow-up to national reference laboratories (NRLs) that underperformed during proficiency tests (PTs) and the tools used by some EURLs to share information with NRLs could be improved (up-to-date websites, user-friendliness of tools, etc).

The evaluation furthermore concluded that the EURLs' assistance to NRLs had been adequate in order to improve analytical methods and the quality of analytical data generated in the EU, that the analytical methods and techniques developed, validated, or assessed could be considered as responding to state-of-the art standards and being appropriate to ensure food and feed safety, and that the coordination and training activities carried out such as PTs and workshops had been satisfactory.

The evaluators also noted that a large majority of EURLs had been able to deliver good scientific advice and expertise in a very timely manner and that there was a common agreement that EURLs fulfilled the requirements laid down in Article 32 (4) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 (suitably qualified staff with adequate training, presence of equipment and products needed to carry out tasks assigned to them, sufficient knowledge of international standards and practices, etc.) and that they contributed to the achievement of the objectives pursued by EU legislation and the improvement of food and feed safety in the EU.

The evaluation identified clear added value in the network of EURLs over the (counterfactual) situation without an EU system for developing new analytical/diagnostic methods, contributing to the harmonisation and improvement of analysis/diagnosis and providing confirmatory diagnosis in emergency situations as well as over a (hypothetical) central EURL responsible for all tasks currently performed by the EURLs in the various Member States (MS) (since the current EURL network builds on long-standing expertise of existing laboratories). The EU funding appeared furthermore to be used in a cost efficient manner when compared to the benchmark of a (hypothetical) centralised approach and other benchmarks (no EURL(s), limited network of laboratories in Canada) as economies of scale and scope and learning curve effects stemming from the combination with existing laboratories would be lost.

It also underlined however that at the network level, some potential efficiency gains resulting from the increase of collaboration between EURLs, and the reduction of overlaps between them and the tapping of potential synergies identified, did exist.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/controls/reference\\_laboratories/evaluation\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/controls/reference_laboratories/evaluation_en.htm)



## Ex-post evaluation of the Public Health Programme (PHP) 2003-2008

### ABB activities:

17 03 Public health

### Timing:

March 2011

### Background, scope and focus

Overall purpose of this evaluation: assess the effectiveness, efficiency and utility of the Public Health Programme (PHP) which means that it is to be ascertained whether the achievements of the programme correspond with its objectives, are whether these are reached at reasonable resource use/costs and correspond with needs, problems and issues of relevance (to stakeholders).

Furthermore, the impact of the programmes, projects, and activities on the improvement of public health policies in the Member States and at EU level is assessed. This is done by evaluating the extent to which the programme has achieved the intended outcomes/impacts, delivered inputs to policy, ensured consistent and complementary implementation with respect to the Member States' expected achievements in the field of public health, and been implemented in accordance with the international public health aims. All this is undertaken with a view to examining European added value.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

It was found that very many projects funded by the Public Health Programme rely primarily on networking, best practice promotion and exchange of views and experiences, making it difficult to measure its effectiveness or impact in quantitative terms in a fully comprehensive way. Generally, one was left to recognise difficulties encountered by our external contractors, COWI A/S, in the execution of this evaluation, but acknowledge its contribution, *inter alia*, as one material for discussion in the conception of the next Programme 2013+.

Irrespective of the scope and future of a Commission Health Strategy to which the programme would refer, the main message from the evaluation pinpoints the need for a reduction in the number of priority areas in the Annual Work Programmes (AWP). Concretely, it is recommended that this be done by allowing a maximum of five priority areas in each of the three strands to increase the impact within the priority areas, bringing them to not more than 15 per yearly call. The number here is more guessed than elaborated and the concept of priority in the context of the PHP has not been further defined and not aligned with the findings of the Court of Auditors report.

A second relevant significant finding refers to policy applicability of funded projects – DG SANCO is invited to ensure that the priority areas in the AWP are focused and based on a

thorough analysis of needs and EU added value (carried out by staff versed in these issues on the basis of criteria to be developed by the Executive Agency for Health and Consumers (EAHC), which should also compile brief descriptions of project results, compatible with the existing database, including considerations about use potential and policy recommendations, and disseminate these to Commission staff and national stakeholders at the political level).

A third remarkable message refers to the need to reach Member States which appear inactive in the PHP, typically countries with a relatively low GDP/capita. The evaluators therefore recommend that inclusion be pursued by providing technical assistance to write proposals (EAHC) or by increasing the EC financial contribution (DG SANCO), possibly on the basis of an alternative cost model since the need to reach high levels of co-funding in the projects is prohibitive for those countries facing lower levels in public spending.

In the absence of objectively formulated, clear performance indicators at programme level (success criteria based on a thorough elaboration of the intervention logic underpinning the different areas and priorities) to facilitate follow-up and evaluation of achievements, the evaluation stressed the need to clearly define these and highlighted areas where progress had been made and aspects that could still be strengthened going forward:

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/docs/ex\\_post\\_evaluation\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/docs/ex_post_evaluation_en.pdf)

### **Mid-Term Evaluation of the EU Health Strategy 2008-2013**

**ABB activities:**

17 03 Public Health

**Timing:**

August 2011

#### **Background, scope and focus**

The mid-term evaluation of the EU Health Strategy (HS) – covering the period 2008 to 2011 – was undertaken from October 2010 to August 2011 not as a legal obligation as is most often the case but as a policy review opportunity endorsed by Management. Its aim was to take stock of the strategic policy document in a joint exercise with the mid-term evaluation of the Public Health Programme (PHP) 2008-2013. The two evaluations proceeded in parallel, with different external expert teams assigned to each individual file.

It must be noted that the original need for an EU Health Strategy has been largely defined by a

sharp increase of policy domains eligible for EU-level actions where MS often requested initiative or assistance from the Commission. These domains became evident in relation to growing health challenges in MS, the new Treaty responsibilities in health and also a relative shift of the centre of gravity of the EU health policy debate away from WHO. It is in this context that a sound, high quality evaluation of the Health Strategy represents clearly an indispensable instrument for further policy development.

## **Summary of findings and conclusions**

### **1. Equivocal nature of the Strategy document**

Of particular interest in terms of the key findings of the evaluation are the status of the Strategy as a document and its dual but equivocal nature representing on one hand a "shared vision" framework paper and, on the other hand, a more directing framework aiming to align a set of common objectives, values and actions and calling for a concerted response to increasingly diverse and mounting challenges. This duality is largely a legacy of the Strategy's development process at its inception but is equally a feature impacting on the current implementation of the Health Strategy. Moreover, the reception of the Health Strategy is different between one end of the stakeholder spectrum (the Senior Level Working Party consisting of MSs) and the other (the EU Health Policy Forum captured by some vocal NGOs). As a result, the mobilisation capacity is hence overall reduced and this represents a significant barrier for implementation. This aspect could have been elicited and described in more detail by the external contractors as this task would have been feasible given the means at hand.

### **2. Weak links with other EU and MS strategies and actions**

No solid evidence has been found as to the directive influence of the HS on what MS undertake in terms of actions, policies and programmes. The occasional good level of compatibility identified by the contractors between the EU HS and national MS strategies in terms of thematic and structural ideas does not conclusively establish a direct causal link. Stakeholders in particular do not see the EU HS as being the driving force behind action at national level, despite some partly unfounded expectations in this regard. Therefore, the HS is not recognized as yet to be a strong determinant of health policy in the EU: firstly because of its equivocal nature and secondly perhaps due to the fact that the HS's two coordination mechanisms, the SLWP and the EUHPF, are not living up to their full potential.

In addition, the external assessment gives much more prominence to the fact that the HS's impact on other EU policies and activities/funding programmes appears to be relatively low. Not only has there been no discernible direct impact of the EU HS on these policies, but the recent evaluation of the Health Programme confirmed the difficulty in this area, i.e. the absence of significant means mobilised to realise an alignment of the health policy as developed by this DG with Structural Funds expenditure<sup>1</sup>. In the absence of an established, solid political Commission-wide reference framework for policy integration, any future strategic action as a follow-up to the Health Strategy would have to establish the process of integration by its own means and point to those activities which could help to reach its objectives and realise its principles.

### **3. Are the coordination mechanisms the drivers of implementation?**

---

<sup>1</sup> Few projects such as EUREGIO under the Health Programme were funded and these preferentially covered relatively more affluent regions.

For the Senior Level Working Party (SLWP) does the evidence not only point in the direction of a dwindling level of seniority in its attendance over time, but Council presidencies priorities are not influenced by the agenda of the SLWP or vice versa. Engagement with this coordination mechanism has been fading, though it is understood that at present the SLWP itself is likely to tackle this via its new mandate. Moreover, according to the views of EUHPF and SLWP representatives, the coordination mechanisms have contributed to health policy developments at MS level to a very limited extent<sup>1</sup>. Although this might never have been expected by some from the start, it might also partially be due to the equivocal nature of the HS. If a strategy is generally understood as a framework that aligns principles and objectives with actions and means, such a definition is nowhere met, neither in the White Paper nor in the evaluation document.

An easy to reach assessment of the main operational conclusions of the evaluation is that irrespective of the scope and direction of a future Commission Health Strategy, the real need for an ex-post evaluation of the present Health Strategy in 2 years' time cannot be retained. It is very unlikely that such an exercise would retrieve any measure of further intelligence and supporting data for evidence-based policy-making. One could possibly draw more input from a set of targeted follow-on studies Supplementing on e of the weaknesses of the current exercise would be to obtain more refined policy implementation indicators which could assist in a future monitoring exercise of the implementation of a renewed Health Strategy.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/health/strategy/docs/midtermevaluation\\_euhealthstrategy\\_2011\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/strategy/docs/midtermevaluation_euhealthstrategy_2011_report_en.pdf)

### Mid-Term Evaluation of the Health Programme (2008-2013)

<b>ABB activities:</b>	17 03 Public Health
------------------------	---------------------

<b>Timing:</b>	October 2011
----------------	--------------

#### Background, scope and focus

The purpose of this assignment was to carry out an interim evaluation of the (2<sup>nd</sup>) Health Programme 2008-2013 in order to provide an overview of the implementation of the Health

<sup>1</sup> Few if any PHP projects can be considered as spin-offs of the stakeholder community under the EUHPF, showing an issue with access to the implementation of the Strategy by the stakeholders (especially for those who have in principle little alternative funding source for their actions)

Programme in the first three years. The overview should provide a quantitative and qualitative description of priorities set, financial mechanisms used (grants/operating grants/joint actions/tenders etc), beneficiaries, actions funded, and intended results. In view of recent evaluations of the previous Public Health Programme (2003-2007), the new evaluation exercise checks where and how improvement has been achieved and whether the same problems persist. The conclusions and recommendations produced will feed into the ongoing implementation of the Health Programme up until its termination on 31<sup>st</sup> December 2013 and into the preparation and design of the post-2013 programming period.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

This evaluation builds on previous efforts to take stock of the Public Health Programme and of its forerunners<sup>1</sup>. Much as in the previous exercise, we have again to recognise the difficulties encountered by our external contractors, TEP (The Evaluation Partnership), in the execution of this evaluation. We also acknowledge the contribution material made available for the discussion towards the next Programme 2013+.

Focus of the present exercise was to be the *impact and added value of the PHP*, as it had not been possible to demonstrate these aspects clearly in the previous evaluations by RAND and COWI for the 2003-2008 Programme. This was due either to the absence of an intervention logic as pointed out by the Court of Auditors or to the over-reliance on network-building among public health actors as a main activity of the Programme up to the point that these networks and their maintenance was to become an objective *per se* for the Health Programme, while little if any work was channelled into verifying what the impact of this capacity-building would pragmatically be.

The significant step forward achieved by this evaluation was the identification of projects where the added value could be verified thanks to predefined assessment criteria.

#### KEY FINDINGS

*Firstly*, even though the Health Programme funding volume is relatively minor<sup>2</sup>, it impacts significantly on the work done by public health practitioners across the EU. It contributes to creating and maintaining a professional public health community at European level fostering the exchange of knowledge and experiences.

*Secondly*, activities such as on health determinants and comparable health data could be

<sup>1</sup> Originally, the PHP has been growing out of a small number of singular, empirically managed actions in response to calls from Council and Parliament such as actions on HIV/AIDS, health information etc. Inevitably, the number of priorities increased to meet the different expectations that were developing up to a level well above what could remain manageable and deliver sufficient impact. Nevertheless, the PHP evaluation recognizes a strong potential in contributing to the preparation, development and implementation of EU public health policies. While in the initial period from 2003-2007, a rather large spectrum of health priorities were attempted to be covered and this is somewhat expectable with a programme in its formative stage, the experience now gained offers the future programme the opportunity to benefit directly from the setting-up of an intervention logic encompassing SMART objectives, the designation of concrete actions directly linked to the instruments at hand and the recognition of clear performance indicators. Additionally, at the present stage, stakeholders already expressed their views for prioritising the needs and concentrating the efforts on actions meeting well defined, proven EU added value criteria.

<sup>2</sup> The HP is endowed with a total budget of 321.5 million EUR whereas FP7 consists of 6.1 billion EUR.

developed in new Member States thanks to the support of the Health programme in a situation where the current budget restrictions would not allow this to become a priority.

*Thirdly*, the current Health Programme has promoted important issues at the level of EU and national political agendas i.a. on rare diseases and cancer screening guidelines and has influenced policy development and implementation at national levels. Dissemination of PHP results is in this context clearly an additional field for improvement and is directly linked to the issue of the intervention logic: the outcomes of the financed actions that target health policy making at EU level as well as at national or regional level are insufficiently known and therefore not recognized by national stakeholders and policy makers.. More dissemination would entail more feedback from end users and would also help to monitor impact generated by the actions of the programme.

On the programme management level, there is a significant improvement in the delivery of the Programme following the first five-year cycle mainly due to the outsourcing of management to the Executive Agency for Health and Consumers. The new financial mechanisms have generally been received positively and all mechanisms have been utilised.

#### MAIN CONCLUSIONS

**Firstly:** The Public Health programme post-2013 should be much more focused on priorities and concentrate financial support on a fewer number of actions in key priority areas, bringing up the largest EU added value as was already underlined by the Court of Auditors in the report "The European Union's Public Health Programme (2003-2007): an effective way to improve health?"<sup>1</sup>. This focusing and priority reduction cannot be realised unless a specific methodology based on the agreed EU AV criteria<sup>2</sup> is adopted.

**Secondly:** The Public Health programme post-2013 should be enabled to better serve and further involve all EU Member States, especially those with a relatively low GDP per capita where stakeholders encounter numerous cultural, procedural and financial barriers that reduce their opportunities for participation. Emphasis should be placed on actions in areas where Member States cannot act in isolation in a cost-effective manner.

**Thirdly:** Evaluators made recommendations for developing more tangible and focused Programme objectives set in a better defined strategic framework with long-term targets. Limiting the number of actions to those health issues that are of most concern to Member States and where there is real value identified in intervening at EU level could increase efficiency gains and maximise the impact of the Programme. Actions and their results need to be built into a regular reporting system and shared more effectively between Commission services and with stakeholders and national policy makers. This assumes the development of credible and accepted intermediate milestones associated with a targeted iterative review process. The second recommendation meets also the outcome of a recent audit on the usage of the Programme management Executive Agency.

**Fourth Main Conclusion:** The exercise validated the use of the 7 EU added value criteria as devised by the Executive Agency for rendering the projects funded more effective in terms of impact. Use of these added value criteria needs to be further analysed and complemented by reflections on devising a way to operationalise also the *leverage effect*<sup>3</sup> of the projects, a matter which would benefit from further attention.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://eca.europa.eu/portal/pls/portal/docs/1/2838313.PDF>

<sup>2</sup> These 7 EU AV criteria are: promotion of best practice, networking, economies of scale, implementation of EU legislation, benchmarking for decision-making, cross-border threats and free movement of people.

<sup>3</sup> By "leverage effect" it is meant the strategic advantage and traction that a project can bring to a stakeholder group or population, much broader than the one originally directly involved in the project.

By emphasising the need to develop a solid intervention logic for the entire programme, the evaluation also upgrades the urgency of the finding in the Court of Auditors' report as to the need for an intervention logic at project level.

Finally, the problematic level of dissemination of this Programme 2008-2013 as established by the current evaluation echoes the low level of notoriety of the Programme verified by the former evaluation.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/docs/mthp\\_final\\_report\\_oct2011\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/docs/mthp_final_report_oct2011_en.pdf)

### Evaluation of the Community Plant Variety Right Acquis

#### ABB activities:

17 04 Food and feed safety, animal health, animal welfare and plant health

#### Timing:

Date of the report: April 2011

#### Background, scope and focus

The CPVR regime is based on Council Regulation (EC) N° 2100/94 of 27 July 1994 on Community Plant Variety Rights and its implementing rules. Community Plant Variety Rights are granted to breeders on request and the breeder's rights cover in a uniform and harmonised manner the entire territory of the European Union (EU). The Regulation sets out rules for the application, examination of new plant varieties, while satisfying requirements of the TRIPS<sup>1</sup>/WTO<sup>2</sup> agreement and the 1991 Act of the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) and providing plant variety protection that becomes effective in all Member States through a single application process. It coexists with national plant variety right systems in 23 Member States (MS).<sup>3</sup> In 1995 an EU agency with legal personality, the Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), located in Angers in France, was established. This self-financed agency is responsible for the implementation of the Regulation. The CPVO adopts individual decisions with regard to granting plant variety protection titles which are legally binding for third parties.

The evaluation of the Community Plant Variety Rights- acquis covered the period that the

<sup>1</sup> TRIPS: Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights

<sup>2</sup> WTO: World Trade Organisation

<sup>3</sup> Cyprus, Greece, Luxemburg and Malta do not have a national plant variety rights system.

CPVR legislation has been in effect (1995 - present). The main focus was to assess how well the CPVR *acquis* has met its original objectives assess current strengths and weaknesses, and propose options to resolve deficiencies identified in the system.

## Summary of findings and conclusions

**The evaluation has concluded that the CPVR system functions well overall, that stakeholders are happy with it and that they wish to retain the system in its current form, albeit with some carefully targeted adjustments.**

### Key findings:

The evaluation found that there is broad support for the stated objectives of the legislation. The CPVR system functions well overall, that stakeholders are happy with it and that they wish to retain the system in its current form, albeit with some carefully targeted adjustments.

Harmonisation: The CPVR *acquis* provides for a harmonised intellectual property regime for plant varieties at EU level, but practical 'enforcement' varies in the Member States (MS). CPVR holders consider this to be one of the biggest problems inhibiting an effective EU-wide plant variety rights system. Enforcement in this evaluation refers to the practical management of rules set out by this regulation and not to the transposition of the legal requirements of this regulation. The practical management is regulated by national or EU general legislation and consequently can not be the subject of the current CPVR *acquis*. Possible solutions must be carefully explored, especially as regards proportionality.

Appropriateness and effectiveness: The CPVR *acquis* has enabled the granting of intellectual property rights valid throughout the EU. It coexists effectively with national plant variety rights regimes. The acts to which only CPVR holders are entitled and the rights conferred on CPVR holders are appropriate in general, although there is scope to improve the provisions extending to harvested material in the case of unauthorised use or for material in transit.

Basic requirements for plant variety protection: A plant variety must be new, distinct, uniform and stable (i.e. conform to DUS criteria), and have an appropriate variety denomination to qualify for CPVR protection. The application of these criteria is generally appropriate and effective, though the quality of testing centres could be improved in few Member States. The CPVO has recently implemented an audit and entrustment process to assess the capabilities of all examination offices across the EU. DUS criteria examinations are generally satisfactory. Few stakeholders consider that the criteria themselves could be more flexible to reflect varieties adapted to local conditions. The CPVO has developed a database to check variety denomination, but, due to the lack of its utilisation by some Member States, the CPVR system for variety denomination is complex and unsatisfactory and needs to be changed.

Duration of protection: The duration of protection is in general appropriate to the system's needs. CPVR protection durations are comparable to national plant variety rights systems in MS. On average, a CPVR 'lifespan' is much shorter than the protection period provided under existing legislation. Nonetheless many breeders would still like to see the duration of protection



extended to 30 years for all plant varieties.

Exemption for plant breeders: The CPVR *acquis* provides an appropriate exemption for plant breeders. The breeders' exemption is the cornerstone of effective plant variety rights, and central to what makes plant variety rights an important and useful system of intellectual property protection. The breeders' exemption is an open access system to the new varieties for further breeding activities and therefore it encourages competition in the breeding sector and facilitates rapid advancement and innovation in variety development.

Essentially derived varieties: The provision for 'essentially derived varieties' (EDV) is appropriate and helps to protect against plagiarism of plant varieties that are too similar to one another. Nevertheless, the definition is unclear, however, both in the CPVR Basic Regulation and in UPOV and there are few established protocols for making EDV determinations. Procedures to determine 'essential derivation' are not well-established, therefore technical determinations do not produce clear results. There is scope for improvement in this area.

Exemption to farmers: The *acquis* also provides a limited exemption to farmers to save part of their harvest and sow this material on their own farm, providing for payment of an appropriate royalty on farm saved seed (FSS). The small farmers are exempted from this obligation. Implementation of the 'agriculture exemption' has been problematic and some stakeholders are widely dissatisfied with it. In particular the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) had to address several rulings on the legal interpretation of farmers' obligation to report FSS use. The operation of this exemption could be improved and more effective royalty collection systems for FSS established across the EU.

Definition of a 'small farmer': The appropriate definition of a 'small farmer' in the context of the farm saved seed measures is also contentious and there is disagreement about whether the provision should remain in the Basic Regulation. Any decision should be taken in agreement with the EU Agricultural Policy as revised to ensure that changes lead to an enhanced consistency between the various legal acts that apply to agriculture, starting of course with the legislation on production and marketing of seed and propagating material.

Definitions of 'own holding' and 'equitable remuneration': The 'own holding' definition in the context of the farm saved seed measures could be clarified to better reflect farming practices as defined by the EU Agricultural Policy, and there is scope to clarify the definition of 'equitable remuneration'.

List of species covered: The list of species covered by the agriculture exemption is generally satisfactory though there is a case to reconsider potatoes on the list of exempt species because of the phytosanitary risks associated with farm saved potatoes as mentioned by some stakeholders and some Member States.

#### **Proposed options for the future:**

The evaluator does not provide straightforward recommendations but rather discusses several directions with their pros and cons.

A large part of the options are related to improvements of some requirements to permit an easier implementation of the current legislative framework. The most relevant ones are the following:

1. Useful adjustments could be made where the *acquis* interacts with other EU legislative frameworks:

– The Seed and plant propagating Marketing legislation- implementing a ‘one key, several doors’ approach, supervised by the CPVO, could create greater efficiencies and avoid duplication, where only one procedure is used to grant CPVR and to market varieties of species covered by those Directives.

– The legislative framework for patents (Directive 98/44/EC) - CPVO could provide more information regarding plant-related patents and their implications for particular plant varieties to help breeders determine when a patent overlaps with plant variety rights.

– The EU Enforcement Directive (2004/48/EC) - Articles 94 and 97 could be amended so that the two frameworks are aligned on compensation, damages, and restitution, and to ensure that the language in the CPVR Regulation does not preclude use of Directive 2004/48/EC.

2. Extending the CPVR acquis to EFTA countries would help to bring the EU and the EFTA trade polices into closer alignment and may improve EU breeding industry competitiveness.

3. The provision for essentially derived varieties (EDV) is appropriate but the definition of EDV needs clarification. EDV enforcement could be improved by developing standardised protocols for the most economically important species. CPVO could play a greater role in developing these protocols.

4. The provisions for the farm saved seed (FSS) need to be revised. Following the decision of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) on several rulings, CPVR holders currently find it difficult to obtain royalties for FSS use due to their limited ability to request information from farmers without prior evidence of such use. Amending the CPVR Basic Regulation to introduce new definitions and requirements such as obligate farmers to answer ‘yes’ or ‘no’ when asked whether they have used farm saved seed would relieve the burden on breeders to discover its use and is consistent with the CJEU decisions.

The duration of the protection should be revised on a case-by-case basis to ensure that the plant breeders can obtain a return on investment where the breeding programme and variety development are particularly long.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/propertyrights/docs/cpvr\\_evaluation\\_final\\_report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/propertyrights/docs/cpvr_evaluation_final_report.pdf)

### **Evaluation of the EU legislative framework in the field of cultivation of GMOs under Directive 2001/18/EC and Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003, and the placing on the market of GMOs as or in products under Directive 2001/18/EC**

#### **ABB activities:**

17 04 Food and feed safety, animal health, animal welfare and plant health

<b>Timing:</b>	March 2011
----------------	------------

### **Background, scope and focus**

This evaluation examined the issues that have arisen in the implementation of the EU's legislative framework governing cultivation of genetically modified organisms.

The main focus was

- to gather information on the issues faced by those involved in the operation of the EU's legislative framework on the cultivation of genetically modified organisms and the marketing of their other uses; and
- to generate options and ideas on how any problems that are identified might be addressed.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

At time of adoption, the Directive and Regulation constituted an attempt at a new and improved legislative framework governing what had proven to be a difficult area of EU policy. Yet, from the time it came into force until March 2010 the EU did not adopt a single decision, positive or negative, on an application to cultivate a GMO. The Amflora potato is the first cultivation approval in Europe since 1998. Applications cycle within the system are stalled, inch forward and then cycle again at the next stage of the process. Dissatisfaction and frustration is widespread in many quarters.

This evaluation was asked to consider whether the legislative framework in the field of cultivation of GMOs under Directive 2001/18/EC and Regulation (EC) 1829/2003 and marketing of their other uses under 2001/18/EC is fit for purpose. The empirical evidence is clear – as currently implemented, it is not. Despite the best effort of many hard-working individuals and ongoing efforts to improve it, the system is not working as envisaged and is not, in aggregate, meeting its objectives. As the analysis in this report and earlier outputs from this evaluation have suggested, the 'dysfunction' arises as a consequence of a complex set of factors, both external and internal to the authorisation process.

The external socio-political environment undoubtedly affects the way actors engage with and use the authorisation process. The EU is attempting to operate an approval system based on a science-based safety assessment for products that many in Europe, including Member State governments, object to on socio-economic and ethical grounds. And while extensive efforts have been made to ensure that the appraisal systems are rigorous, they struggle to accommodate the particular assumptions, perceptions of risk and local concerns of different actors. The resulting frustration triggers objections, which result in requests for further analysis, which increases the workload on the system, which in a world of finite resource leads to more delays, which further increases frustration.

The evaluation has identified a number of options that could help to fine-tune (through changes in procedure and process) and lubricate (through greater resources) the authorisation machinery. These changes are worthwhile: each could make a small contribution towards creating a system that is more efficient, time-limited and transparent.

None of these modifications, however, directly address the gap between the scope of some actors' concerns with GMO products and the scope of the EU's authorisation process as set out in the legislation. The Commission's initiative to bring forward options that allow more choice

to Member States in deciding whether to cultivate GMOs does, however, reach into this more difficult territory. Consideration of these more fundamental reforms should not delay or substitute for efforts to improve the authorisation system as it exists today – improving the specification of processes where needed and looking at whether injection of more resources would help those processes work faster and better.

**Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biotechnology/evaluation/docs/gmo\\_cultivation\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biotechnology/evaluation/docs/gmo_cultivation_report_en.pdf)

## 18 – Home affairs

### **Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the application of Directive 2003/109/EC concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents**

*Evaluation related study*

<b>ABB activities:</b>	18 02 Solidarity - External borders, return, visa policy and free movement of people
------------------------	--

<b>Timing:</b>	28/09/2011; COM(2011) 585 final
----------------	---------------------------------

#### **Background, scope and focus**

Directive 2003/109/EC establishes common rules on granting third country nationals an EU long term residence permit after they have resided legally in the EU for five years.

This new status created by the Directive was called for by the European Council in 1999 with a view to fostering the integration of long term residents in the Member States and promoting economic and social cohesion.

To achieve this aim, the third-country nationals that are granted an EU long-term residence permit are granted a secure residence status, including a set of uniform rights which are as close as possible to those enjoyed by the citizens of the EU. They enjoy equal treatment with regard to access to employment and self-employed activities, education and vocational training, recognition of professional diplomas, social security, social assistance and social protection, tax benefits, access to goods and services. Under certain conditions they also have the right to reside in another Member State.

When applying for the EU long-term residence status third-country nationals have to prove that they comply with certain conditions (stable and regular resources, sickness insurance, and integration measures). Once they achieve this status, it is a permanent one and it can be lost only in very few cases.

#### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

According to the findings of the report, there is still a weak impact of the Long Term Residents Directive in many Member States. There are four Member States having around four fifths of all long term residents (EE, AT, CZ, IT). And, Member States with a large number of third-country nationals, like DE or FR, issuing so far only around 2 000 EU long-term resident permits. The available data also shows that only a very small number of the long term residents are using their mobility rights under the Directive.

On one hand, the report reveals many deficiencies in the transposition of the Directive –

restrictive interpretation of the scope of the Directive, additional conditions for admission, very high fees for the application in granting the permit, illegal obstacles to intra-EU mobility, not a proper application of the equal treatment clause. On the other hand, a real problem seems to be the general lack of information among many third-country nationals about the existing status as an EU long-term resident and the rights attached to it.

The Commission intends therefore to increase its efforts to ensure that the Directive is correctly transposed and implemented across the EU. In order to achieve this result, the Commission is considering launching further infringement proceedings when necessary (a ruling of the European Court of Justice on fees under the Directive was issued on 26 April 2012, C-508/10). The Commission will also increase its efforts to better inform the third-country nationals on their rights under the Directive. For this purpose, it will make use of the tools already available (Immigration Portal, Europa website) and support Member States in launching awareness-raising campaigns.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/news/intro/docs/20110928/1\\_EN\\_ACT\\_part1\\_v62.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/news/intro/docs/20110928/1_EN_ACT_part1_v62.pdf)

### **Report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the results achieved and on qualitative and quantitative aspects of implementation of the European Refugee Fund for the period 2005-2007 (COM(2011)2)**

*Evaluation related study*

#### **ABB activities:**

18 03 Migration flows - Common immigration and asylum policies

#### **Timing:**

14/01/2011

#### **Background, scope and focus**

Article 54(5) of Decision No 573/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council lays down that the Commission shall submit to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions a report on the results achieved and on the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the implementation of the European

Refugee Fund for the period 2005 to 2007.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

Actions supported by the Fund covered one or more of the three following areas: reception conditions of asylum seekers and asylum procedures; integration of target group persons whose stay in the Member States is of a lasting or stable nature; and the voluntary return of target group persons to their country of origin. Ninety three per cent of the budget appropriations were allocated to the Member States for carrying out national programmes under shared management, while the rest was available for Community actions implemented directly by the Commission to finance transnational actions or actions of interest to the European Union as a whole.

The total costs of all operations funded through the national programmes amounted to almost €300 million. The Fund's contribution accounted for slightly more than half of that amount. In total, 1 403 projects were funded. The majority of project beneficiaries were non-governmental organisations and local authorities (82 %). From the three Actions eligible for support, the Action 'Reception conditions and asylum procedures' was the most important in terms of the number of operations funded, followed by the Actions 'Integration' and 'Voluntary return' (in this order).

In most of the Member States the results achieved met the planned targets. Integration operations proved to be the most successful ones, followed by those targeting the reception of asylum seekers, whereas operations on voluntary return produced the least satisfying results. The main reasons why certain operations achieved results in excess of those planned, or did not achieve them, were connected not to the type of activity concerned, but rather to external factors, especially the unpredictability of asylum flows.

The costs incurred to achieve the projects' outputs seemed reasonable. The resources needed to implement the projects were assessed as sufficient in general. The timeliness of fund availability was less satisfactory. Funds were available to implementing organisations later than expected; this was due to the fact that not all EU provisions were in place until one year after the beginning of the programming period, but national delays were also a factor.

The use of the Fund proved to be additional to national funding. There were only very few instances where projects could have been funded through national support. Moreover, in no single case did the Fund replace financing from other European funds. As a result, few, if any, of the projects funded would have been implemented in the absence of the Fund.

The projects provided direct benefit to a total target group of more than 350 000 persons. Of these, 26 200 persons returned to their country of origin under voluntary return schemes. In addition, more than 6 500 persons belonging to the project implementing organisations received support from the Fund, e.g. for training or as a result of recruiting additional staff.

Significant impacts were identified mainly in the improvement of reception conditions and asylum procedures in the Member States. In particular, in the Member States which joined the European Union from 2004, the projects provided a major contribution to the renovation or extension of reception centres for asylum seekers or to the quality of the services they provide to asylum seekers, thus enabling meeting the EU standards. Impacts on the integration of refugees and on the voluntary return of target group persons were less pronounced at EU level; they appeared to be specific to some Member States.

Finally, projects produced tangible, lasting effects for the organisations implementing projects in the form of an increase in experience, qualification and institutional capacity, as well as in relation to fund and project management; cooperation and networking with other organisations;

and recognition from national authorities.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

<http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/eims/HOME/136663/COM%282011%292.pdf>

### **Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the application of Directive 2005/71/EC on a specific procedure for admitting third country nationals for the purposes of scientific research**

*Evaluation related study*

#### **ABB activities:**

18 02 Solidarity - External borders, return, visa policy and free movement of people

#### **Timing:**

20/12/2011; COM(2011) 901 final

#### **Background, scope and focus**

Directive 2005/71/EC establishes a special admission procedure and conditions of entry and residence applicable to third country nationals for stays of more than three months in the Member States for the purposes of conducting a research project under a hosting agreement with a research organisation.

The Directive has created a common entry scheme for researchers who will work for a research organisation of a Member State. Its objectives are twofold: on the one hand, to simplify entry procedures for third-country researchers and on the other hand, to give responsibility to research organisations in Member States and give them a leading role in the procedure. This is done using the instrument of 'hosting agreements' which are agreed between a researcher and a research organization specifically recognised for this purpose.

The Directive makes the EU more attractive to third-country researchers, by providing them with a set of rights (mainly on family reunification, teaching, equal treatment with nationals in areas such as diploma and professional qualifications recognition, working conditions, social security benefits, tax benefits and access to goods and services). Importantly, it also contains provisions on intra-EU mobility.

#### **Summary of findings and conclusions**



The legal analysis showed that Member States have transposed most of the key elements of the Directive, be it the approval of research organisations, hosting agreements or application procedures. Yet there is a clear need for improvements, highlighted by the low numbers of researchers admitted under the Directive (6,945 in 2010, many coming from India, China, the United States, the Russian Federation and Japan). This is in stark contrast to the challenges at stake - in order to meet the Europe 2020 target of increasing R&D investment to 3% of GDP, one million additional researchers will be needed.

Member States' effective implementation of the Directive is paramount, in particular by providing clear and unambiguous definitions of researchers' rights, safeguarding them in the event of the withdrawal of a research organisation's approval, and by making clear distinctions between permits for researchers and other types of permits. Basic definitions such as 'researcher' and 'research organisation' need to gain a uniform understanding in all Member States bound by the Directive. The report also points to a number of areas in which the Directive may need to be amended. These include clear definitions regarding the legal quality and format of hosting agreements, a more uniform way of updating and publishing the list of research organisations and possibly also laying down time limits for deciding on an application.

Therefore, the Commission intends to propose amendments to the Directive during 2012. Moreover, the Commission will continue to ensure that the Directive is correctly transposed and implemented across the EU, including by launching infringement proceedings where necessary. The Commission will also continue working at the technical level with the Member States and intends to better inform and assist both the Member States and third-country nationals, making the best use of the internet, in particular the EU Immigration Portal.

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

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0901:FIN:EN:PDF>

### **Mid-term evaluation of the Framework Programme “Security and Safeguarding Liberties (2007-2013) (SSL)”**

**ABB activities:**

18 05 Security and safeguarding liberties

**Timing:**

June 2011

**Background, scope and focus**

The Framework Programme “Security and Safeguarding Liberties (2007-2013) (SSL)”, consists of two Programmes: “Prevention and Fight against Crime (ISEC)” and “Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security Related Risks (CIPS)”.

According to their respective legal basis (Decision 2007/125/JHA, article 15.3(c) and Decision 2007/124/EC, Euratom, article 14.3(c), OJ L58 of 24.2.2007), the Commission has submitted to the European Parliament and the Council an interim evaluation report on the results obtained and the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the programmes. The report covered the 2007 – 2009 period as well as initial data related to 2010.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

During the 2007 – 2009 period, the CIPS and ISEC Programmes cumulatively supported nearly **400 projects** and financed approximately **150 procurement contracts**, worth a total of **€ 213 million**. ISEC allocations amounted to € 167 million, for CIPS to € 46 million. The bulk of the funding went to 280 action grants, accounting for 61% of total resources, followed by approximately 100 FPA grants, accounting for 24% of funds. Procurement accounted for about 10% of the funds.

The Programmes provided support for; a **wide range of activities**, from training to the purchasing of equipment, and from the preparation of technical publications to the assistance of cross border police operations (including the Joint Investigation Teams).

Both Programmes presented a **high level of trans-nationality** which was generally highly appreciated by stakeholders. The Programmes are aimed at a varied audience, ranging from law enforcement officers to members of civil society organisations, and from researchers to legal practitioners. **Law enforcement officers** were the main applicant group in both ISEC and CIPS. In general, the geographical distribution of projects was fairly skewed, with a relatively small number of countries playing a leading role.

For the **ISEC** programme, during the period covered, the programme's activities were found to correspond well with the EU's priorities and policies. The initial priorities of the ISEC programme were **reconfirmed** in the Commission's Communication of 22 November 2010 on the **Internal Security Strategy in Action** ("Internal Security Strategy") as part of the future strategic objectives and priority actions in the field of Internal Security. For the **CIPS** programme, the level of intervention among the various domains corresponded to the priorities and policies agreed in the field of Critical Infrastructure Protection, which were confirmed in the Stockholm Programme. The Commission's Communication of 22 November 2010 has reconfirmed the overall importance of Critical Infrastructure Protection.

In general, projects supported by the Programmes were **largely effective in delivering their planned outputs**. However, about two thirds of the projects were not expected to use all the funds available, mostly because there was an initial overestimation of costs. In addition, administrative application procedures were considered relatively lengthy.

Nevertheless, **the results** sought and achieved reflected the varied nature of the projects funded, ranging from operational outcomes (e.g. arrests, seizures etc.) to less tangible results such as awareness-raising and development of new approaches. The most common types of results achieved were the **development and adoption of new tools and methodologies, such as databases**, and the **spreading of best practices**, but many projects also contributed to **furthering the knowledge of specific issues and/or solutions**. Overall, the **level of achievement of results was broadly satisfactory**.

As a general conclusion, it was considered that ISEC and CIPS programmes delivered the desired outcomes reasonably well and that implementation of both programmes was reasonably successful.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/security/funding\\_intro\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/security/funding_intro_en.htm)

Direct link to the document: <http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/docs/COM2011318final16062011.pdf>

### **Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the Application of Directive 2004/114/EC on the conditions of admission of third country nationals for the purposes of studies, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service**

*Evaluation related study*

#### **ABB activities:**

18 02 Solidarity - External borders, return, visa policy and free movement of people

#### **Timing:**

28/09/2011; COM(2011) 587 final

#### **Background, scope and focus**

[Directive 2004/114/EC](#) establishes common rules of admission for non EU nationals to an EU Member State for the purposes of studying, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service.

The overall objective of the Directive is to promote Europe as a world centre of excellence for studies. As part of this effort, the Directive aims to set up a common legal framework, making it easier for third-country nationals to enter and stay in the EU for the purpose of studying. The Directive also lays down a set of basic rules on the conditions under which school pupils, unremunerated trainees and volunteers may enter and stay in the EU. As opposed to the rules on students, Member States may choose whether to apply the Directive to these three groups of migrants.

The report meets the Commission's reporting obligation under Article 21 of the Directive and evaluates the state of transposition of the Directive, identifies problematic issues which are impeding the full potential of this EU instrument and proposes a way forward to address the identified shortcomings and further reinforce the attainment of its objectives.

## Summary of findings and conclusions

According to a report issued by the Commission, foreign students still experience difficulties coming to the EU to study, due to an uneven implementation of the relevant EU legislation. The first report on how Member States have implemented EU rules on the entry and residence of students, pupils, unremunerated trainees and volunteers from third countries suggests that the use of these forms of temporary migration could be further improved. In particular, the level of harmonisation achieved by the Directive and the rights it grants could be increased and strengthened.

The report reveals a crucial need for amendments to the Directive, especially regarding: the reinforcement of procedural guarantees; the strengthening of mobility clauses; the stimulation of synergies with EU programmes that facilitate third-country nationals' mobility into the EU; or the improvement of the level of harmonisation as regards volunteers, unremunerated trainees and school pupils.

Therefore, the Commission intends to propose the amendments to the Directive during 2012. Moreover, the Commission will continue to ensure that the Directive is correctly transposed and implemented across the EU, including by launching further infringement proceedings where necessary. The Commission will also continue working at the technical level with the Member States and intends to better inform and assist both the Member States and third-country nationals, making the best use of the internet, in particular the EU Immigration Portal.

## Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/news/intro/docs/20110928/1\\_EN\\_ACT\\_part1\\_v6.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/news/intro/docs/20110928/1_EN_ACT_part1_v6.pdf)

**Report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions  
On the results achieved and on the quantitative and qualitative aspects of  
implementation of the External Borders Fund for the period 2007-2009 (report  
submitted in accordance with Article 52(3)(b) of Council Decision 574/2007/EV of 23  
May 2007)**

*Evaluation related study*

<b>ABB activities:</b>	18 02 Solidarity - External borders, return, visa policy and free movement of people
------------------------	--

<b>Timing:</b>	30/06/2010
----------------	------------

## Background, scope and focus

One of the four Funds of the 2007-2013 General Programme "Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows" with a total allocation of 4.032,23 million Euros, is the External Borders Fund<sup>1</sup>, established for the period 2007 – 2013 with a total envelope of 1.820 million Euros. This amount is supplemented by the contributions from the Schengen Associated States, Norway, Iceland, Switzerland and Lichtenstein, participating in the Fund as of 2010.

The basic act establishing the Fund requires the Commission to submit an intermediate report on the results achieved and on the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the implementation of the Fund<sup>2</sup>.

The report presents results achieved by the annual programmes 2007-2009 as collected on the basis of reports from the Member States in the second half of 2010<sup>3</sup>, completed with information available with the Commission in the first quarter of 2011. These results are intermediate pending the approval of the final reports on the implementation of the programmes<sup>4</sup>.

The report also provided input in the reflection process on the future instruments.

## Summary of findings and conclusions

Having reviewed the reports from the Member States, and also taking into account other information (including from monitoring missions), the Commission finds that, despite starting difficulties and some specific issues with the rules and implementation, the Fund lived up to its objectives. For 2007-2009 it clearly fulfilled its purpose as a specific vehicle to channel EU aid to boost investments at borders and in consulates in the interest of the Schengen area as a whole.

As illustrated in section 5.3.3, the Fund actively leveraged important EU policy initiatives and projects. As such, it contributed significantly to furthering integrated border management and the use of new technologies to facilitate legitimate travel. Besides the development of the Schengen Information Systems and the Visa Information System, the Fund supported pilot projects on the introduction of automated border controls and preparation for the registered travellers' programme. Thanks to the financial contribution of the Fund to these measures, even if relatively small, valuable experiences were gained through the development of such innovative systems which will be an important input for the Commission in the further preparations of the 'smart borders concept' for the future, notably with regard to making it possible to use them (for third-country nationals as well). In that respect, the Member States are encouraged to include fingerprint readers in their ABC projects, in order to make them future-proof in relation to the EES and RTP (Smart Borders initiative). The Fund proved also very useful to boost, in a very short period of time, investments in vulnerable areas, such as the Mediterranean.

It has helped improve the management of the EU external borders, fighting irregular migration as well as enhancing Member State cooperation, as testified by the following results:

<sup>1</sup> Decision No 574/2007/EC, OJ L144, 6.6.2007, p.22

<sup>2</sup> Article 52(3)(b) of Decision No 574/2007/EC

<sup>3</sup> A compilation and the country reports are available at [http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/borders/funding\\_borders\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/borders/funding_borders_en.htm)

<sup>4</sup> Article 51 of the basic act

- Firstly, thanks to the investments in national communication systems, border crossing infrastructure, state-of-the-art operating equipment for border checks and surveillance, means of transport and training for border guards, Member States have benefited from significant technical improvements at the external borders and at border crossing points, resulting in increased safety at EU external borders, more effective border traffic control and improved coordination between the various law enforcement authorities at national level. Thus, the Fund has contributed to the national efforts to handling efficiently the external borders and in particular to fighting illegal entry into the Schengen area, completing past investments (Schengen Facility) and strengthening further the integrated border management system of the EU.
- Secondly, under the 2007-2009 annual programmes, the Member States purchased and upgraded the necessary equipment for the VIS and SIS II, enabling a smooth connection of the national platforms to the central systems. Given that all participating Member States must be ready with development of their national systems, in order for these European projects to function properly as a whole, the Fund, as a long term framework for complementing national funding, has proven to be of vital importance for the implementation these common IT projects.
- Lastly, the Member States made use of the additional resources provided by the Fund for measures to improve the visa handling process by investing in modern technology equipment (including biometric capture devices) and strengthening the security of consular offices. These measures have contributed to a swifter processing of visa applications, enhancement in the quality of services and an equal and fair treatment of visa applicants.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52011DC0857:EN:NOT>

### External Evaluation of the European Migration Network

#### ABB activities:

18 03 Migration flows - Common immigration and asylum policies

#### Timing:

13/11/2011

#### Background, scope and focus

As indicated in Article 13 of Council Decision 2008/381/EC establishing the EMN, the purpose was to perform an external and independent evaluation on the development of the EMN since the entry into force of the decision, i.e. since 21<sup>st</sup> May 2008. It covered the following broad aspects:

- the extent to which the EMN meets its objectives and how/what can be improved;
- the functioning of the EMN, including of its various members (Commission, Service Providers, EMN NCPs);
- how the EMN might further contribute to the more effective use of existing information sources and networks to ensure the availability of comparable data on migration issues, with a view to better informing policy choices (in accordance with Section 6.1.3 of the Stockholm Programme).

Moreover, the evaluation explored whether and to what extent the Council Decision might be amended.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The Table below gives an overall summary assessment of the EMN's performance.

**Table 1: Overall Summary – EMN Performance**

**Positive**

**Less Positive**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of EMN outputs (mostly up-to-date, objective, reliable and comparable) with Ad-Hoc Queries especially highly valued</li> <li>• Positive influence on policy-making, especially at the EU level, but also in relation to many Member States</li> <li>• Intensity of networking between EMN NCPs and their commitment to the EMN</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality and quantity of outputs compared with level of financial and human resources</li> <li>• Time-lags in producing information and limited comparability, especially when not all EMN NCPs make an input</li> <li>• In relation to the wider public, very limited impact and uncertainty as to the EMN's role</li> <li>• Relatively low visibility of EMN (e.g. low number of website hits and newsletter registrations) and weak national networks in some countries</li> <li>• Lack of resources at EU level to support EMN's development.</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

Overall, the EMN was considered to be performing well, providing useful information to support policymaking at the EU and Member State level. Less positive were the limited readability of the information it produced (e.g. too long) for policymakers and the lack of visibility or awareness of the EMN amongst other practitioners as well as policymakers, particularly within the EU institutions.

Some thirty recommendations to improve further the functioning of the EMN were identified. Indeed, even whilst the evaluation was underway, the EMN took on board several recommendations in the development of its annual work programme for 2012, in particular in relation to ensuring that information provided was more relevant, up-to-date and with concise summaries of findings for policymakers in particular.

## Availability of the report on Europa

Report not yet available on Europa, but is publicly available at:

<http://emn.intrasoft-intl.com/Downloads/prepareShowFiles.do?directoryID=249>.

## **Report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the results achieved and on the quantitative and qualitative aspects of implementation of the European Return Fund for the period 2008-2009 (report submitted in accordance with Article 50(3)(b) of Council Decision 575/2007/EV of 23 May 2007)**

*Evaluation related study*

<b>ABB activities:</b>	18 02 Solidarity - External borders, return, visa policy and free movement of people
------------------------	--

<b>Timing:</b>	30/06/2010
----------------	------------

### **Background, scope and focus**

One of the four Funds of the 2007-2013 General Programme "Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows" with a total allocation of 4.032,23 million Euros, is the European Return Fund<sup>1</sup>, established for the period 2008 – 2013 with a total envelope of 676 million Euros.

The basic act establishing the Fund requires the Commission to submit an intermediate report on the results achieved and on the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the implementation of the Fund<sup>2</sup>.

The report presents results achieved by the annual programmes 2008-2009 as collected on the basis of reports from Member States in the second half of 2010<sup>3</sup>, completed with information available with the Commission in the first quarter of 2011. These results are intermediate pending the approval of the final reports on the implementation of the programmes<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Decision No 575/2007/EC, OJ L144, 6.6.2007, p.45

<sup>2</sup> Article 50(3)(a) of the basic act

<sup>3</sup> A compilation and the country reports are available at [http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/return/funding\\_return\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/return/funding_return_en.htm)

<sup>4</sup> Article 51 of the basic act



## **Summary of findings and conclusions**

Having reviewed the reports from Member States, and taking into account other information, including from monitoring missions, the Commission finds that, despite starting difficulties and some specific issues with the rules and implementation, the Fund is living up to its promise to boost the implementation of integrated return management in Member States.

- In a number of Member States thanks to specific information campaigns, further information on return possibilities was made available and disseminated widely to migrant communities in Member States. In some cases, these outreach efforts were based on the practical experiences of persons who had returned and are enjoying a successful reintegration in their countries of origin.
- The Fund supported the introduction or consolidation of return management practices which had been almost non-existent in many Member States beforehand. Projects successfully enhanced the capabilities of government services, in co-operation with non-governmental organisations and/or the IOM, to encourage the voluntary return of migrants and asylum seekers. Assisted voluntary return programmes were consolidated or extended to cater for aid to more third-country nationals. Several projects on counselling and reintegration supported the development of innovative and more tailor-made tools for return management that can be rolled out more comprehensively in the coming years.
- In addition, thanks to the Fund, Member States were able to offer more or higher financial incentives and/or support to returnees for setting up income-generating activities, thus resulting in sustainable returns.
- In the area of forced return, the Fund was consistent with the activities of the Frontex Agency on the coordination of joint return operations. Member States have successfully used the resources under the Fund for national and joint return flights which complemented the efforts made by the Agency.
- Moreover, the cooperation projects between Member States and countries of return have resulted in an increase in the number of removals by improving working arrangements with third countries on the identification and issuing of travel documents.
- Finally, the Fund has also generated opportunities for further exchange of experience between Member States. Less experienced Member States are making use of this funding to learn from the Member States that have long standing experience.

In terms of results, the Fund has therefore already undoubtedly led to the optimisation of the measures for assisted voluntary return, a reduction in the length of stay in reception and/or detention centres, improved dissemination of information to the target population on return options and an increase in the number of third-country nationals actually taking advantage of the opportunity of voluntary return, benefiting from more dignity and better prospects than they would have encountered, if they had been subject to a forced removal.

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

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52011DC0858:EN:NOT>

## 19 - External Relations

### Evaluation de la coopération de l'UE avec la Tunisie de 1995 à 2008

<b>ABB activities:</b>	19 02 Cooperation with third countries in the area of migration and asylum
------------------------	--

<b>Timing:</b>	May 2011
----------------	----------

#### Background, scope and focus

Le rapport présente les résultats de l'évaluation de la stratégie de coopération de l'Union européenne (UE) avec la Tunisie entre 1995 et 2008. Les objectifs sont de fournir aux services concernés de l'UE ainsi qu'au grand public une appréciation globale et indépendante de la coopération passée et présente de l'UE avec la Tunisie et d'en tirer les principaux enseignements en vue d'améliorer les stratégies et programmes actuels et futurs.

Par rapport à une évaluation géographique classique, la présente étude a bénéficié des résultats d'une étude menée en parallèle par le même bureau d'études sur les opérations d'appui budgétaire dont la Tunisie a bénéficié. L'évaluation est structurée autour de 10 questions évaluatives, qui couvrent les différents critères d'évaluation du CAD de l'OCDE et de la Commission européenne.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

*La coopération a largement contribué à la mise en œuvre de réformes institutionnelles et sectorielles dans les secteurs clefs de l'économie et de l'éducation. Le soutien continu au développement des ressources humaines a contribué à atteindre des résultats quantitatifs remarquables, un défi restant toutefois à approfondir, l'employabilité des diplômés. Le soutien au secteur de la gouvernance et des processus démocratiques s'est caractérisé par un dialogue difficile avec le gouvernement sur le renforcement de l'état de droit et sur les modalités d'ouverture à la société civile. Au niveau de la gestion des programmes, il y a eu une bonne articulation entre les différents instruments de coopération*

#### Principales conclusions

1. Un **partenariat solide et à long terme** entre l'UE et la Tunisie caractérisé par une forte cohérence par rapport aux axes prioritaires de l'Accord d'Association puis au Plan d'Action Voisinage, embrasse les domaines politiques, économiques et culturels. La **pertinence de la coopération** est reflétée par sa correspondance avec les programmes inscrits aux plans nationaux de développement et avec les besoins de croissance économique et d'intégration internationale du pays;

2. La **cohérence et la complémentarité entre les différentes interventions de la CE sont significatives**, mais l'approche sectorielle est faible;

3. La coopération de la CE a appuyé les réformes du gouvernement au niveau national/central mais n'a **pas mis en œuvre des mesures et des programmes spécifiques d'appui au développement décentralisé**;

4. La CE a contribué dès le début de la période aux **réformes dans le système d'éducation nationale aux différents niveaux** ainsi que dans le secteur de la formation professionnelle aidant à atteindre les objectifs du millénaire. L'intégration des ressources humaines dans le marché du travail représente encore un défi majeur;

**Sur les thèmes de la justice, de l'Etat de droit et des libertés d'expression et d'association ainsi que sur les modalités d'ouverture à la société civile, le dialogue avec le gouvernement a été souvent difficile.**

**Principales recommandations:**

1. Renforcer et relancer le partenariat – Le dialogue politique sur le "statut avancé" pourrait représenter pour l'UE et la Tunisie une occasion pour fixer de nouveaux objectifs stratégiques qui puissent élargir et relancer le cadre d'opportunités représenté jusqu'à présent par l'Accord d'Association. Il convient notamment dans ce cadre de donner une nouvelle impulsion aux politiques de compétitivité et d'emploi;

2. Appui aux politiques sectorielles du gouvernement tunisien – Cet appui devrait se poursuivre à tous les niveaux et s'ouvrir davantage à la concertation préalable avec les intervenants nationaux et avec les autres bailleurs de fonds;

3. Cohésion territoriale – Afin de consolider les résultats des réformes sectorielles soutenues par la CE et de favoriser leur impact sur le développement décentralisé, il convient d'envisager un soutien à la mise en œuvre de véritables politiques de cohésion territoriale, selon les principes de bonne gouvernance multi niveau et les modèles de référence existant dans le contexte européen;

4. Développement des ressources humaines – L'appui dans ce domaine doit être poursuivi et consolidé en veillant à une meilleure intégration entre l'éducation et la formation professionnelle, les politiques sectorielles et de décentralisation ainsi que les exigences du marché du travail;

5. Gouvernance démocratique – Les acteurs de la gouvernance tels que la justice, les droits de l'homme ou les médias devraient être **pris en compte à tous les niveaux dans le futur**, dès la programmation, en impliquant les acteurs aux niveaux politique et institutionnel ainsi que la société civile.

**Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2011/1287\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2011/1287_docs_en.htm)

## Evaluation of the European Commission's co-operation with the Philippines

### ABB activities:

19 10 Relations with Asia, central Asia and Middle East (Iraq, Iran, Yemen)

### Timing:

June 2011

### Background, scope and focus

The evaluation covers co-operation strategies and implementation including a mix of all activities and modalities during the period 2002-2009. During that period EU support co-operation with the Philippines has focused on combating poverty and raising standards of living of the poorest groups in the country. This has included support for rural development and for agrarian reform; for the health sector; for decentralisation, local governance and governance as a cross-cutting issue; for the promotion of human rights, democracy and the rule of law; and a contribution to peace-building. Since 2005, the EU co-operation programme has primarily supported equitable access to social services, with particular attention to quality health services through a sector-wide approach and budget support mechanism.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

*The overall assessment of EU strategy in the Philippines, during the period 2002-2009, is positive. The EU cooperation programme has been aligned with the Philippine Government's policies and adequately designed and implemented. The Health Sector Policy Support Programme (HSPSP) has emphasised coordination and harmonisation of aid. Through HSPSP, technical assistance has contributed in reinforcing capacities. EU support in rural development has contributed to improved living standards for the poor, however the main projects did not address mechanisms perpetuating poverty. The cooperation programme has given prominent attention to the role of trade in the development process; Philippines now is in a better position to participate in international trade. However, synergies between the bilateral EU-Cooperation programme and regional EU-ASEAN projects are limited and coordination is not formally institutionalised. The EU managed to establish high visibility in human rights and the anti-corruption agenda. The EU's mix of financing instruments and aid modalities has been appropriate to the national context and EU cooperation objectives. Coordination mechanisms exist in all cooperation sectors; however, the specific dynamics of Member States' national interests and the changing financial volume of bilateral programmes limit strategic planning and division of labour.*

#### **Main conclusions**

1. The EU programme has been highly relevant to poverty reduction in the Philippines.

However, several nuances or points of attenuation have emerged. For example, the main projects on rural development did not engage in analysing structures and mechanisms perpetuating poverty.

2. Although the start of the EU support to HSPSP was slow and it took time to match sector budget support with the context of decentralisation, the Technical Assistance (TA) has invested capacity and succeeded in several provinces. In a similar vein, the MHSPSP has contributed fully to the EU's poverty reduction objective.

3. The EU enjoys high visibility and credibility with regard to governance particularly concerning to the anti-corruption and human rights agenda.

4. EU dialogue with civil society on strategy and CS involvement in the cooperation programme itself is seen as exemplary. The series of MTR consultations that the EU Delegation held with CSOs in 2009 is a case in point.

5. Projects as part of both bilateral and regional programmes as well as thematic budget lines have had a strong focus on training and capacity-building and have performed strongly at the output level. However, there are insufficient attempts at monitoring and assessing outcomes/result of capacity-building. In many cases capacity-building seems to be seen as an end in itself.

6. Overall the Philippines is in a better and stronger position to participate in international trade than at the beginning of the evaluation period in 2002. However, synergies between and among the bilateral EU-Cooperation cooperation programme and regional EU-ASEAN projects only exist to a limited extent and coordination mechanisms are not formally institutionalised.

#### **Main Recommendations**

1. Projects aiming at reducing poverty should carefully address who they are actually reaching and with what effect, and devise well elaborated systems that are able to monitor progress in terms of poverty reduction on a regular basis.

2. The EU should consider assisting GoP in improving governance in the health sector and increasing participation of civil society and private sector involvement. Both can be attained through more efficient local health systems.

3. Both projects in direct support of governance and the practise of mainstreaming governance in all cooperation sectors should continue.

4. More effort should be put into monitoring the effectiveness of training and capacity-building components of projects in all sectors. In many cases, it is not clear how trained stakeholders use the acquired knowledge within their respective organisations and, thus, how capacity building is related to overall project outcomes/results.

5. The formalising and institutionalisation of project coordination between bilateral EU-Philippines and regional EU-ASEAN programmes/projects should be considered to achieve more synergies between bilateral and regional interventions that address similar sectors.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2011/1299\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2011/1299_docs_en.htm)

## Evaluation des opérations d'aide budgétaire de la Commission européenne à la Tunisie entre 1996 et 2008

### ABB activities:

19 08 European Neighbourhood Policy and relations with Russia

### Timing:

March 2011

### Background, scope and focus

Les objectifs de l'évaluation étaient, d'une part, de tester la nouvelle approche d'évaluation de l'aide budgétaire et, d'autre part, de fournir une appréciation globale et indépendante des résultats de l'aide budgétaire fournie par la Commission Européenne à la Tunisie entre 1996 et 2008 afin d'en tirer les principaux enseignements et d'améliorer les futurs programmes d'appui budgétaire.

Le champ de l'évaluation a porté sur 7 opérations d'aide budgétaire, sur les 14 financées par l'UE, comportant les appuis budgétaires généraux (gérés conjointement par la Banque Mondiale et la Banque Africaine de Développement) et les appuis sectoriels dans les domaines de l'éducation secondaire et supérieure et de la formation professionnelle. Le montant total transféré a été de 400 M€, soit environ 60% de la totalité de l'aide budgétaire apportée par l'UE sur la période.

Les résultats de l'évaluation ont alimenté l'évaluation de la stratégie pays de l'UE réalisée simultanément.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

*Grâce à l'approche évaluative adoptée, l'évaluation a pu souligner l'importance des appuis budgétaires de l'UE pour l'atteinte des résultats de développement enregistrés par la Tunisie entre 1996 et 2008. L'appui budgétaire a fourni un cadre de dialogue, des appuis techniques et des appuis financiers qui ont renforcé la mise en œuvre des stratégies du gouvernement. Celles-ci, profitant du cadre d'opportunités offert par l'Accord d'Association, ont permis la réalisation de réformes économiques et sociales importantes, qui ont été à la base des succès en matière de croissance économique et de bien-être social enregistrés par le pays. De nombreux défis restent toutefois à relever.*

#### **Principales conclusions**

En Tunisie, l'aide budgétaire générale a été un succès dans la mesure où elle a contribué à la croissance de l'économie tunisienne.

- L'instrument a été bien adapté au contexte tunisien, à savoir un Gouvernement engagé, sur le long terme, dans des réformes en profondeur.

- L'Accord d'Association (AA), partenariat global euro-tunisien, a été le moteur du succès de la coopération car il a permis à la Commission européenne d'avoir un dialogue permanent sur les politiques nationales. Grâce à l'aide budgétaire, les passages cruciaux nécessaires à la réussite des grandes réformes économiques, mais non identifiés dans l'AA, ont été définis, discutés et suivis. L'arrivée de la Commission européenne comme nouvel acteur fournissant de l'aide budgétaire, en plus de l'appui budgétaire fourni par la Banque Mondiale depuis 1986, a permis d'aller plus loin qu'une approche purement technique et d'obtenir des résultats durables.
- Ainsi, la Tunisie a su conjuguer stabilité macro-économique et croissance. La période a été caractérisée par un fort dynamisme du secteur privé, notamment grâce à la réforme de l'environnement des affaires et à la libéralisation du commerce extérieur, soutenues par l'aide budgétaire. Des points de blocages subsistent cependant, principalement liés à la rigidité et à la faible compétitivité du marché intérieur.
- Les ABG ont contribué spécifiquement à l'amélioration de la gouvernance économique, et à la légalité dans le monde des affaires, qui ont enregistré des progrès, bien que les standards atteints soient encore insuffisants.
- Les résultats obtenus dans le secteur de l'éducation sont plus mitigés.
- Des avancées quantitatives en termes d'accès à l'enseignement secondaire et supérieur ont été constatées.
- Cependant, l'aide budgétaire "Education" a été handicapée par un manque d'approche sectorielle, tous bailleurs de fonds confondus, de la part de la Tunisie.
- Les réformes de l'éducation (secondaire et supérieure) et de la formation professionnelle ont été abordées avec détermination, mais les résultats, en termes de qualité et d'employabilité, sont encore faibles.
- Par rapport à l'appui budgétaire sectoriel, l'appui budgétaire général s'est ainsi révélé comme le moyen le plus approprié pour appuyer les grandes réformes économiques. Il a été le seul instrument qui a permis aux partenaires de créer un espace de dialogue rapproché sur les réformes à mettre en œuvre.

### **Principales recommandations**

- Relancer le partenariat euro-tunisien pour un nouveau bond stratégique de la coopération;
- Renforcer l'approche sectorielle de la part du gouvernement tunisien grâce à un dialogue stratégique ouvert aux principaux partenaires internationaux dans les macro-secteurs prioritaires;
- Utiliser l'appui budgétaire pour parachever les grandes réformes et les étendre à de nouveaux secteurs (par ex. services et agriculture) dans une perspective d'accroissement des investissements et de création d'emplois;
- Conjuguer, de façon équilibrée, les différents inputs des aides budgétaires : fonds, dialogue sur les politiques et conditionnalités, assistance technique, harmonisation et alignement.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2011/1286\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2011/1286_docs_en.htm)

## Evaluation of the crisis response and preparedness components of the European Union's Instrument for Stability (IfS)

**ABB activities:**

19 06 Crisis response and global threats to security

**Timing:**

July 2011

### Background, scope and focus

In line with Article 21 of the Regulation of the European Union's Instrument for Stability (IfS), the European Commission authorised an independent evaluation of the IfS' crisis response and preparedness components — Articles 3 and 4(3) of the IfS Regulation, respectively. Of the €2.062 billion originally allocated to the IfS in 2007-2013, the crisis response component (including conflict prevention measures) was to receive no less than 72% (€1.49 billion), while no more than 5% was to be allocated to the component on crisis preparedness (Article 4(3)), including capacity building. The allocation of funding to the different areas of focus reflects the intention of the Council and European Parliament to make the IfS primarily an instrument for crisis response (including prevention).

As the first horizontal appraisal of these components since the IfS inception in 2007, this evaluation assesses the relevance of the two components across various dimensions, with a view to contributing to upcoming decision-making about the future of the IfS after its current legal basis expires in 2012. In line with the terms of reference, the main objective of the evaluation is "...to ascertain the results to date of the Instrument for Stability crisis response and preparedness components and help enhance IfS approaches towards future crisis response measures and strategies for future preparedness programming."

The key legal and policy documents related to the IfS' creation and functioning, as well as key policy documents of the European Union in the area of peace and security, constitute the baseline of the evaluation. In addition, a range of programme documents related to selected case studies were examined. As this is an overall programme-level evaluation, its scope and process did not include specific in-depth project-level reviews; hence this evaluation is not meant to draw conclusions on the effectiveness and impact of specific IfS crisis actions on the ground, nor on capacity-strengthening activities at project level. However, documentation on five case studies was reviewed to bolster the conclusions made here. These comprised four Exceptional Assistance Measures (EAMs) in Georgia, Sudan, Somalia and Indonesia, and support to Post Conflict Needs Assessment (PCNA) and Post Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) methodology development and training.

In order to refine findings, the evaluators elaborated a set of 'qualifiers' used to review findings as they emerged from the evaluation process. These include:

- Institutional opportunities/constraints, ranging from access to high quality information on crises, to a small team managing a large budget;



- The inherently political nature of the IfS, which enables the EU to play an enhanced role as a foreign and security policy actor;
- The fact that the IfS operates across the security and development nexus and is designed to complement, and often to prepare the ground for the EU's mainstream external action instruments;
- The high risk and highly volatile environments in which crisis response instruments like the IfS often operate; and
- The complex nature of the international crisis preparedness, response and peace-building architecture.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The evaluation concludes that the IfS has significantly contributed to enhancing the overall relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of EU crisis response and preparedness actions. It also makes a significant contribution to the coherence of the EU peace, security and development architecture – and to global peace and stability. Critical to its contributions is the IfS' demonstrated capacity to provide quick, timely and catalytical responses in situations of crisis.

The design and implementation of crisis response and preparedness actions and strategies funded under Articles 3 and 4(3) have been found to be in line with the Regulation, and contribute to achieving the objectives stated therein. Decision-making processes are sufficiently robust and inclusive; they allow an important exchange between the technical and political decision-makers of the EU peace, security and development architecture. The management and disbursement of funding is considered effective and timely once IfS measures have been identified. The evaluators consider the IfS to be a unique Instrument within the EU peace, security and development architecture. Articles 3 and 4(3), in particular, fill an important strategic, funding and capacity gap, and allow the EU to support a broad range of critical crisis prevention and response initiatives, as well as capacity building for crisis preparedness.

Initiatives funded by the crisis response and crisis preparedness components have contributed to:

- Expanding and scaling up EU capacity to intervene in crisis situations from a geographic, thematic, funding and time-horizon viewpoint, particularly through Article 3 conflict prevention and crisis response measures;
- Leveraging and enhancing the coherence and effectiveness of the EU peace, security and development instruments and initiatives (including the Common Security and Defense Policy) in support of critical crisis prevention, stabilisation and peace-building objectives;
- Providing relevant policy input to high level EU decision-making and helping to kick-start important reforms, while also providing EU visibility and political leverage in third countries;
- Enhancing the capacities of potential implementing partners to prepare for and respond to crises; and
- Promoting inclusive approaches to crisis prevention and response by involving civil society, regional and other international partner actors.

The evaluators make the following recommendations to further bolster the already significant impact of the IfS and build on the contributions made by the EU through the Instrument:

1. Increase financial resources for the IfS in order to extend impact to additional crisis contexts;
2. In the Regulation, include further flexibility in the overall timeframe for the use of the IfS for crisis response measures and strengthen linkages with other EU Instruments;
3. Further strengthen the design and focus of interventions;
4. Further balance political and technical aspects of decision-making;
5. Diversify choices of — and specify criteria for — the selection of implementing partners;
6. Bolster monitoring and evaluation processes;
7. Seek to more consistently integrate an enhanced risk management strategy into IfS project design;
8. Increase Service for Foreign Policy Instruments staff resources at HQ and country level

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat\\_general/evaluation/search/search.do](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/evaluation/search/search.do)

### Evaluation of the European Commission's cooperation with overseas countries and territories

<b>ABB activities:</b>	19 11 Policy strategy and coordination for 'External relations' policy area
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	June 2011
----------------	-----------

#### Background, scope and focus

This evaluation covers the strategies of the European Union (EU) for cooperation with the Overseas Countries and Territories (OCTs) and their implementation over the period 1999-2009, including the intended effects under the current programming cycle 2008-2013. The objectives of this study are to provide an independent assessment and to identify key lessons learned in order to improve future strategies and programmes.

The evaluation is based on 8 evaluation questions, relating to the five DAC evaluation criteria plus coherence and EU value added. This study was supervised by a Reference Group composed by representatives of the 4 EU Member States directly concerned, by the Association of the

OCTs and by members of the EU services.

## **Summary of findings and conclusions**

*The EU has been consistent with the EU policy objectives of promoting the economic and social development in the OCTs and bringing these islands economically closer to the EU. Regarding trade, the EU preference regime did not sufficiently counterbalance the economic diversification constraints. The involvement of the OCTs in regional programmes was minimised by isolation from regional networking, high participation costs and sometimes by the language barrier. Few results have been achieved on climate change and the disaster crisis management. EU support management and delivery mechanisms have been less conducive to the achievements of the cooperation's objectives.*

### **Conclusions**

9. EU support to the Overseas Countries and Territories (OCTs) has served its purpose well by being consistent with the EU's policy objectives of promoting economic & social development in the OCTs and bringing the OCTs economically closer to the EU. EU support was also consistent with the priorities set out by the OCT governments and the needs of their populations.

10. The EU trade preference regime did not sufficiently counterbalance the OCTs' economic diversification constraints. At the same time, the EU-ACP EPA negotiations represent a threat for the OCTs by levelling trade advantages to ACP-countries (free of duty and quota) more in line with the OCTs preferential terms.

11. In spite of the efforts towards regional integration and cooperation supported under the EDFs, the involvement of the OCTs in regional programmes was minimised due to isolation from regional networking, high participation-costs and in the South Pacific, by the language barrier.

12. Despite recognising the importance of the environment, the reality of climate change and the importance of crisis management, few results from the EU-OCT cooperation were found in this field so far. However, prospects for future impact from interventions that have recently started hold promise.

13. The delivery mechanisms of EU support and its management have been less conducive to the overall achievement of the cooperation objectives. Significant delays have occurred in some cases and there have been cases where the Commission's approach was inconsistent.

### **Recommendations**

1. In future, the framework should be revised in order to respond better to new emerging OCT priorities, such as energy and climate change challenges and opportunities, and to new EU objectives such as sustainable marine management. It should also facilitate OCT access to all relevant EU agencies, programmes and thematic budget lines.

2. The EU should move from the present trade regimes to a framework of positive discrimination. The trade incentive framework should be integrated in a GBS policy dialogue platform on trade and economic diversification. The incentive framework should counterbalance any further erosion of trade preference by establishing an EU-funded scheme designed to promote internationalisation and innovation among OCT SMEs. More resources should also be committed to technical assistance.

3. The EU should increasingly consider the OCTs as EU stakeholders in regional programmes than as ACP countries. In order to build a closer relationship with OCTs' neighbours, the OCTs

and neighbouring ACP countries should reach an agreement, closely coordinated with EU bilateral National Indicative Programmes (NIPs) on economic co-operation and trade focused on services, environment and scientific and cultural co-operation.

4. OCTs should be supported in developing "centres of excellence", capable of creating and disseminating knowledge, in particular with respect to climate change, renewable energy and environment issues that apply to their regions. Centres of excellence could be shared between different OCTs, thus promoting their co-operation.

5. A mix of co-operation-instruments (project versus budget support) should reflect the individual OCT circumstances and needs. When project modalities are applied, it should be ensured that they are part of a sector approach and that the territorial capacities are adapted to the chosen modality.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2011/1294\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2011/1294_docs_en.htm)

### **Thematic evaluation of European Commission support to conflict prevention and peace building (CPPB)**

<b>ABB activities:</b>	19 11 Policy strategy and coordination for 'External relations' policy area
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	October 2011
----------------	--------------

#### **Background, scope and focus**

This evaluation assesses European Union support to CPPB, as defined by the 2001 Commission Communication on Conflict Prevention (COM(2001)21) and subsequent documents. It covers all support provided during the period 2001-2010 and in all relevant regions where EU support is implemented. It concerns a total of €7.7bn of funds contracted by the European Union over the period covered.

## Summary of findings and conclusions

*The EU has significantly increased its focus on CPPB (reflected in a total of €7.7bn of funding over the period) and strengthened its policy framework. However, the conceptual orientations at policy level have not always been appropriated at operational level. The support often remained in a developmental perspective. The EU needs to clarify its role and focus on crisis management and causes of conflict. The EU should consolidate and further develop its support for CPPB and ensure that its financial support is sufficiently complemented and leveraged by non-financial support.*

### **Main conclusions:**

1. Since 2001, the EU has operated a substantial shift towards support to CPPB, but there is a gap between the EU's policy commitments and the actual implementation.

2. Conceptual orientations at policy level have generally not been appropriated at operational level and were not always univocal and shared at strategic level.

3. The support of the EU often remained in a developmental perspective rather than operating a shift towards a genuine CPPB perspective with a clear and prioritised strategy.

4. The conflict (-prone) or post-conflict context challenged the relevance of the alignment of EU support on the strategies and policies of national authorities:

- National development strategies did not always exist;
- It was not always clear with whom to align;
- The national authorities were sometimes a major party to the conflict;

5. The EU provided value added that differentiated it from most other actors:

- Stronger neutrality;
- Reliability (continued presence);
- Critical mass in terms of financial support;
- Ability to draw on a wide array of instruments;
- Long-term thematic experience in fields potentially impacting on CPPB;
- Credibility in terms of promoting democracy, peace and human rights.

### **Main recommendations:**

The EU and, where appropriate the High Representative, should:

1. Clarify the role the EU wants to play in conflict (prone) and post conflict contexts by focusing both on crisis management efforts and on tackling the root causes of conflict through a clear and prioritised strategy geared to CPPB rather than to “classic” development. The institutional changes brought by the Lisbon Treaty aim at providing positive developments in that regard.

2. Strengthen its position as a key player in terms of CPPB by consolidating and further developing its support for CPPB (operational recommendations are provided in the report).

3. Ensure that its financial support is sufficiently complemented and leveraged by non-financial

support at global, regional and country levels.

4. Ensure clarification and common understanding of concepts among its staff, including at operational level.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2011/1291\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2011/1291_docs_en.htm)

### Thematic evaluation of the European Commission support to Justice and Security System Reform (JSSR)

#### ABB activities:

19 11 Policy strategy and coordination for 'External relations' policy area

#### Timing:

November 2011

#### Background, scope and focus

This evaluation assesses the European Union support to JSSR during the period 2001-2009, considering only those aspects of justice reform which most directly fall under Security System Reform: strengthening of criminal justice systems and the legal institutions involved in the oversight of security institutions.

The evaluation provides an overall independent assessment of the EU's past support to JSSR and identifies key lessons with a view to improving current and future Commission strategies and programmes.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

*The EU substantially increased its funding, amounting to €1bn, developed a concept to support JSSR and engaged in a wide range of assistance activities. However, the EU support has generally not been geared towards enhancing the delivery of services in a manner that was responsive to people's needs. The weaknesses of the EU Policy Framework and internal capacity*

*limitations hampered the support's impact and prevented the EU from bringing all its potential added value.*

### **Main conclusions:**

#### **On policy commitment and framework**

Since 2001, the EU has substantially increased its engagement in JSSR globally through funding, development of its concept and utilisation of a wide range of financial and non-financial instruments. However, the EU did not generally adopt a strategic, political approach to supporting JSSR in partner countries due to weaknesses in the EU Policy Framework and the limitations of its instruments.

#### **On strategy and implementation**

- The EU focused on building institutional capacity within state security and justice bodies rather than on addressing the constraints to service delivery from the perspective of the intended beneficiaries.
- The EU placed strong emphasis on national ownership at both policy and programming levels, but its focus on state institutions and its inflexible programming procedures significantly constrained its ability to tailor JSSR assistance effectively

#### **On results and impact**

EU assistance contributed to enhanced institutional capacities within state security and justice bodies to deliver public services, but the overall impact on people's security and access to justice has been difficult to measure and was limited by its overall strategy for supporting JSSR processes.

#### **On institutional capacity and partnerships**

- The EU institutional set up, human resource capacity and programming tools and guidance were not commensurate with its policy commitment and its level of funding for JSSR
- No clear division of labour or enhanced coordination and complementarity in JSSR assistance programmes between the EU and its partners, either within the EU or outside

### **Main recommendations:**

#### **On policy commitment and framework**

The Commission should work with the EEAS to strengthen the EU JSSR Policy Framework and develop complementary operational guidelines

#### **On strategy and implementation**

- The EU should adopt a more strategic, political approach to JSSR assistance
- Greater emphasis on securing the local knowledge and inputs at the design stage of the JSSR programmes
- A longer timeframe for the JSSR programming, combined with more flexible and rapid approval procedures
- Service delivery outcomes should drive the EU overall approach to JSSR

#### **On results and impact**

The EU should incorporate the mechanisms required to measure results and, in particular, the impact of its assistance on the lives of people

*On institutional capacity and partnerships*

- The Commission with the EEAS should work to develop a stronger pool of EU JSSR experts by improving training and ensuring appropriate support
- The EU should exploit the comparative advantage offered by its supranational character and more effectively harness Member State capabilities

**Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2011/1295\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2011/1295_docs_en.htm)

**Thematic evaluation of the EC support in employment and social inclusion sectors in partner countries 1999-2009**

**ABB activities:**

19 11 Policy strategy and coordination for 'External relations' policy area

**Timing:**

September 2011

**Background, scope and focus**

The objective of this evaluation is to assess to what extent the EU sustained relevant and efficient development support at various levels of Employment and Social Inclusion (ESI) to eradicate poverty and achieve social cohesion in partner countries during the period 1999-2008.

The evaluation is based on 7 evaluation questions, relating to the five DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact) plus coherence and EU value added. At the occasion of this study, it has been notably produced a global worldwide inventory of EU/ESI interventions, a reconstruction of the ex-ante intervention logic of EU support and a large survey to EU Delegations and national counterparts' staff on the assessment of EU/ESI programmes and their features

**Summary of findings and conclusions**

*Employment and Social Inclusion (ESI) is a significant priority in development policy and in actual programmes. Nevertheless, there has been a weak mainstreaming of ESI in EU supported*



*programmes and a poor sector or thematic approach including a lack of ESI-related indicators. Moreover, informal economy was often overlooked. EU support to trade development, macroeconomic stability and growth contributed to creating new employment opportunities. However, few of these interventions focused explicitly on employment creation. Technical and Vocational Education and Training support policies contributed to improving "employability". The EU has focused positively on the social cohesion of vulnerable groups and on labour market governance.*

### **Main conclusions**

1. Regarding policy and response strategy, ESI represents a significant priority in development policy and actual programmes. Nevertheless, there was weak mainstreaming of ESI in EU programmes during the period covered by the evaluation and a poor sector or thematic approach including a lack of ESI-related indicators. It is also evident that informal economy is often overlooked.
2. EU support of trade development, macro-economic stability and growth contributed to creating new sustainable employment opportunities. However, few of these interventions focus explicitly on employment creation.
3. TVET (Technical and Vocational Education and Training) and other active labour market support policies contributed to improving employability which is a major bottleneck in employment. Their importance has been growing but they have rarely been combined with other interventions to a fully integrated and comprehensive thematic approach.
4. The EU has focused positively on the social cohesion of vulnerable groups and on labour market governance such as social dialogue or labour disputes but with only limited weight.

### **Main Recommendations**

1. On policy and strategy, it is recommended to mainstream ESI focus in economic and social development support, to foresee a specific focus on informal economy and to further enhance country ownership of the ESI agendas. Regarding programming and implementation, it is recommended to promote government-led sector approaches (SWAPs) comprising an increasing and improvement of the use of budget support and an establishment of targets and indicators as well as an improvement of Monitoring and Evaluation systems.
2. On increasing employment opportunities, it is suggested to enhance employment consequences of economic reform and private sector support programmes through the introduction of specific measures and monitoring and evaluation tools, mainly via the introduction of adequate employment indicators.
3. On improving employability via TVET support, it is recommended to monitor more systematically the effect of support to TVET on employment and income and support the establishment of TVET partnerships with the involvement of employers and workers organizations in the design and implementation of TVET policies and programmes.
4. Social inclusion and protection should be systematically linked to support for growth and employment-related interventions. Marginalized and vulnerable groups should be taken into account in economic growth programmes and active labour market policies.

**Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2011/1296\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2011/1296_docs_en.htm)

## Study on legal instrument and lessons learned from the evaluations managed by the Joint Evaluation Unit

*Evaluation related study*

<b>ABB activities:</b>	19 11 Policy strategy and coordination for 'External relations' policy area
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	July 2011
----------------	-----------

### Background, scope and focus

The current European multi-annual budget runs from 2007 to 2013 and includes a set of 10 external action budget lines or 'legal instruments' as they are known. Out of the current 10 legal instruments, 6 were analysed in this study: DCI, ENPI, INSC, IfS, EIDHR and ICI. Proposals for Europe's next multi-annual financial framework (MFF) from 2014 are discussed during 2011-2012.

The overall purpose of this study was to see what lessons could be learnt from the past experience of EU external action programmes that might be useful in the design and formulation of the EU's next multi-annual budget.

The study was conducted in two steps:

- Ex-ante analysis: what did the 6 legal instruments set out to achieve?
- Ex-post analysis: what can be learned from 57 evaluation reports finalised between 2006 and 2010?

### Summary of findings and conclusions

The ex-ante analysis carried out under the first step of the study (analysis of the 6 regulations) led to the following key conclusions:

- ***Having a single legal base for each instrument*** helps improve the clarity of what is intended in the legal instrument as well as the governance and accountability provisions.
- ***The objective to have policy-driven instruments*** remains relevant and useful as the policies help clarify and explain intentions in greater detail.
- ***Formulating clear logic chains in regulations is key.*** This can be encouraged by avoiding

unstructured lists of activities and unclear links between activities, outputs and their intended impacts. The relationships between each step in the chain should be clear and logical so as to avoid gaps in the logic and ‘orphan’ outputs or impacts.

– ***A division of tasks*** between the regulation and the policy document can be a way to go into greater detail without overloading the regulation. The policies can be used to provide a more detailed framework than is found in the regulations so as to ensure a common-basis of understanding and *guide the choices* made in country/regional strategy papers as well as help ensure alignment with the regulation. The instrument should not just be seen as a random cluster of activities that the EC wishes to conduct, but rather as an agreed *intervention framework with a thought through logic*.

– ***Prioritisation to guide execution***. Several regulations contain long lists of identified activities. Prioritising these in relation to the objectives of the instrument can be useful to clarify the intervention logic.

– ***The complementarity between thematic and geographic instruments needs to be clearer***. Complementarity that was ‘required’ by the regulations did not always emerge in practice. This points to a need to (a) *specify what type of complementarity* is intended and to (b) clarify further the *division of tasks and relationship between thematic and geographic* instruments and programmes.

The ex-post analysis carried out under the second step of the study (analysis of evaluation reports) led to the following key conclusions:

– ***Lack of clarity in intervention logics leaves room for interpretation***. Linking the evaluation results to the interventions logics is made more difficult when the latter are not clear in their logic chain and overloaded at the result level. This obscures both learning and accountability on whether the results as found in evaluations contributed to the impact and global impact objectives as stated in the legal instruments.

– ***A fair degree of convergence was evident*** between what was expected and what took place, *but not all results are positive*. The sizeable proportion of mixed results (i.e. which did not make a difference) indicates *room for improvement* in both the programming and implementation, but also in the formulation of the guidance the instruments themselves provide for these actions.

– ***Missing links***. There was a lack of evidence on linkages and interrelations between the six legal instruments being made in practice in their use. None of the evaluations addressed this explicitly.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2011/1292\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2011/1292_docs_en.htm)

## 20 – Trade

### Evaluation of the Commission's Market Access Database (MADB)

**ABB activities:** 20 02 Trade policy

**Timing:** October 2011

#### Background, scope and focus

The evaluation of the MADB followed up on a previous evaluation undertaken in 2006, and assessed the current state of the MADB – including improvements implemented since the previous study - and the context in which it operates. The work ran from **February to October 2011**.

The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the contribution of the MADB towards achieving its main goals (*effectiveness*); to consider the financial and human resources committed to its operation (*efficiency*); and to provide recommendations for future orientations and eventual improvements of the service. DG TRADE had already received feedback that the MADB in general is a useful tool for stakeholders, but wanted to learn: about how to further improve the service; about the **utility and reliability** of each of the core sections of the MADB; about possibilities to make it more **user-friendly**; and about ways to reach a **broader audience** as the level of use was considered to be rather low.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

Overall, **the MADB is well targeted** to address the needs of its four main target groups. It supplies reliable, comprehensive and up-to-date information which cannot be found in the same quality and depth through other, freely available services.

The level of **usage of the MADB has remained relatively stable** over the last years at around 1,700 “daily unique visitors” on an average weekday (excluding users from within the EC). However, although the MADB ought to be especially beneficial to smaller sized enterprises – which often lack the resources, networks and critical mass to procure trade-related information efficiently through other means – **SMEs seem to be underrepresented** among those visitors.

Stakeholders generally **hold a positive view over the overall quality and usefulness of the MADB**. It combines different pieces of information into one integrated system – making it unique among comparable services.

Overall, the evaluation found that: **the performance of the MADB with regard to its first function – ie, providing basic information of interest to EU exporters -- is excellent**; the

second function (ie, listing all the trade barriers affecting EU exports) is less well implemented; and the approach taken to fulfil the third function (ie, making available an interactive means of communication between business and the EU authorities) has not yet proved successful.

**User feedback regarding the user-friendliness of the MADB is positive:** 71% of respondents find the MADB as a whole rather or very convenient to use. **The MADB could however be made more convenient to use** by: enabling multi-country or multi-tariff line searches; providing the option to download multiple information and in different formats; creating a “printer friendly” alternative for documents and results; and, by providing more explanation for novice users.

**More than half (57%) of MADB users report also using other online databases or web services:** mostly those that are free of charge. In comparison with the most popular alternative sites, **the MADB is relatively user-friendly, more up-to-date and more comprehensive** as regards to tariffs and import formalities (the *Applied Tariffs Database* and *Exporters' Guide to Import Formalities* sections). However, certain competitor websites have more complete trade barriers and SPS measures databases, and some of them offer information in more than one language.

**The awareness and take-up of the MADB amongst target groups is still limited,** especially amongst (smaller) exporting companies. The number of companies visiting the MADB is much lower than the overall number of European exporters. Information on the MADB does not reach them sufficiently: authorities and organisations on the ground do not seem to be very active in advertising the MADB. **Only 251 web pages link to the MADB,** and – within the framework of a “mystery shopping” exercise – **only two out of 14 trade promotion agencies or business representations recommended using it.** Furthermore, finding the MADB through a Google search is very difficult if one does not know its full name, using common trade-related search terms.

**The arrangements for day-to-day management of the MADB are adequate.** However, the swiftness of uploading data to ATD and EGIF sections and especially feedback to complainants could be improved. **The resources spent on the MADB are more than justified by the monetised benefits to users.** Total costs for the service amount to ca. €1.7 million, corresponding to a per-unit cost of €2.8 per single query – this is significantly lower than the price for a single query on the most comparable alternative service.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

<http://madb.europa.eu/mkacddb2/evaluation2011.htm>

## 21 – Development and Relations with African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States

### Evaluation of the European Commission's co-operation with the Dominican Republic

<b>ABB activities:</b>	21 06 Geographical cooperation with African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	November 2011
----------------	---------------

#### Background, scope and focus

The evaluation covers co-operation strategies and implementation of all activities during the period 2001-2009, primarily of the European Development Fund (EDF8 & EDF9, and programming of EDF10). During that period EU support co-operation areas included focal sectors (education / health, water & sanitation, governance, and macroeconomic support).

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

*The EU aid contributed to reducing poverty in key sectors, but has not specifically targeted the socio-equity gap. The sustainability of some results remains weak, primarily, but not only, due to the inadequate Government's financial support to most sectors in which the EC has operated (education, natural resources management and the DR-Haiti border zone development). Therefore, the EU should continue with the current strategy while focusing more on capacity development of the various local stakeholders and investing in robust monitoring and evaluation systems.*

#### **Main conclusions**

1. The EU supported the development priorities of the Government of the Dominican Republic and the needs of the people of the country, but did not specifically address the socio-equity gap that is critical in the country.
2. The EU's final choice of focal sectors was appropriate and proved to be effective, given the needs of the country and the comparative advantages of the EU.
3. The EU and the Government of the Dominican Republic have not been able to put into place a framework for mutual accountability founded on policy dialogue, results-based performance and the commitment to sustainability.
4. The EU has been relatively successful in transitioning from a project-based approach to a budget support-based approach. The decision to use Budget support was warranted from policy

and bilateral relationship perspectives but the mutual accountability base and the efficiency of that mechanism needs improvement.

5. In implementing its strategic vision concerning the role that Civil Society and Non-State Actors should play in Dominican Republic Society, the EU has been successful in helping to generate policy frameworks concerning Civil Society and in supporting Civil Society capacity to participate in specific policy debates.

6. The EUD is not sufficiently equipped with resources and management systems (design and assessment, risk management, monitoring, capacity development expertise) to effectively support the strategic objectives of the EU in the DR.

7. Although capacity development is a central tenet of the EU cooperation policy generally and in the Dominican Republic specifically, capacity development design in the country does not focus on sustainable and evidence-based competencies.

8. The EU is not systematically mainstreaming governance improvement and corruption elimination into its interventions, and following up with adequate monitoring systems.

9. The EU's programming and its subsequent implementation followed EU guidelines on the cross-cutting issues of environment and gender.

### **Main Recommendations**

1. Continue with poverty reduction as the key programme impact objective and focus on the reduction of the socio-economic equity gap in the country, ensuring that the management emphasis is on verifiable results and clear milestones of policy reform.

2. Ensure that capacity development is at the heart of every EU-supported intervention, and manage the capacity focus in keeping with the EU's Backbone Strategy, while focussing on evidence-based competencies and on-going monitoring and evaluation.

3. Invest in monitoring and evaluation processes and systems to be able to 1) define baselines, 2) follow progress on results, 3) enable faster adjustments to be made, 4) manage risks and 5) plan strategically based on a business eco-system approach.

4. Expand support to the education through a comprehensive multi-modality strategy to resolve key issues such as quality of education and management of resources.

5. Continue to use budget support as the main modality for supporting the Government of the Dominican Republic but tighten up the performance assessment framework. Focus the policy dialogue and the performance framework on results and significantly reinforce policy dialogue mechanisms.

6. Formalize a Civil Society Organisation Support Strategy based on a focussed approach to the capacity required within civil society and ensure that all EU modalities and instruments as well as the efforts of Member States leverage each other.

7. Continue to increase the competitiveness of the Dominican Republic both internally and for trade, by selecting a small number business clusters for a comprehensive support programme for competitiveness capacity.

8. Support to the mining sector should be continued so as to consolidate capacity and ensure sustainability.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2011/1293\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2011/1293_docs_en.htm)

## Evaluation of the European Commission's co-operation with the Republic of Malawi

<b>ABB activities:</b>	21 06 Geographical cooperation with African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	November 2011
----------------	---------------

### Background, scope and focus

The evaluation covers co-operation strategies and implementation including a mix of all activities and modalities during the period 2003-2010. During that period EU support co-operation with Malawi included focal sectors (regional development, agriculture and food security, regional interconnection – local and regional road transport), non-focal sectors (support to trade and investment, fight against HIV/AIDS and governance – civic education, justice and support to Non-State Actors) and cross-cutting issues (including environment, sustainability and gender issues).

### Summary of findings and conclusions

*Although EU cooperation has well responded to the country's enduring needs, certain aid modalities could be improved to adapt to evolving needs. The support has contributed to improved access and availability to food. It has been successful in reducing malnutrition in children under 5. EU aid has positively contributed to the maintenance of the existing road network, yet little has been achieved in terms of wider regional connectivity. Budget support has proved to be a powerful tool which has contributed to macro-economic stabilisation.*

#### **Main conclusions**

Budget support is a powerful tool with an excellent absorption capacity for the beneficiary country, and sector-wide approaches (SWAs) are the preferred modalities of both the Government of Malawi and the Commission. Progress towards SWAs has nevertheless been impeded in many sectors by institutional capacity issues.

Certain modalities (such as programme estimates and EDF procurement regulations) are very



demanding in terms of administrative and financial management and have hence led to delays, major under-spending and lack of achievement of support objectives. This is not the case for all modalities: budget support, pooled funding, co-operation and administration agreements and division of labour in compliance with the Paris Declaration are recognised as effective.

Capacity constraints and institutional weakness continue after many years of major technical assistance by the Commission and other donors. These continuing weaknesses impact upon broader governance, communication and dialogue, leadership and sector management at all levels. There are persistent significant needs for continued EU support to institutional capacity and governance.

The focal sector support of the EU to continuing national needs has been correctly focused and appropriate in terms of national absorption capacities and the capacity of the EU Delegation. In most support sectors sustainability prospects are better at 'grass roots' levels where beneficiaries have a more immediate and personal appreciation of the benefits but this sustainability is not assured. Sustainability prospects at higher levels are poor. However, needs are still there and, for focal sectors, there are no exit strategies in sight, whilst affordability and sustainability of some support interventions are in doubt. Further, "emerging risks" of population growth and as-yet undetermined effects of climate change potentially add pressure on development prospects.

Support of the EU for regional integration and connectivity has not been effective. Regarding infrastructure, Malawi is well placed to take advantage of a paradigm shift in regional connectivity that, if correctly leveraged by Malawi, could have significant impacts on quality and costs of transport services and on the competitiveness of Malawian products.

### **Main Recommendations**

#### ***Maximising the impacts of sector-wide approaches and budget support***

Launch support for the sector-wide approach in the Road Transport (sub) sector under the Road Transport Sector Policy Support Programme (RTSPSP) subject to confirmation of credible and convincing evidence of resolution of issues regarding "arrears".

#### ***Management of modalities***

Critically examine the Commission's and EDF procedures with a view to making them more practical and more user-friendly.

Regarding visibility actions, the report questions how positive perceptions weigh up against negative perceptions. The report suggests that the positive perceptions offset the negative ones but also highlights the need to assess what the value and/or purpose of visibility is.

#### ***Aspects of governance***

During the course of implementation of the proposed EDF10 Democratic Governance Programme consider additional aspects regarding the National Initiative for Civic Education, support to formal and informal justice sub-sectors and capacity building for non-state actors.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2011/1297\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2011/1297_docs_en.htm)

## Evaluation conjointe des opérations d'aide budgétaire au Mali entre 2003 et 2009

### ABB activities:

21 06 Geographical cooperation with African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States

### Timing:

September 2011

### Background, scope and focus

Les objectifs de l'évaluation étaient, d'une part, de tester la nouvelle approche d'évaluation de l'aide budgétaire et, d'autre part, de porter une appréciation globale et indépendante des résultats de l'aide budgétaire fournie par tous les partenaires techniques et financiers au Mali afin d'en tirer les principaux enseignements pour améliorer l'aide budgétaire future.

Le champ de l'évaluation a porté sur 32 opérations d'aide budgétaire, sur les 33 financées par dix partenaires techniques et financiers (PTF)\*. L'évaluation a porté sur les opérations d'appui budgétaire général (ABG) et d'appui budgétaire sectoriel (ABS) (Education, Santé, Gestion des finances publiques et Décentralisation) pour un montant total transféré de 966 M€.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

*L'aide budgétaire a fortement contribué au financement de la politique nationale de développement. La gestion des finances publiques a été améliorée. Grâce à la gestion macroéconomique prudente des autorités maliennes et à l'aide budgétaire, les conditions de vie des populations maliennes se sont globalement améliorées pendant la période sous évaluation. De nombreux défis restent toutefois à relever, notamment en matière de gestion des finances publiques et d'amélioration du climat des affaires de façon à accroître le développement économique et social. L'aide budgétaire devrait être poursuivie en cherchant à améliorer son efficacité.*

### **Principales conclusions générales**

– Grâce à son importance pour le budget national (environ 10% des dépenses de l'Etat sur la période), l'aide budgétaire a permis de financer la stratégie nationale de développement pour laquelle les autorités maliennes avaient un fort engagement. Par contre, l'aide budgétaire n'a globalement pas eu d'effet sur l'évolution des politiques nationales.

- L'aide budgétaire a contribué aux avancées enregistrées en matière de gestion des finances publiques qui nécessite toutefois d'être encore améliorée.
- En raison de sa «masse critique», de sa flexibilité comme moyen de financement et de son suivi de la stratégie nationale, l'AB a aidé à améliorer l'efficacité globale de l'affectation des ressources et à faire face aux besoins stratégiques des secteurs prioritaires.
- Dans le contexte d'une gestion macroéconomique prudente, la contribution financière des AB a été importante pour permettre au Mali d'atteindre un taux moyen de croissance économique réelle de 5% par an.

#### **Principales conclusions sectorielles**

- L'appui budgétaire sectoriel (ABS) a permis d'accélérer la mise en œuvre des réformes en matière de décentralisation et déconcentration.
- Sans le financement additionnel de l'ABS et de l'ABG, il aurait été impossible de financer les réalisations dans les secteurs de l'éducation et de la santé et donc les résultats positifs pour les populations maliennes.
- Toutefois, le frein principal à la croissance économique est lié au faible taux d'investissement privé sur lequel l'aide budgétaire n'a pas eu d'influence.

#### **Principales recommandations**

- Renforcer l'impact des transferts financiers en agissant sur les indicateurs, la prévisibilité, la flexibilité et la date des décaissements des aides budgétaires.
- Redéfinir les objectifs du dialogue sur les politiques afin d'améliorer la contribution de l'aide budgétaire aux processus nationaux d'élaboration et de suivi des politiques, ainsi qu'à la formulation et au suivi du budget national.
- Eliminer les freins à la mise en œuvre de la stratégie nationale de développement et mettre en place un programme réaliste d'amélioration du climat d'investissements.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation\\_reports/2011/1290\\_docs\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2011/1290_docs_en.htm)

## 22 – Enlargement

### Strategic/Interim Evaluation of EU IPA Pre-Accession Assistance to Albania

<b>ABB activities:</b>	22 02 Enlargement process and strategy
------------------------	--

<b>Timing:</b>	February 2011
----------------	---------------

#### Background, scope and focus

It covers European Union assistance under Component 1 starting from the 2007 IPA programme and the intervention logic followed in the Multi-Annual Indicative Planning Documents (MIPDs) of 2007-2009, 2008-2010 and 2009-2010. The purpose is to provide an assessment of the intervention logic of IPA assistance to Albania including the extent to which assistance should be programmed and implemented through a sectoral approach. The evaluators also provide a judgement on the performance (actual or expected) of assistance, particularly as regards its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

##### Key findings

- The overall quality of the intervention logic is good and has improved over time although it is not sufficiently focused and measurable.
- A common weakness in the intervention logic is that objectives are wide and/or not sufficiently precise. MIPDs do not include sufficient indicators to measure results and indicators in project fiches are not sufficiently SMART, particularly as regards timing.
- IPA financing is of limited capacity to address Albania's needs or to achieve the priority objectives in MIPDs as they are currently formulated. Effectiveness can be enhanced by focusing available resources on selected priority sectors.
- There has been relatively limited sequencing within prioritised sectors in Albania, particularly with regards to infrastructure projects.
- A sector-based approach is a feasible and operational option for future IPA programming.
- The involvement of line institutions in project implementation can be improved. This, together with high staff turnover, has led to some important implementation delays.
- The Ministry for European Integration (MEI), which is the National IPA Co-ordinator (NIPAC), prepares to set up sector monitoring sub-committees. This coincides with the finalisation of the Integrated Planning System (IPS) monitoring system. On the one hand, this

provides an opportunity for developing a unified sector monitoring system. On the other, there is a risk of confusion and overload in line institutions and of duplication of procedures and conflicting reporting time schedules.

- Contracting and disbursement has been low to date as compared to plan and there is a risk that the funds may not be fully contracted on time. The lack of capacity and engagement by beneficiary institutions is an important factor for this.
- Based on result-oriented monitoring (ROM) reports, expected impact and sustainability were judged as positive. Nevertheless, the evaluators reported some risks related to insufficient institutional support and post-implementation arrangements, including financing.

### **Key recommendations**

- The number of priorities and objectives in the MIPDs should be reduced and better focused. Annual programming should focus consistently, in successive years, on a limited number of prioritised sectors.
- The quality of objectives of project fiches should be more focused and measurable as well as better linked to MIPD objectives.
- More flexible financial allocations per priority axis and/or annual allocations are recommended to improve prioritisation and sequencing of assistance.
- There is a need to formulate minimum quality standards for sector strategies to assess their use for a sector-based approach.
- The Albanian authorities should decide which sectors would be appropriate for a sector-based approach, based on three criteria: (a) relevance to EU integration/accession; (b) the quality of strategies; (c) administrative capacity to implement and monitor strategies. The evaluator is of the view that (a) should be the main criteria for the selection of sectors.
- The Albanian government should ensure that there is sufficient capacity in line institutions to manage the implementation of a sector-based approach for selected sectors.
- The MEI (NIPAC) should lead the development of a single monitoring system using common data inputs from line institutions and common reporting formats.
- There is a need to increase beneficiaries commitment in the activities financed with the aim to improve impact and sustainability of assistance.

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

For the internal use of the Commission.

**Interim Evaluation of Cross-Border Programmes between Candidate/Potential Candidate Countries (Intra-Western Balkan Borders) under the Cross-Border Cooperation Component of IPA; Report II – Performance of assistance**

**ABB activities:**

22 02 Enlargement process and strategy

**Timing:**

02/06/2011

**Background, scope and focus**

This evaluation is the second part of the Interim Evaluation of Cross-Border Programmes between Candidate/Potential Candidate Countries (Intra-Western Balkan Borders) under the Cross-Border Cooperation (CBC) Component of IPA; and focuses on the CBC programme implementation. The evaluation covers the eight Intra Western Balkan IPA CBC programmes with an emphasis on the overall instrument level and, where relevant, at the programme or grant scheme level. The main objective of the evaluation is to identify lessons learned and recommendations for the revision of the current CBC programmes.

**Summary of findings and conclusions**

**Key findings**

- Stakeholders perceive that the programme has contributed to improve good neighbourly relations.
- Projects are expected to deliver expected outputs; some projects may need an extension; the limited budget available for some programmes may pose challenges to their implementation.
- The long process of evaluating project applications has resulted in the need to change some projects and has generated frustration of the stakeholders involved.
- There are no unified contract templates which could be used by partners on either side of the border, nor formal procedures for secondary procurement.
- Monitoring systems are not in place yet and this results in a lack of data collection and weak risks mitigation mechanisms.
- Sustainability is uncertain since systems and institutions which could secure impact after the end of projects have not been planned or designed yet.

**Key recommendations:**

- Programme allocations between the two sides should be more balanced in order to reduce

leftover amounts.

- The evaluation and selection process should be shortened by merging steps and checks and by delegating more tasks and responsibilities to the JTSs.
- Rules and procedures should be harmonised and streamlined, and the capacity of administrative structures strengthened.
- A monitoring system including common data collection and assessment of risks should be put in place.
- Adequate advice should be provided to future applicants to avoid the recurrent use of extensions.
- The capacity of stakeholders should be improved through more focused training and programme guidelines in order to promote sustainability.
- Action should be taken to promote applications from groups which have not been well represented (i.e. municipalities and other public bodies).

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/financial\\_assistance/phare/evaluation/20120304\\_2cbc\\_wb\\_2\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/financial_assistance/phare/evaluation/20120304_2cbc_wb_2_en.pdf)

### **Retrospective evaluation of EU pre-accession assistance to CBC programmes in Bulgaria and Romania**

<b>ABB activities:</b>	22 02 Enlargement process and strategy
------------------------	--

<b>Timing:</b>	01/2011
----------------	---------

#### **Background, scope and focus**

The objective of the evaluation is to evaluate the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of PHARE CBC programmes. The scope includes 2004–2006 CBC programmes i) between Bulgaria and Romania and ii) between them and neighbouring IPA countries.

#### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

### **Key findings**

- The CBC programmes show satisfactory intervention logic although with some weaknesses. The intervention logic of programmes is sound, with in general SMART objectives. However, there is not sufficient coherence between indicators at different programming levels and between Joint Programming Documents and Project Fiches.
- Relevance of CBC programmes has been satisfactory. The interventions and grant sizes have been adequate to support and complement the Accession Strategy. Furthermore, CBC provided the opportunity (the first for some countries) for stimulating cooperation among local stakeholders.
- Local and regional authorities have been consulted during the programming phase, though the level of involvement has not always been satisfactory, particularly in case of border region municipalities.
- Project selection has been based on clear, coherent and homogenous criteria, though the level of transparency could be improved.
- In terms of efficiency and effectiveness CBC has only been partially satisfactory. In general, the administrative procedures and organisational structures in place have been adequate. However, in certain programmes some inefficiencies have undermined the efficient and effective delivery of interventions. These include: insufficient cooperation between National Aid Co-ordinator (NAC) services; insufficient resources to manage a large amount of grants; uncertainties regarding transition from PRAG<sup>1</sup> procurement to national procurement rules, problems with delegation of responsibilities; disproportionate burden in terms of documents to be submitted, a mostly paper-based selection process and an excessive focus on tight controls rather than a real attention towards programme results.
- Programme and project monitoring has only been partially adequate. Indicators defined at programme level have not in all cases been adequate and consistent with those defined at project level, and a formal monitoring has not been carried out at programme level, but only at project level. The overall monitoring system and its reports have been focused on the implementation of the programme, with limited focus on results/impacts. Another weakness in the monitoring process has been the lack of a comprehensive web-based information system.
- The main impacts have been the improvement of institutional capacity and improved cooperation although the implementation period has not been appropriate in some cases. Assistance has contributed to improve management skills of beneficiaries; the development of positive attitude towards cross-border cooperation and the creation of sustainable networks between institutions and local authorities as well as between grants beneficiaries. In many of the programmes, the implementation period for grant schemes with an investment component/small-scale infrastructure projects may have not been appropriate.

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

For internal use of the Commission.

---

<sup>1</sup> Practical Guide to Contract Procedures for EU External Actions



## Thematic evaluation of EU's support to civil society in the Western Balkans and Turkey

### ABB activities:

22 02 Enlargement process and strategy

### Timing:

26/06/2011

### Background, scope and focus

The thematic evaluation of EU's support to civil society (CS) in the Western Balkans and Turkey (WBT) consists of two parts. It covers EU assistance to the WBT funded under the IPA 2007-2009 national programs and the IPA multi-beneficiary programmes under Component I. This includes the multi-beneficiary programmes within the Civil Society Facility (CSF): Technical Assistance for Civil Society Organisations (TACSO), the People 2 People programme (P2P) and Partnership Actions. Part I of the evaluation provides an assessment of the intervention logic of EU assistance to support civil society in the WBT.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

1. Interventions are relevant for the objectives identified in the Multi-Annual Indicative Documents (MIPDs). However, measurement of progress is challenged by the absence of SMART indicators and the wide definition of strategic objectives.
2. CS needs are formulated with reference to enlargement political objectives. However, these objectives may not always reflect WBT citizens' socio-economic priorities such as employment, service provision or environmental concerns.
3. Involvement of CS organisations and other key stakeholders in needs assessment and the accuracy of this assessment could be enhanced throughout the programming cycle.
4. While programming is well prioritised, sequencing of projects is less regular and its practice depends on national sector priorities and project context.
5. Lengthy calls for proposals significantly delay the implementation of the programmes.
6. Key terminology such as "Civil Society", "Civil Society Development", "Civil Society Dialogue", and "Civil Society Facility" is not sufficiently clear among stakeholders and does not correspond to common perceptions of CS organisations/NGOs in the WBT.

### Key recommendations

- Strategic objectives should be more operational and supported by relevant SMART indicators.
- The EC and beneficiaries should agree on operational definitions of key concepts, such as “Civil Society”, “Civil Society Development”, and “Civil Society Dialogue”.
- The beneficiary selection procedure should be reviewed to assess the adequacy of the coverage of different CS players, and to focus support on beneficiaries with good sustainability prospects.
- Participation of CS and other stakeholders in programming and project selection could be improved by adopting and implementing the EC “Minimum Standards”<sup>1</sup> for consultation of CS on EU related matters.
- The time-span from programming to implementation should be reduced, particularly by speeding up the call for proposal process.
- Impact could be improved by increasing the use of long-term grants.
- Sustainability of interventions may be enhanced through increasing partnerships with stakeholders with a potential for income generation and local visibility (e.g. local authorities).

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

For internal use of the Commission.

### **Thematic Evaluation of IPA-Funded Information and Communication Activities**

**ABB activities:**

22 02 Enlargement process and strategy

**Timing:**

07/06/2011

#### **Background, scope and focus**

The evaluation covers EU assistance to the Western Balkans and Turkey in the field of information and communication (IC) activities funded under the IPA Multi-Beneficiary

<sup>1</sup> Commission of the European Communities, “Towards a reinforced culture of consultation and dialogue – General principles and minimum standards for consultation of interested parties by the Commission”, COM(2002) 704 final, 11 December 2002

Programme during 2007-2011. The purpose was to provide an assessment of the intervention logic of IC programmes and actions running within the EU's communication strategy for the candidate and potential candidate countries. The evaluators were asked to provide a judgement on the performance of assistance, particularly as regards its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

1. While overall objectives of IPA-funded IC are clear and coherent at Headquarters (HQs) and EU Delegation (EUD) level, specific objectives are too broad and do not meet SMART criteria.
2. IC activities are particularly relevant in a context where beneficiaries place relatively low importance on communicating enlargement.
3. While complementarity of activities and coordination with key stakeholders (i.e. beneficiaries' administration, Member States and international organisations) are good, there is scope for increased coordination and planning at the strategic level.
4. IPA IC funds have generally been deployed in an efficient manner. However, efficiency could be increased by downscaling activities with limited effectiveness (e.g. publications) and greater concentration of resources on fewer activities.
5. At an operational level, human resources within EUDs have been deployed in an effective manner and EUD staff show a high level of commitment towards their tasks. However, with the exception of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Kosovo<sup>1</sup>, all EUDs lack human resources to effectively and efficiently implement IC activities.
6. IC activities are clearly visible and effective for audiences with an interest in enlargement but less so for “non-informed” audiences and the broader public.
7. EUDs are effective in providing independent and objective information on enlargement but less effective in timely addressing public misconceptions and concerns.
8. Overall, IPA IC activities are likely to have a soft and indirect impact on public knowledge through involvement of multipliers and media coverage of activities.
9. A significant positive impact on public opinion is unlikely, since the communication efforts are too marginal and there exist other important factors influencing public opinion.
10. Sustainability of activities without continued EU funding is likely to be low as funding from beneficiaries or other sources is uncertain.

### **Key recommendations**

- While general objectives may remain broad, specific objectives should be more focussed, realistic and time- bound.
- DG ELARG should provide more operational support to EUDs in the planning and

---

<sup>1</sup> This designation is without prejudice to positions on status and is in line with UNSCR 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence.

implementation of IC activities.

- Consultation with EUDs on the definitions of activities to be undertaken at central level should be strengthened.
- Current staff allocation and organisation of communication within EUDs should be reviewed and where possible additional human resources should be allocated to IC management.
- EUDs should elaborate guidelines for the effective management of monitoring/measurement activities undertaken by contractors. Evaluations of previous activities should be used as one of the baselines for selection and implementation of future activities.
- Conditions for sustainability of funded activities should be better addressed during the selection process at EUDs.

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

For internal use of the Commission.

### **Thematic evaluation of EU pre-accession multi-beneficiary assistance to Western Balkans and Turkey in the fields of environment and disaster risk reduction**

**ABB activities:**

22 02 Enlargement process and strategy

**Timing:**

31/05/2011

#### **Background, scope and focus**

The evaluation covers EU assistance to the Western Balkans and Turkey in the fields of environment and disaster risk reduction (DRR) under the multi-beneficiary (MB) programmes financed under CARDS during 2002-2006 and under IPA - Component I during 2007-2009. The purpose is to provide judgement on the performance (actual or expected) of assistance, particularly as regards its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The evaluators were asked also to provide relevant lessons learned and recommendations for the programming of future multi-beneficiary pre-accession assistance in the areas covered by the evaluation.

## **Summary of findings and conclusions**

1. The intervention logic under IPA is clearer than the one under CARDS. However, the objectives are too broad and not sufficiently linked across the different programming stages.
2. Objectives at project level are relevant and financial assistance follows the priorities outlined in key strategic documents.
3. While programming is lead by the European Commission (EC) in close consultation with “institutional” stakeholders (namely EC, national authorities, International Financial Institutions (IFIs), there is limited involvement of NGOs.
4. There are no formally defined criteria to support project selection and the selection process is perceived by some stakeholders as insufficiently transparent.
5. Programmes and projects are not systematically supported by assessments in terms of funding needs, added value of the MB/regional approach and response to national needs.
6. A key contribution of the MB programmes has been the promotion of beneficiaries' institutional change towards working together on environment and disaster-risk reduction (DRR) issues by encouraging networking and sharing experiences.
7. Existing monitoring is not effective as it does not provide a comprehensive sector overview. This limits its potential use for improving programme design.
8. Impact and sustainability of programmes is hampered by uneven commitment and ownership of the beneficiary countries which dedicate limited human and financial resources and often do not plan follow-up actions beyond EU assistance.
9. Multi-annual long-term projects are effective in creating sustainable links between participants beyond the projects implementation.
10. Dissemination and visibility activities are not fully effective in promoting sustainability.

### **Key recommendations**

- Programming should be more focused and prioritized.
- Capacity and participation of national institutions to should be reinforced.
- Consultation with stakeholders, including NGOs, should be strengthened and more transparent.
- Impact and sustainability of assistance could be enhanced by favouring multi-annual projects.
- Post-project management procedures should be defined in the programme and project design, including a strategy to use project outputs and disseminate results.
- Monitoring should be reinforced at programme level.

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

For internal use of the Commission.

## Strategic/Interim Evaluation of EU IPA Pre-Accession Assistance to Kosovo<sup>1</sup>

**ABB activities:** 22 AWBL-03 Enlargement pre-accession negotiations

**Timing:** December 2010/Dissemination February 2011

### Background, scope and focus

This evaluation was completed in December 2010. It covers European Union assistance under Component 1 starting from the 2007 IPA programme and the intervention logic followed in the MIPDs of 2007-2009, 2008-2010 and 2009-2011. The purpose is to provide an assessment of the intervention logic of IPA assistance to Kosovo including the extent to which assistance should be programmed and implemented through a sectoral approach. The evaluators also provide a judgement on the performance (actual or expected) of assistance, particularly as regards its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The results of this evaluation have been taken into consideration within the Mid-term Meta-evaluation of IPA which will be completed shortly.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

#### Key findings

- The overall quality of the intervention logic is good although not sufficiently targeted and measurable.
- Sequencing for infrastructure projects could be improved, taking into account the beneficiary's capacity and the availability of co-financing.
- There are indications that a sector-based approach to IPA programming in Kosovo could be implemented in the near future.
- National strategies do not cover all *acquis*-related sectors and MIPD priorities, there are significant gaps in coverage. The quality of existing strategies varies significantly.
- The alignment of IPA and other donors' assistance is key, as there is significant donor activity in Kosovo.
- Adequate administrative and organisational structures have been established, but their role is not well-defined and the involvement of officials in project preparation is limited.

<sup>1</sup> This designation is without prejudice to positions on status and is in line with UNSCR 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence.

- An examination of contracting data indicates that the procurement stage of implementation is well managed by the European Commission Liaison Office (ECLO) to Kosovo.
- Increased contracting needs in PFs are often underestimated and this offsets efficiency gains deriving from larger projects.
- Based on ROM monitoring reports, expected impact and sustainability were judged as positive. Nevertheless, the evaluators reported some risks related to insufficient institutional support and post-implementation arrangements, including financing.

#### **Key recommendations**

- The number of priorities and objectives in the MIPDs should be reduced and better focused.
- The quality of objectives of NPs/PFs should be more targeted and measurable and better linked to MIPD objectives.
- Infrastructure projects should be sequenced according to beneficiary capacity and availability of co-financing.
- National sector strategies should cover all acquis-related sectors and MIPD priorities. The quality of most existing strategies needs to be improved by developing realistic action plans and adding indicators which can be used for performance monitoring.
- The Ministry of European Integration should take a leadership role in the sector strategic planning process.
- Action to limit the number of contracts per project fiche is recommended.
- Mechanisms to improve prospects for impact and sustainability of assistance should be introduced, including formal post-implementation arrangements.

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

For internal use of the Commission.

### **Strategic/Interim evaluation of IPA pre-accession assistance to Serbia**

<b>ABB activities:</b>	22 AWBL-03 Enlargement pre-accession negotiations
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	January 2011
----------------	--------------

#### **Background, scope and focus**

This evaluation was part of a project completed in January 2011. It covers European Union assistance under Component 1 starting from the 2007 IPA programme and the intervention logic followed in the MIPDs of 2007-2009, 2008-2010 and 2009-2010. The purpose was to provide an assessment of the intervention logic of IPA assistance to Serbia including the extent to which assistance should be programmed and implemented through a sectoral approach. The evaluators were also asked to provide a judgement on the performance (actual or expected) of assistance, particularly as regards its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The evaluation was also intended to provide input for the Mid-term Meta-evaluation of IPA.

## **Summary of findings and conclusions**

### **Key findings**

- The harmonisation between IPA objectives and the beneficiary's policies is good although some adjustment would be suitable upon the introduction of the sector-based approach.
- Donor-coordination works well; donors are participating in the inter-sector working groups and the process is supported by an online database.
- In the last National Programmes (NPs) projects have gained in coherence and comprehensiveness as compared to previous programmes.
- There is a well-functioning project-selection mechanism in place, with proper sequencing and prioritisation.
- Administrative and monitoring structures are in place, though adequate human capacity remains a major problem.
- The performance in terms of contracting and disbursement is appropriate.
- Measuring progress is difficult, as the main programming documents do not include SMART indicators/objectives.
- More than seventy strategies were mapped by the consultants. Overall, their quality in terms of identification of needs (including financial) is limited and they are not systematically monitored.

### **Key recommendations**

- Reduction of the number of strategic objectives in the MIPDs would be advisable, with SMARTer indicators to measure progress.
- Solving the staffing problems within the Ministry of Finance would allow the gradual withdrawal of programming technical assistance.
- Monitoring structures need to be strengthened, especially by introducing formal mechanisms to make better use of the monitoring results.
- Continuous efforts should be placed in development of Serbian leadership in programming and implementation of assistance.

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



For internal use of the Commission.

## Evaluation on stakeholder participation in programming and implementation of pre-accession assistance to Turkey

**ABB activities:** 22 AWBL-03 Enlargement pre-accession negotiations

**Timing:** January 2011

### Background, scope and focus

The overall objective of the evaluation was to assess stakeholder involvement in programming and implementation of pre-accession assistance to Turkey, as well as providing lessons learned and recommendations on how to involve stakeholders in future programming and implementation under the Instrument for Pre-Accession (IPA) in the Turkish context.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

#### Key findings

- The principle of stakeholder participation is generally accepted and there is a growing interest and preparedness to ensure wider stakeholder participation in IPA I programming.
- Stakeholders involved in the programming and implementation of IPA I included a large category of institutions (development partners, EU organisations, governmental institutions and civil society organisations (CSOs)). The involvement of CSOs (especially trade unions and NGOs) is relatively limited due to lack of capacity and the high level of fragmentation. Interest representation is highly centralised.
- A long term perspective, preferably supported by sectoral strategies, is a key factor for effective stakeholder participation. Some sectors (political criteria, civil society, and environment) show larger stakeholder participation, compared to others (justice, freedom and security, taxation).
- MIPD preparation and revision offer limited scope for wide stakeholder participation. Inviting stakeholders to provide written comments on the draft MIPD appears ineffective. The introduction of sector strategies in 2011-2013 MIPD may facilitate stakeholder participation.
- The preparation process of the Annual National Programme is the main bottleneck for stakeholder involvement. External stakeholder participation in Project Identification Sheet (PIS) and Project Fiche (PF) formulation remains limited.

- The phase with the widest involvement of stakeholders is implementation. Governmental bodies represent the largest share of direct and indirect beneficiaries. The Senior Project Officer (SPO) has a key role in terms of stakeholder participation as they are responsible for deciding on the members of the Steering Committee.
- Of the different contract forms, grant schemes were assessed as offering the largest scope for stakeholder participation.
- Monitoring activities are performed by SPOs and IPA management partners with very limited involvement of external stakeholders. External stakeholders are usually not involved in monitoring activities, which contrasts with other IPA components.

**Key recommendations**

- Beneficiaries need to develop a strategic approach to stakeholder involvement. This should include: (a) an assessment of relevant actors and stakeholders and (b) a roadmap for the development and implementation of a capacity building strategy.
- The Secretary General for EU Affairs (EUSG) should exert stronger leadership in providing operational support and guidance to beneficiaries, monitoring progress and enforcing the strategic approach.
- The EU Delegation should improve consultation with development partners, MS embassies and CSOs during the preparation of sector strategies, MIPDs and project pipeline. This may include increasing the use of workshops and sectoral working groups to complement written consultation.
- EUSG should adjust the guidelines and formats of the PIS and PF templates and assessment forms. This may include making stakeholder participation a selection criterion for PIS and PF.
- SPOs should extend the participation of stakeholders in consultative and decision-making bodies, such as Steering Committees.
- EUSG should consider systematically inviting representatives of CSOs and other external stakeholders as observers to the Joint Monitoring Committee/Transition Assistance and Institution-Building Component (JMC/TAIB) and Sectoral Monitoring Sub-Committees (SMSCs), in order to improve visibility and accountability to the wider public and foster capacity building.

**Availability of the report on Europa**

For internal use of the Commission.

## Review of Twinning in Turkey

*Evaluation related study*

### ABB activities:

22 02 Enlargement process and strategy

### Timing:

23/05/2011

### Background, scope and focus

The evaluation was intended to provide a retrospective assessment of Twinning in Turkey in terms of its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Secondly, it was expected to provide recommendations for programming future Twinning assistance in Turkey. The period covered by the evaluation was 2002 to 2009.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

#### Key findings

- The vast majority of Twinning projects in Turkey achieved their objectives. (Based on the positive average score in the Interim Evaluation Reports (IER), and the confirmation of the IER scores in the case studies.)
- The most common reasons for Twinning projects to fail to deliver included: lack of political commitment, problems with procurement, inadequate expert mobilization from the Member State institution, and an outdated needs assessment.
- The presence of synergies between Twinning projects and other EU and/or donor funded projects was a key factor supporting the success of Twinning projects.
- Results and impacts could be achieved more cost-effectively by reducing the delay in the delivery of the activities.
- Institutional and/or legal alignment to the Acquis is in most cases still pending, and will be dependent on the political adoption of the relevant legislative or organisational reforms.
- Twinning has had significantly more impact in the Environment sector than in the Agriculture and Fisheries sector. Its role in the Justice and Home Affairs sector has been mixed and requires more sustained efforts.
- Despite mostly good intentions, ongoing cooperation between the beneficiary and the member state institution after the end of the Twinning project is not widespread in practice.

#### Key Recommendations

- In line with the Twinning manual, political commitment should be assessed at the start of the

project. The criteria used to support a new Twinning project should be more objectively verifiable.

- Twinning should be used in more sectors. Training on the Twinning instrument, including information on Twinning projects in other government sectors and other accession countries, should be provided.
- Programming and contracting procedures should be shortened, so that the time between the needs assessment and the actual start of the Twinning project is reduced.
- The beneficiary should ensure that the staff members directly involved in the management of the Twinning project are fully available. The Secretary General for EU Affairs (EUSG) should monitor and interfere in case such availability is not guaranteed.
- The selection of the Member State institution should be carefully based on Resident Twinning Adviser (RTA) availability and competences, as well as the institutions' capacity to endow short term experts to the project.

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

For internal use of the Commission.

### **Evaluation of Twinning versus Technical Assistance**

**ABB activities:**

22 02 Enlargement process and strategy

**Timing:**

26/01/2011

#### **Background, scope and focus**

The evaluation covers European Union assistance delivered through twinning (standard and light) and technical assistance. The purpose is to assess the contribution of these instruments to the overall accession process in the Western Balkans and Turkey. The evaluators undertook a comparative analysis of the relative advantage of each instrument as well as of the choice considerations. The report presents lessons learned and guidance on the programming and planning of future assistance. In this context, the evaluation team developed a cost-benefit template to support decisions on when to use twinning and when technical assistance.

#### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

- Twinning is suitable for support of public bodies, acquis related assignments and for organisations with sufficient capacity and awareness to handle twinning projects. For organisations less able to make full use of twinning, technical assistance (TA) is a suitable alternative.
- TA is nominally more expensive than twinning. The cost-difference is, however, offset by flexibility/efficiency gains. The time necessary to start operations or to adjust the work plan are more cumbersome under twinning.
- Important assumptions as regards twinning are proven valid: its possibility to foster relations between institutions in the EU and in the (potential) candidates, as well as changes in working culture. In contrast, TA appears to be more flexible and easier to steer.
- The sampled projects scored above average on impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. There was no significant difference in this regard between projects using twinning or TA.
- Some of the factors for a successful project are: the 'chemistry' between providers and beneficiaries; a shared understanding of the issue; clear division of responsibilities; no imposed solutions; detailed knowledge of the issue and its background by the provider.
- The selection of providers is equally important as the selection of an instrument. Providers from institutions detached from mainstream public administration would normally have less of a benefit in terms of developing relations by the beneficiary with 'sister institutions' in the EU.

#### **Key recommendations**

- Twinning is suitable for acquis related assignments in acquis related beneficiary organisations that have sufficient capacity to absorb twinning. For other assignments, TA may be more effective.
- Developing lasting relations with a member state is important. This, however, should not be a reason for selecting twinning if the beneficiary is not able to make full use of it.
- Insisting on more detailed twinning proposals would facilitate the selection of the provider. A presentation from TA providers, as part of the tender procedure, would also facilitate selection.
- The lead time for twinning projects could be shortened. The twinning manual should be more explicit on the roles and responsibilities of beneficiary and provider.
- The preparatory workshop for providers should be longer (i.e. more than the current 1.5 days). It needs to focus on communication skills, flexibility and pro-active approach during the assignment.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/financial\\_assistance/institution\\_building/2012/20120525\\_twinning\\_vs\\_ta\\_final\\_report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/financial_assistance/institution_building/2012/20120525_twinning_vs_ta_final_report.pdf)

## 23 – Humanitarian Aid

### Evaluation and Strategy Orientation of DG ECHO-Funded Health Sector Activities in Burmese Refugee Camps in Thailand (2004-2009)

<b>ABB activities:</b>	23 02 Humanitarian aid including aid to uprooted people, food aid and disaster preparedness
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	February 2011
----------------	---------------

#### Background, scope and focus

The camps for Burmese refugees in Thailand are the result of the ongoing conflict between the central Burmese regime and some ethnic minorities. The Directorate-General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection of the European Commission has been supporting food assistance to the refugees in Thailand since 1995, and since 2004 it has funded the provision of basic health assistance in six of the nine camps along the border. The scope of the evaluation covered the actions funded through the humanitarian policy of the EU in the health sector between 2004 and 2009. The first objective of the evaluation is to provide a retrospective assessment of the activities in the health sector and the second one is to provide a prospective strategic assessment with a view to identifying practical options and recommendations in the context of the EU current strategy.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

The health conditions in all the refugee camps over the period were satisfactory, compared to standard reference indicators and even more so to indicators for Burma/Myanmar. This situation logically reflects the effectiveness of health structures, which have been organized to the best of the partners' abilities with adequate funding over a protracted period, despite a number of constraints. All major health risks have been addressed, resulting in low mortality rates and appropriate outbreak and disease control. Nevertheless, in the absence of involvement of the Thai authorities, the currently controlled situation is entirely based on external assistance, including public health and medical support, and these figures would undoubtedly increase rapidly again to unacceptable levels without such assistance. As a consequence of the lack of integration perspectives, the continued EU assistance to all health subsectors is similarly still appropriate, although it should be increasingly focused on a public health approach rather than a purely medical one.

Regarding future strategy orientation about possible transfers of Health services to the Thai Health System, as long as refugees reside in the camps, the only alternative to NGO/international community provision of health care would be the provision of this care by the Thai authorities. However it is highly unlikely that this will happen. Therefore, under the

present conditions, there does not seem to be any alternative for the financing of health care for the refugees other than by the international community. This includes the various health activities inside the camps and the payment for cases referred to the Thai hospitals.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2011/Burma\\_Final\\_Report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2011/Burma_Final_Report.pdf)

### **Evaluation of DG ECHO's Actions in the Water Sanitation/Public Health Sector in Zimbabwe**

#### **ABB activities:**

23 02 Humanitarian aid including aid to uprooted people, food aid and disaster preparedness

#### **Timing:**

June 2011

#### **Background, scope and focus**

In 2008, cholera outbreaks in Zimbabwe infected local communities and the water and sanitation networks. At that time the Government was unable to respond to the epidemic in any meaningful way. In order to address some of the underlying factors contributing to water borne disease outbreaks, Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) partners established an Emergency Rehabilitation and Risk Reduction programme. Since 2008 and until 2011 the European Union humanitarian services have mainly provided support in the areas of Water and Sanitation and health (under the acronym WERU, standing for Water, sanitation and health Emergency Response Unit) and food security. The scope of the evaluation covered the implementation of EU-funded humanitarian actions between 2008 and 2010 (3 years). Furthermore, it focused on the water and sanitation components of the overall action, with the links to public health.

#### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The response to the cholera emergency in Zimbabwe was not a carefully planned programme which was established in advance. The WERU approach that emerged from the emergency response of several separate agencies and actors in the sector was interactive in nature and

organic in its growth and development. The evaluation team had difficulties to assemble verifiable indicators of past performance for comparison against present targets. Moreover, there was insufficient documentation available specifically explaining the formulation of the WERU approach and detailing its main features and implementation modality. Despite the lack of formalized documentation it is clear that the collective understanding of the WERU approach was a voluntary agreement by the four organizations who had signed partnership agreements with UNICEF.

It is considered that the response to the cholera was well developed and entirely relevant to the dramatic evolution of the cholera epidemic in the country. The overall impression is that the work done by WERU partners during and shortly after the peak of the cholera crisis in 2008 and 2009 was a major contributing factor to the prevention and control of the disease and was greatly appreciated by the Government of Zimbabwe. The EU role in this rapidly developing situation was pivotal as the Harare ECHO office was able to respond to funding requests and dispense those funds with alacrity and flexibility. Nevertheless, it is recognised that efficiency was better achieved during the emergency phase of the WERU programme between 2008 and 2010 than during the less stressed post-emergency phase during and after 2010. In fact, the coordination mechanisms operated during the latter stages of WERU activity are not considered to be ideal in that they are entirely voluntary and do not have any executive powers to enforce technical or health sector standards, which are essential for the sustainability of the results. Finally, even if WERU was originally an emergency response unit, it shifted its focus slightly towards developing new capacity in emergency preparedness. This is itself a quasi-transition activity and a good starting point for developing a more coherent transition strategy.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2011/Zimbabwe\\_Final\\_Report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2011/Zimbabwe_Final_Report.pdf)

### Evaluation of the DG ECHO action in Uganda

<b>ABB activities:</b>	23 02 Humanitarian aid including aid to uprooted people, food aid and disaster preparedness
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	May 2011
----------------	----------

#### Background, scope and focus

The reduction in humanitarian aid to the north-central region of Uganda, which has been the focus of the humanitarian community for more than 10 years, is a result of the perceived reduction of humanitarian needs in the country.



The scope of the evaluation covers the implementation of the EU funded humanitarian action between 2006 and 2010, and focuses on: food assistance, protection of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), water, sanitation and hygiene promotion (WASH), health/nutrition, and especially on Linking Relief Rehabilitation and Development keeping in mind the plan of phasing out by December 2011.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

In general terms, the EU funded activities, mainly multi-sectoral programmes, were relevant and appropriate to needs. Projects were implemented within agreed budgets; sometimes more direct beneficiaries were registered than foreseen previously (for instance 89,529 people could benefit from the Oxfam project in WASH sector compared to 77,357 previously foreseen).

Regarding the WASH sector, Uganda was a pilot country for the introduction of the cluster approach, which has permitted (in particular the Food Security and Agricultural Livelihoods) important achievements, for example coverage improved for thematic areas of child protection. However not all sectors worked well under clusters, local actors were largely excluded, ownership remaining low.

In addition, the EU WASH interventions focused on rehabilitation of existing infrastructure rather than construction of new water points.

Regarding sanitation and hygiene promotion, there has been an increase in access to water at places of return, and general reduction of distance to water points; there was an increase in latrine coverage; however sanitation structure was not adapted to the persons with physical disabilities. The hygiene promotion was not included in the budget, resulting in lack of sensitising the community about the safe water chain and household sanitation.

Health interventions were highly relevant and well aligned with the Health Sector Strategic Plan Framework. However the capacity building was not fully efficient.

Nutrition interventions regarding capacity building of district staff to be able to manage feeding centres and of health service staff brought variable results.

Regarding humanitarian protection, the EU has maintained a consistent support in this area, with a particularly well focused programme reducing number of camps.

LRRD is constrained by lack of appropriate instruments. However DG ECHO livelihood interventions discussed earlier with DG Development permitted a coherent approach. They were considered complementart with a view to longer term development focus. Sectors not considered as focal in Country Strategy Papers remains of concern for example WASH, health and education.

As a conclusion, overall the relevance and effectiveness of EU funded interventions has been good with an appropriate focus on multi-sectoral programmes, which was highly adapted to the needs.

The EU has significantly contributed to health facility rehabilitation and health service delivery.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2011/Uganda\\_Evaluation\\_report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2011/Uganda_Evaluation_report.pdf)

## **Real-time evaluation of humanitarian action supported by DG ECHO in Haiti 2009-2011**

### **ABB activities:**

23 02 Humanitarian aid including aid to uprooted people, food aid and disaster preparedness

### **Timing:**

April 2011

### **Background, scope and focus**

This evaluation covers the EU response, delivered through its department for Humanitarian Aid and Civil protection (DG ECHO), to the earthquake of 12 January 2010 and the cholera crisis, the work of the DIPECHO programme and the Global Plan (implemented in 2009 for a period of 18 months). The objectives of the evaluation were:

- To analyse the appropriateness and effectiveness of DG ECHO's action in response to the Haitian crisis with a special focus on the earthquake response;
- To assess the current situation of DG ECHO's action in Haiti, in order to identify relevant opportunities, challenges and threats;
- To provide recommendations within a larger comprehensive strategic framework.
- To assess the effectiveness of DG ECHO's coordination with the different stakeholders of the crisis (Member States, UN agencies, other donors, partners, etc) at different levels;
- From a LRRD perspective, to analyse the coherence and complementarity of EU funded actions with present and future interventions of other EC services.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

In general the programmes supported and the strategies adopted by DG ECHO have been relevant, as well as the presence of the DIPECHO programme. DG ECHO's advocacy for DRR is found to be appropriate. DG ECHO's presence in Haiti and its network of partners capable of carrying out operations in different humanitarian sectors contributed to the effectiveness of the European response.

The decision to fund a broad range of partners was essential in Haiti. This variety made it possible to ensure that aid was delivered on a large scale. Some difficulties occurred in LRRD (linking relief rehabilitation and development) despite the shared will to advance in this sense,

due to the time frames for projects (limited to 18 months) and the fact that funding mechanisms for the transition have yet to be developed. Cross cutting issues as gender, protection and environment were only marginally taken into account and rarely transformed into programme content, except when it was linked to questions of DRR.

DG ECHO's 3-pillared strategy for 2011 which involves three main areas (withdrawal from the earthquake response, withdrawal from the Global Plan and maintenance of a strong DRR component) responds to the challenges posed by the context of the crisis. ECHO should pursue the withdrawal during 2011-2012. Furthermore the efforts in LRRD, including consideration of the links between humanitarian action and poverty reduction should be pursued. The Haitian disaster management and resilience building mechanisms should be strengthened at all levels, placing the risk reduction need at the heart of development policies in Haiti. Funds should be allocated progressively to deal with the evolution of the contexts. The efforts to improve working methods in urban contexts should be supported. ECHO should continue to advocate for better coordination in the field, both at the strategic and operational levels and both at the sector and multi-sector levels.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2011/Groupe-URD\\_evaluation\\_Haiti\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/evaluation/2011/Groupe-URD_evaluation_Haiti_en.pdf)

### **Commission evaluation of the Civil Protection Mechanism and the CP Financial Instrument 2007-2009**

<b>ABB activities:</b>	23 03 Civil protection financial instrument
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	November 2011 (COM(2011)696)
----------------	------------------------------

#### **Background, scope and focus**

The evaluation was undertaken in compliance with article 14 of the Civil Protection Mechanism Decision, which requires the Commission to evaluate the application of the Decision by the end of 2010, and transmit the conclusions of that evaluation to the European Parliament and the Council. Moreover, Article 15(2)(b) CPFI requires the Commission to evaluate, on an interim basis, the results obtained and the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the implementation of the Civil Protection Financial Instrument (CPFI).

The results of the evaluation provide the Commission and other stakeholders with key findings on and lessons to be drawn from the experience gained in the implementation of the above-

mentioned actions in the field of civil protection. These will help the Commission in the continued effective implementation of the Mechanism and the Financial Instrument, and also provided important input to the preparation of the revision of Civil Protection legislation by the Commission in December 2011 (COM(2011)934).

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The conclusions of the external evaluators are overall positive in that they recognise and emphasise the usefulness and relevance of EU Civil Protection activities during the period under review. In particular, the Monitoring and Information Centre has been widely acknowledged as providing useful services that are relevant to Participating States when civil protection assistance interventions are deployed within or outside the EU.

Regarding the ad hoc nature of the current EU disaster response, there appears to be a need to shift to a system where advance planning allows core assets to be available for immediate deployment. The planning of EU civil protection operations would be improved through developing reference scenarios, mapping Member States' assets and developing contingency plans, establishing a pool of Member States' assets pre-committed on a voluntary basis to the EU operations, streamlining and reinforcing provisions on transport support, as well as other measures outlined in the October 2010 Communication on disaster response (COM(2010)600).

The training courses have proved to be a valuable asset in terms of preparing national experts for civil protection assistance interventions, thus improving the overall response capability of the Mechanism. Nonetheless, the evaluation also showed that the further evolution of the training arrangements is limited due to a lack of an overall policy framework. Similar conclusions have been drawn in respect of the exercises programme, which has received overall support but has experienced a lack of a general policy framework. To better serve their ultimate purpose, i.e. the improvement of operations, the establishment of an integrated training and exercises policy will need to be considered.

The transport assistance provisions now seem to be firmly embedded in the Mechanism, and a highly significant use of the pooling and co-financing arrangements has been noticed in the last two years, even though calls for streamlining the procedures have been voiced and are duly taken note of. Beyond mere simplification of rules and administrative procedures, important considerations arising from the evaluation lead to a need to investigate different levels of co-financing depending on the urgency or priority of delivery for certain relief resources, as well as improving the access to transport assets/options.

The modular approach was met with great interest and success among Participating States, and should be further developed, including through specialised exercises and developing

Innovative arrangements seeking to enhance the availability of key relief assets tested through pilot projects and preparatory actions proved to be viable and should be built upon. It is to be noted, however, that by their very nature pilot projects and preparatory actions are time-limited and cannot substitute a more permanent policy and regulatory framework.

The European cooperation and coordination in the field of civil protection has seen substantial progress but there is still also unused potential. One important area which has received increasing awareness and acknowledgment is the policy need in the field of disaster prevention and disaster management. An enhanced EU prevention policy framework would be able to address the various prevention aspects in different EU policy fields (environment, security, health and regional policies) and facilitate further cooperation among Participating States.

**Availability of the report on Europa**

Hyperlink to the evaluation report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/evaluation/thematic\\_en.htm#cp](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/evaluation/thematic_en.htm#cp)

## 26 – Commission's administration

### Evaluation of Internal Communication and Staff Engagement Strategy of the European Commission

<b>ABB activities:</b>	26 01 Administrative expenditure of 'Commission's administration' policy area
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	31/3/2011
----------------	-----------

#### Background, scope and focus

The evaluation of Internal Communication and Staff Engagement is a follow-up to the previous evaluation report on internal communication of April 2007. It specifically reviewed the progress made on internal communication and staff engagement based on the objectives and actions included in the "Communication on the Internal Communication and Staff Engagement", assessing to what extent the objectives have been met, identifying the gaps and recommend measures to enhance internal communication and staff engagement in the Commission.

The scope of the evaluation covers internal communication and staff engagement at both corporate and local (DG/directorate/unit) level.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

The overall conclusion is that, while the infrastructure for internal communication is in place, it is not obvious with the current approach to explicitly show the impact of internal communication and staff engagement on the organisational performance. More synergies between the internal communication function and other organisational functions need to be created; the active participation of middle and senior managers and interactive communication needs to be enhanced.

##### Main results of the evaluation

- The fact that a strategy for Internal Communication and Staff Engagement was adopted by the Commission in 2007 has given these areas an official standing and assisted in bringing them to the attention of senior and middle management
- The engagement score at the Commission increased between 2006 and 2008, and it is comparable to other equivalent organizations
- The Commission's approach to internal communication, a combination of a centralised and decentralised approach, is still deemed appropriate

- Internal communication experience and expertise in the Commission needs to be enhanced in order to raise the profile of internal communication within the organisation
- A lack of support and buy-in from senior management for internal communication and staff engagement issues seems to exist, mainly due to a limited understanding of their full potential for driving employee performance
- Links between DG HR and DG COMM have improved over the last few years through joint initiatives but there is still scope for further collaboration
- A continuing commitment to supporting tools and activities aimed at facilitating internal communication at the Commission and DG levels exists, but they are mainly used for passing information rather than actively engaging staff; the recent increased promotion and use of participatory methods is rated positively
- Numerous monitoring and evaluation tools are in place at Commission level and in the DGs. However, a more integrated and systematic approach to collating data and reporting on it periodically is likely to result in a better ongoing view of the internal communication and staff engagement situation across the Commission
- A little progress with developing and implementing indicators on internal communication and staff engagement performance for managers has been achieved

**The evaluation report proposes a set of recommendations, among which:**

- Identification of a high level owner for the strategy and establishment of an Internal Communication & Staff Engagement Committee made up of senior managers;
- Internal communication & staff engagement competencies to be included and consistently used in the recruitment and appraisal of middle and senior managers; senior managers to set expectations for internal communication and staff engagement for their middle managers;
- Reinforcing the links with the HR community;
- Aligning internal communication with strategic objectives of the DG and Commission;
- Further coordination of external and internal communications – communicate to staff before/simultaneously to announcing any important decision externally;
- More two-way communication and opportunities for staff to provide feedback; and
- Systematic measuring, evaluation and reporting.

**Availability of the report on Europa**

For internal use of the Commission.

**Ex-ante evaluation of the contract "Processing of public procurement notices for publication in the Supplement to the Official Journal of the European Union, hereafter OJ S"**

*Evaluation related study*

**ABB activities:**

26 02 Multimedia production

**Timing:**

25/08/2011

**Background, scope and focus**

It's an ex-ante evaluation of the contract for the production and translation of public procurement notices to be published in the Official Journal S, namely on TED website (Tenders Electronic Daily).

This contract covers preparation, inputting, translation, proofreading, codification (encoding, metadata production) and administrative monitoring of public procurement and other notices published in the OJ S. This corresponds to notices' lifecycle from their reception by the Publications Office until their readiness for publication, or, in case of certain alternative scenarios, until their deletion.

**Summary of findings and conclusions**

The findings of the evaluation showed that the current contract, restructured on the occasion of the last call for tender, is functioning well. Thus, there wouldn't be any benefits from the changes in the production contract which would justify additional development costs and risks to the proper final implementation of TED-Monitor. Therefore, it appears reasonable to keep the basic structure of the contract as it is.

The first years of the implementation of the contract proved that some modifications are needed and it was possible to identify weaknesses which should be addressed in the future contract.

Managing technical and organisational risks was a centrepiece in defining the changes to be implemented. As outlined above, a change in the contract structure could not bring serious advantages in this area either.

There are some changes expected (accession, publication of additional defence related notices) but they have no significant impact on the volumes and costs, except for the need of translation into additional language(s).



### Availability of the report on Europa

For internal use of the Commission.

## Ex-ante evaluation of the contract "Performance of publication services"

*Evaluation related study*

### ABB activities:

26 02 Multimedia production

### Timing:

14/12/2011

### Background, scope and focus

It's an ex-ante evaluation of a multiple framework contract for the provision of the general publication services. It's a complex contract with several lots, multiple contractors and large variety of publishing services required.

This evaluation was in-deep analysis of the contract structure, price schedule, technological requirements that should adapt the contract to quick technological changes (digitalization of printing, electronic distribution, multiplication of technologies), low profitability of the publishing industry and the OP's limited human resources.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

The findings of the evaluation showed that, although the current contract is functioning well, the future one should be restructured in order to adapt to the evolution of technology, the trend to limit paper production and go towards electronic publications and to fulfil the requirements of the Transformation Programme of the Publications Office.

The next contract should offer a contractual framework for more efficient multi-purposing (by media) of texts as well as an updated approach to e-publishing.

This can be ensured by a central role for the extensible Markup Language (XML), a format permitting separation of content from the medium employed, development of an electronic-first workflow capability and pure XML publishing. To achieve this, prepress and printing operations should be separated.

This evaluation confirmed the necessity to shorten production time and to simplify administrative and technical work. The Cross-media Publishing Unit is analysing the processes in order to see how to achieve this objective. Some of the solutions investigated were: possibility

of dissemination by the printers and fast digital printing for small print-runs of urgent publications.

**Availability of the report on Europa**

For internal use of the Commission.

## 29 – Statistics

### Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the quality of fiscal data reported by Member States in 2010

*Evaluation related study*

<b>ABB activities:</b> 29.02	29 02 Production of statistical information
------------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	11/04/2011
----------------	------------

#### Background, scope and focus

Article 8(3) of Council Regulation (EC) No 479/2009 on the application of the Protocol on the excessive deficit procedure annexed to the Treaty establishing the European Community<sup>1</sup> requires the Commission (Eurostat) to report regularly to the European Parliament and to the Council on the quality of the actual data reported by Member States. The report provides an overall assessment of compliance with accounting rules, completeness, reliability, timeliness and consistency of the data.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

Eurostat concludes that progress on the quality of fiscal data continued in 2010. In general, Member States have provided better information, both in EDP notification tables and in other relevant statistical returns. Overall consistency of EDP data with the reported ESA95 government accounts is satisfactory and is still improving, particularly on the financial side, compared with the situation in earlier years.

No reservations on the quality of the reported data were expressed in 2010 apart from the reservation on the quality of the data reported by Greece in the April 2010 notification. This reservation was lifted in November 2010. Closing a long-lasting and critical process since October 2009, Eurostat concluded on 22 November that the latest revised data for 2006-2009 for Greece were sufficiently reliable for EDP purpose, in line with the quality of the data of other EU Member states. A specific information note on Greek fiscal data is available on Eurostat's web site.

In spite of the recognised improvements, some issues nevertheless persist linked to the compliance with accounting rules and the completeness and quality of some of the statistical information provided. Eurostat has therefore invited Member States to continue investing in the quality of government finance statistics with a view to achieving the desired level of quality as regards the compliance with the relevant accounting rules, completeness, reliability, timeliness and consistency of government data.

Furthermore, drawing upon the experience in the case of Greece and upon observations of the European Statistical Governance Advisory Board, the Commission will issue a Communication

addressing the issues of systemic risk in national statistical systems and of the deployment of a risk-based approach for Excessive Deficit Procedure data, notably for upstream source data, implementing Eurostat's strengthened powers under Regulation (EC) 479/2009, as amended.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/Fiscal%20data.pdf>

### Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 450/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the labour cost index (LCI)

*Evaluation related study*

#### ABB activities:

29 02 Production of statistical information

#### Timing:

08.03.2011

#### Background, scope and focus

Each quarter, The Commission (Eurostat) releases an update on the hourly labour cost index, which is an important tool for analysing short- and medium-term economic development in the EU.

Article 13 of Regulation (EC) No 450/2003 states that the Commission must submit a report on the quality of labour cost data to the European Parliament and the Council every two years.

More particularly, the 2011 report focuses on accuracy, timeliness and coherence of the data.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

Overall, the degree of compliance with the LCI Regulation has continued to increase since the previous report in 2008. Most Member States are now compliant. Member States have continued to channel resources into implementing actions to achieve more comparable and timely index series. This has clearly raised the overall quality and thus increased the usefulness of the data. The timeliness of data delivery has improved, and the number of Member States with accuracy problems has decreased.

In recent years, the Commission (Eurostat) has regularly urged Member States to step up their improvement efforts. The Commission will be monitoring the remaining non-compliance and quality issues regularly through the data delivered and other national documentation. Where the desired or planned improvements are not advancing appropriately, the relevant national authorities will be approached, and the Commission will take the necessary action to enforce compliance.

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

<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/Labour%20cost%20index.pdf>

### **Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation of Decision (EC) No 1297/2008/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on a Programme for the Modernisation of European Enterprise and Trade Statistics (MEETS)**

*Evaluation related study*

<b>ABB activities:</b>	29 02 Production of statistical information
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	11/01/2011
----------------	------------

#### **Background, scope and focus**

This report documents the activities carried out by Member States under the Modernisation of European Enterprise and Trade Statistics (MEETS) Programme together with the Commission (Eurostat), with respect to the provisions of the MEETS Decision and the associated Commission Decisions on the annual work programmes for 2009 and 2010, both adopted in 2009. The MEETS project follows very closely the main orientations set out in the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council of 10 August 2009 on the production method of EU statistics: a vision for the next decade.

#### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

Since the adoption of Decision No 1297/2008/EC and the adoption of the first work programme

in April 2009, more than 25 projects have been launched for the four MEETS objectives. Major progress has been made in setting up the collaborative networks that are undertaking activities in the following six main areas: consistency of concepts and methods, profiling large and complex multinational enterprise groups, microdata-linking and data warehousing in statistical production, linking micro-data on ICT usage, methodology for modern business statistics and the use of administrative and accounting data. In addition, several projects were launched to support the development and implementation of the EuroGroups Register in the Member States. It should be mentioned, however, that Member States have a limited absorption capacity as regards the additional co-ordination activities involved in the networks.

All the studies that were carried out and finalised will be evaluated together with the main stakeholders from Commission services and the Member States. Developed methodologies will be piloted. The identification of areas of lesser importance will be further integrated into the general overall strategy of Eurostat on priority setting. This strategy is based on the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on priority setting, simplification and reduction of response burden in the field of Community statistics.

Adequate EU funding has been guaranteed by two annual work programmes adopted by the Commission in order to help Member States to achieve the goals in respect of reducing the burden on businesses and to help the European Statistical System in responding to new needs for statistical information. Thirty-one grants totalling around €13.5m were co-financed and 13 external studies for a total of around €1.5m were subcontracted. In addition, workshops and task forces were financed to develop the actions. Owing to their complexity, all actions will be continued and more detailed information on the progress made will be provided in the annual reports, which will continue to be produced until 2013.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0813:FIN:EN:PDF>

### Rolling review of the Education Statistics

*Evaluation related study*

**ABB activities:**

29 02 Production of statistical information

**Timing:**

10/06/2011

#### Background, scope and focus

Rolling reviews represent the layer of evaluation in the overall Quality Assurance Framework

and as such correspond to the requirements of the Commissions' Internal Control Standards to undertake evaluations of major activities on a regular basis. The results are used to formulate recommendations for improvements.

Eurostat conducted a rolling review of Education Statistics, in order to evaluate the quality of the outputs and the processes in this area. This Rolling Review covers the following three collections in the area of education statistics: UNESCO Institute of Statistics/OECD/Eurostat (UOE) data collection on education systems, Continuous Vocational Training Survey (CVTS) and Adult Education survey (AES). The three collections constitute the main instruments for the data collection in regard with the EU (and sometimes Candidate and EFTA countries') Lifelong Learning statistics. This Rolling Review focuses mainly on the UOE data collection and the CVTS.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

Education statistics are a statistical product of high relevance for users and for the national authorities that produce them. However, the results of this rolling review reveal that depending on the collection there are particular quality elements of the produced statistics or particular elements in various developments in this area with which users and partners are not satisfied. In most of the cases Eurostat is well aware about this; however, mainly resource constrains hinder improvements from the side of Eurostat.

Altogether, 16 recommendations for improvement were made with 8 concerning data production, 3 on data and metadata dissemination, 2 on data quality and 3 on other matters.

13 of those recommendations were based on partners' suggestions, 6 on self-assessment checklist and 3 on user survey results (with some recommendations being based on multiple sources).

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

[http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/Executive%20Summary\\_EDUC%20Rolling%20Review.pdf](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/Executive%20Summary_EDUC%20Rolling%20Review.pdf)

## **Rolling review of the Information Society (IS) Statistics**

*Evaluation related study*

<b>ABB activities:</b>	29 02 Production of statistical information
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	07/04/2011
----------------	------------

## **Background, scope and focus**

Rolling reviews represent the layer of evaluation in the overall Quality Assurance Framework and as such correspond to the requirements of the Commissions' Internal Control Standards to undertake evaluations of major activities on a regular basis. The results are used to formulate recommendations for improvements.

Rolling review of Information Society (IS) Statistics was carried out between June 2010 and March 2011 collecting information through three instruments: a user satisfaction survey, a partner satisfaction survey and the completion of a self-assessment checklist by the professional staff within Eurostat, assessing all major steps within the data production cycle.

## **Summary of findings and conclusions**

IS statistics are a statistical product of high relevance for users and their overall quality is highly rated by both users and by the national authorities that produce them.

Depending on the IS dataset, the collection of these data is either based on legislation or gentleman's agreement or compiled from the data produced by other Eurostat units.

Therefore particularities apply to each individual dataset and their production. For instance, partners do not perceive as a problem of the Telecommunication services statistics the absence of European statistical legal basis for their production. While users of ICT usage statistics do not advocate the change of the current flexibility to a more stable set of IS indicators, partners of these statistics are almost equally split between the two options. Both users and partners welcome the collection of micro-data on ICT usage in households and by individuals from 2011 onwards.

Altogether, 10 recommendations for improvement were made, out of which 4 on data productions, 2 concerning dissemination, 2 on data quality and 2 on other matters.

7 were based on partner survey, 7 on self-assessment checklist and 5 on user survey results (some recommendations were based on multiple sources).

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

[http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/Executive%20Summary\\_IS%20Rolling%20Review\\_0.pdf](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/Executive%20Summary_IS%20Rolling%20Review_0.pdf)



## Rolling Review on Inland Waterways Transport Statistics

*Evaluation related study*

**ABB activities:**

29 02 Production of statistical information

**Timing:**

March 2011

### Background, scope and focus

Rolling reviews represent the layer of evaluation in the overall Quality Assurance Framework and as such correspond to the requirements of the Commissions' Internal Control Standards to undertake evaluations of major activities on a regular basis. The results are used to formulate recommendations for improvements.

This evaluation covers the collection of annual and quarterly statistics for goods transported in tonnes and tonne-km and the shares by nationality of vessels by type of vessels and by type of goods. Eurostat collects data on Inland Waterways transport under Regulation (EC) No 1365/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council on Inland Waterways transport statistics.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

While users and partners share a positive appreciation of the quality of the statistics, they can take very different views about individual qualities. Partners were generally more positive about quality of Eurostat's Inland Waterways statistics than users. One major exception was coherence where users were much more strongly positive than partners. This may reflect partners' better knowledge of the mirror statistics. At the opposite extreme, partners were much more positive about timeliness than users. Perhaps again, their understanding of what is involved in preparing the statistics within the current timetable is a factor in this case. Completeness is another quality where partners outscored users. For accuracy, accessibility and clarity, partner and user scores were relatively close.

A key issue were the problems revealed by the mirror statistics, illustrating how well the international transport between two partners was matched in the statistics supplied. These show disturbing differences and make quality improvement urgent. Better cooperation between partners could help to provide this.

The level of product detail collected was not meeting the needs of some important users but no easy solution was at hand. Timeliness is another issue but improvement would be difficult.

There still remain a number of quality issues, for example in the mirror statistics and in transit traffic. These will be the subject of further discussion with partners in the normal round of

consultation in the Inland Waterways transport Statistics Working Group. Even so, there is now a need to look again at the collection process to see how well it matches important user needs and how best to attempt to meet these. The issues that stand out are product detail and comparability across countries.

Altogether, 9 recommendations for improvement were made with 2 on improving dissemination, 4 on data collection, 2 on improving data quality and 1 on partner/user engagement.

3 were based on self-assessment check-list, 2 on partner survey results and 5 on user survey results (with some recommendations based on multiple sources).

### Availability of the report on Europa

<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/Executive%20summary%20Final.pdf>

## Rolling Review - Labour Force Survey Statistics

*Evaluation related study*

<b>ABB activities:</b>	29 02 Production of statistical information
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	December 2011
----------------	---------------

### Background, scope and focus

Rolling reviews represent the layer of evaluation in the overall Quality Assurance Framework and as such correspond to the requirements of the Commissions' Internal Control Standards to undertake evaluations of major activities on a regular basis. The results are used to formulate recommendations for improvements.

This rolling review focuses on EU labour force statistics and the Labour Force Survey (LFS) in particular. The LFS is the most authoritative source for labour market statistics in the EU; it also provides consistent information about the demographic and household characteristics of individuals to a level of precision not matched by any other household survey. In recent years, the LFS data has become more important because of the increased political interest in the development of the European labour market.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

The EU LFS is unique due to the range of topics it covers (more than 100 variables), the sample size and the length of the time series of quarterly data (from 2005 Q1 onwards). It also provides information allowing Europe-wide household analyses of the labour market. The existence of the legal basis of the EU LFS ensures cross-country comparability of Europe-wide labour force information, which is independent of the national administrative and legislative framework. The LFS legal basis includes provisions on quality reporting and this is instrumental in ensuring the quality of the EU LFS. At the same time, while the legal basis is a foundation of the EU LFS framework, it cannot currently be regarded as being indisputably perfect.

Problems that have occurred while applying the Council Regulation have been mentioned by partner NSIs, particularly in relation to the interpretation of the precision requirements, the measurement of some variables and the delays in data transmission. Partner NSIs also recognize that national survey practices vary across Member States, raising some doubts about the cross-national comparability of the data. Eurostat has recognised the importance of this issue and consultation on the review of the legal basis of the EU LFS has started between Eurostat and NSIs.

Altogether, 11 recommendations for improvement were made, with 4 on improving survey characteristics, 1 on cooperation between Eurostat and NSIs, 4 on improving quality, 2 on efficiency.

6 were based on partner survey results, 7 on user survey and 1 on self-assessment checklist (with some recommendations being based on multiple sources).

#### Availability of the report on Europa

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

### Rolling Review - Maritime Transport Statistics

*Evaluation related study*

<b>ABB activities:</b>	29 02 Production of statistical information
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	18/06/2011
----------------	------------

#### Background, scope and focus

Rolling reviews represent the layer of evaluation in the overall Quality Assurance Framework and as such correspond to the requirements of the Commissions' Internal Control Standards to

undertake evaluations of major activities on a regular basis. The results are used to formulate recommendations for improvements.

This rolling review deals with European maritime transport statistics, covering the collection of annual and quarterly statistics of goods and passengers moved through ports, in terms of tonnes of cargo, numbers of transport units, numbers of passengers, and numbers and sizes of vessels used. Eurostat collects data on maritime transport under Directive 2009/42/EC together with the implementing and amending acts Regulation 1090/2010, Decision 2010/216/EU, Decision 2008/861/EC, and Decision 2001/423/EC.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The survey of users of European maritime transport statistics had a reasonable response from a good spread of users in terms of their affiliation, interests, and their use of the data and frequency of access. Accuracy and timeliness are considered by users to be the most important quality categories. In the context of the recession, up-to-date information such as the provisional estimates is of more relevance than quarterly data three or more months after the event.

Partners gave a positive assessment on Eurostat's role in the management and production of maritime statistics. With regard to organisation of meetings, publications, data processing, these are all considered to be very good.

When considering possible changes and extensions of the data collection, partners appear to recognise the benefits of these, but consider it difficult or impossible to implement them at this stage. Hazardous goods statistics are seen to have potential value, given environmental concerns and policy. There is a significant lack of knowledge about EMSA data collection, although those who did know about it felt that it was useful source that should be exploited. There is strong support for a centralised ship database. However those who buy or maintain such a database give strict warning about the effort and resources that are required to maintain it. There was some feeling on the partners' side that the resources available to Eurostat for maritime statistics should be increased.

According to the checklist prepared by Eurostat staff, the strengths of the system are its sound legal basis, clearly defined meta-data, and an established and well-understood methodology. Interaction and communication through the Working Group and Task Force are excellent, and much appreciated by partners. There are good relationships with key users. The timeliness of available information has been much improved by the development of quarterly publication of results.

Weaknesses are recognised as the level of commodity detail, the absence of intermodal linkages and information, and the lack of statistics on hazardous cargoes and emissions. There is a shortage of resources to enable rapid progress in tackling these issues.

Altogether, 11 recommendations for improvement were made, with 3 on improving dissemination, 5 on extending data collection, 2 on data quality, 1 on engagement with partners/users.

5 were based on partner survey, 3 on self-assessment checklist, 1 on user survey results and 2 were made by experts conducting the rolling review.

## Availability of the report on Europa

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

## Rolling Review - EU National Accounts

*Evaluation related study*

<b>ABB activities:</b>	29 02 Production of statistical information
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	November 2011
----------------	---------------

### Background, scope and focus

Rolling reviews represent the layer of evaluation in the overall Quality Assurance Framework and as such correspond to the requirements of the Commissions' Internal Control Standards to undertake evaluations of major activities on a regular basis. The results are used to formulate recommendations for improvements.

The review on National Accounts statistics was implemented from the end of March 2010 to November 2011. Conducted in three phases, the review comprised a user satisfaction survey, a partner satisfaction survey and the completion of a self-assessment checklist by the professional staff within Eurostat, assessing all major steps within the data production cycle.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

75% of respondents consider this data as essential or important for their work. Users' satisfaction was highest with data accuracy and coherence, lowest with accessibility.

The main issues with the data delivery from providers (NSIs) are that less than half of the countries have timeliness problems, most countries present missing data and less than half of the countries use inappropriate transmission means. Nevertheless, almost all data transmitted correspond to requirements.

Altogether, 12 recommendations for improvement with regard to dissemination of results, improvement of data quality and engagement with partners were put forward. Priority levels and ownership was assigned to each recommendation.

More particularly, among other things suggestions concerned timeliness, accessibility comparability and clarity of data on National Accounts and relevant metadata.

Altogether, 12 recommendations for improvement were made, with 4 on dissemination, 4 on data quality and 4 on engagement with users/partners.

5 were based on partner survey, 4 on user survey and 4 on self-assessment checklist (with some recommendations being based on multiple sources).

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

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

### **Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation of Decision No 1608/2003/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on science and technology statistics**

*Evaluation related study*

#### **ABB activities:**

29 02 Production of statistical information

#### **Timing:**

11.04.2011

#### **Background, scope and focus**

Official statistics on science, technology and innovation in the European Union are largely based on Decision No 1608/2003/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 July 2003 concerning the production and development of Community statistics on science and technology. This report evaluates the implementation of the individual statistical actions listed in Article 2 of the Decision.

The first part of the report focuses on the implementation of the measures provided for in Article 2 of the Decision. It is followed by chapters on data quality, costs and the statistical burden. The final chapter of the report looks ahead to strategic actions that should be taken in the years to come.

#### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The main achievements in the various domains of STI statistics have been increased data

production volume and data quality and harmonisation of the data collection questionnaire and time series with the OECD; agreement reached on the treatment of 'R&D funded from abroad'; initiation of measuring trans-nationally coordinated research in Europe (GBAORD and trans-national public R&D performers); and improvement of the quality and harmonisation of the data through the established quality reporting and initiation of improvement actions on this reporting basis.

To meet the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 753/2004, many countries adapted their national questionnaires and data collection from 2002/2003 onwards. A number of countries had problems with transmission of R&D and GBAORD data for the first two obligatory reference years (2003 and 2004), with special reference to the completeness of the data and meeting the deadlines imposed by the above Commission Regulation. Subsequently, data availability and deadline compliance improved considerably.

Regarding data quality, the quality of European R&D statistics improved with the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 753/2004. The data users have not raised criticisms concerning the relevance, accuracy or comparability of the data. However, some coverage and measurement-related improvements are desired.

When it comes to innovation statistics, the timeliness, completeness and comparability of the national data sets have improved thanks to the shorter, clearer questionnaires, the improved production and implementation process at national level and greater familiarity with the innovation concepts on the part of respondents. A harmonised model questionnaire prepared in line with Regulation (EC) No 1450/2004 is considered to have made a positive contribution to the comparability of the results.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/Report%20to%20the%20EP%20and%20the%20Council%20-%20Science%20and%20technology>

### **Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council concerning short-term statistics as required by Council Regulation (EC) No 1165/1998 of 19 May 1998**

*Evaluation related study*

**ABB activities:**

29 02 Production of statistical information

**Timing:**

08/06/2011

## **Background, scope and focus**

The report follows up on the report that was transmitted in June 2008 pursuant to the article 14(2) of Council regulation 1165/1998 concerning short-term statistics.

The report outlines the uses of short-term statistics and their relevance for key European policies and the steering of European monetary policy. It also indicates major developments in short-term statistics since the last quality report; describes in greater detail the different quality aspects of short-term statistics; and presents the cost and the burden imposed by the collection and processing of data for the statistics.

## **Summary of findings and conclusions**

Users declared themselves to be satisfied with the quality of short-term statistics and the related services. 95% of the users who formulated a judgement on the quality found short-term statistics to be adequate, and 60% found it to be good or very good.

Member States show a high level of compliance with the short-term statistics Regulation in terms of reliability, timeliness, coherence and comparability. The EU27 average score was 8.9 (out of 10) as of 1st October 2010, as compared to 8.5 for 1st April 2005 and 6.6 for 1st January 2004. Most Member States are now close to full compliance with the Regulation.

In general, the timeliness of short-term statistics can be considered to be very good and any delays usually correspond to the target delivery day falling on a weekend or a public holiday. In 2010, all dates announced in the release calendar were met.

Regarding the statistical burden, the available data for the European Union as a whole indicate a reduction in both the production cost and the burden on enterprises between 2006 and 2009. Short-term statistics already use a variety of instruments to limit the burden on enterprises.

For some indicators European sample schemes have been introduced. Countries participating in such a scheme only have to compile data for those industries or products for which their national contributions to the aggregate at European level make a significant difference.

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

[http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/Short-term%20statistics\\_0.pdf](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/Short-term%20statistics_0.pdf)



**Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation of Council Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 58/97 and of the Regulation (EC) No 295/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning structural business statistics (recast) which repealed and replaced Regulation No 58/97**

*Evaluation related study*

<b>ABB activities:</b>	29 02 Production of statistical information
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	04/05/2011
----------------	------------

### **Background, scope and focus**

Structural business statistics (SBS) cover industry, construction, trade and services. This report covers the implementation of Regulation No 58/97 that has been repealed and replaced by Regulation (EC) No 295/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council. The aim of the report is to provide information on the actions undertaken by the European Commission to ensure that high quality European structural business statistics are made available to users, and also on the manner and extent to which each of the Member States has implemented the SBS Regulations. Moreover, it provides information on the burden on businesses and the actions taken by Member States in order to reduce that burden.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The report concluded that the compliance level for 2007 data has been increased relative to the compliance level recorded in the previous report. Also, punctuality has improved generally over the years, although some countries continue to send their data with some delay, which has influenced the punctuality of the dissemination of EU aggregates. Compared with the previous report, the most notable improvements from the punctuality point of view were made by Belgium, Ireland, Greece and Slovenia. However, Belgium and Greece sent their data with some delay.

As far as the completeness of the datasets transmitted by the countries is concerned, all datasets received make up 90% of the required data. This represents a significant improvement in comparison with the situation described in the previous report provided to the European Parliament and to the Council in 2007, but it is still insufficient. Several countries are taking action to improve data availability.

Eurostat and the Member States have also taken steps in order to reduce the costs and the burden on business. Some of the actions taken by Member States were related to their way of organising the SBS data collection. Sample surveys were frequently used by the majority of the Member States. In many Member States there is a strong and growing preference for using administrative

data sources instead of carrying out surveys. However, there are several obstacles to using administrative data sources alone, due to the fact that administrative data normally differ from statistical data in terms of definitions, formats, codes, transmission protocols, etc. For this reason, political support is needed to establish agreements between the National Statistical Institutes and the relevant governmental organisations on producing administrative data which would serve the relevant purposes.

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

<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/quality/documents/Structural%20business%20statistics.pdf>

## 32 – Energy

### Mid-term evaluation on the European Energy Programme for Recovery (EERP)

<b>ABB activities:</b>	32 04 Conventional and renewable energies
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	December 2011
----------------	---------------

#### Background, scope and focus

This evaluation on the EERP programme had to assess its contribution to the effectiveness of the use made for its appropriations. The report had to cover 3 original sectors of the EERP Programme which are Infrastructure, Offshore Wind Energy and Carbon Capture Storage. The general objective of this evaluation was to analyse the relevance, the efficiency and the effectiveness of the Programme. The Specific objectives are to evaluate

- the state of play in the implementation of the EERP Projects;
- evaluate, as far as possible, at this early stage of the implementation of the EERP, the impacts of the programme in terms of economic recovery, both at microeconomic and macroeconomic levels;
- evaluate the contribution that the programme is giving to the achievement of the EU energy policy objectives.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

##### Main findings of the evaluators

- Overall, the objectives and the resources of the EERP Regulation were of relevance to economic recovery and of significant relevance to energy policy.
- The financial resources made available are being used but not always as rapidly as envisaged. The economic crisis has been more protracted than had been hoped.
- Nine electricity and gas infrastructure projects had already been completed by mid-2011 – two electricity interconnector projects, three gas interconnectors and four reverse flow/storage projects; most other projects have begun construction and/or begun tendering/placing orders for major items of capital expenditures. A handful of electricity and gas infrastructure projects, mainly 6 large gas infrastructure projects, have not yet taken their Investment Decision, but this is not a bar to preparatory investment.
- One EERP offshore wind farm began feeding power to the grid in December 2010; another began installing foundations in 2011. The orders placed by two offshore wind farm projects had by May 2011 contributed significantly to the development of industrial clusters in innovative

technologies.

- No CCS demonstration project has yet taken the final investment decision. At least one project appeared likely to do so some time in 2012.
- Where projects are taking longer to get off the ground than had been hoped, this is consistent with the pattern of financing and permitting difficulty frequently found in programmes involving large infrastructure, particular where projects cross borders or a technology is moving from demonstration to industrial-scale deployment.
- Utilisation of the EEPR funds measured solely on the basis of payments to promoters understates the impact of the programme, since this has leveraged substantial additional expenditure in terms of orders placed.
- The EEPR had a catalytic effect on other funders in a significant number of cases and on regulatory authorities in a few cases, and therefore has already contributed to achieving the programme objectives to a perceptible extent.
- There appear to be short-term employment benefits in electricity and gas infrastructure, offshore wind and to a lesser extent CCS. Long-term employment and competitiveness benefits from offshore wind, and with less certainty at this stage, CCS appear likely.
- It is already possible to identify infrastructure completed projects in which the EEPR is contributing to security of supply, competitiveness, greenhouse gas reduction and completion of the single market.

#### **Main recommendations by the evaluators**

The contractor failed to include recommendations to improve the performance of the programme in the upcoming years. An earlier version of the report included two sets of recommendations

1. Related to the programme design, and hence not relevant for a mid- term review and
2. Projects management tools to facilitate future programme reviews and reporting. Regarding the 2. key recommendations were:
  - Better use of standard reporting templates across the three sub-programmes to facilitate comparisons.
  - Set up relational databases for the management of projects, preferably at EEPR level but as a minimum for each sub programme
  - Define and collect performance indicators (budgetary objectives, project progress and expenditure, location of suppliers/ manufacturers, job creation and skills, value of the orders, socio-economic indicators, energy policy indicators)
  - Report progress based on the above mentioned indicators

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/energy/evaluations/annual\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/energy/evaluations/annual_en.htm)

## Mid –term evaluation on horizontal issues concerning energy savings in the EU

### ABB activities:

32 04 Conventional and renewable energies

### Timing:

October 2011

### Background, scope and focus

The mid-term evaluation reviewed the cross-cutting provisions of the energy services Directive (Directive 2006/32/EC). The sectorial provisions of this Directive are evaluated in the framework of a parallel "Background study for Energy Supply Side Efficiency Framework".

The evaluation was conducted in preparation for the new energy efficiency Directive (proposed in June 2011) which will replace Directive 2006/32/EC once adopted.

The evaluation period covers the years 2006 until present.

The main objective of the evaluation was to get feedback for the revision of major cross-cutting provisions of Directive 2006/32/EC.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

#### The main findings of the evaluators were

The 9% end use energy target of Directive 2006/32/EC has not contributed to extra savings for the majority of Member States.

1. The National Energy Efficiency Action Plans play a major role for Member States' energy efficiency policy coordination. However, the monitoring of individual measures through the so-called "bottom-up" methodology is extremely costly.
2. The development of national ESCO (energy service company) markets is still highly different from Member State to Member State.

#### Main recommendations by the evaluators

3. Transparency on the available ESCO offers should be increased.
4. Reporting through National Energy Efficiency Action Plans should continue after 2016 and should take a larger scope.
5. The exemplary role of the public sector as formulated in Directive 2006/32/EC is too weak and would need to be stepped up.

The findings of the mid-term evaluation have been incorporated into the draft for the present proposal for an Energy Efficiency Directive.

## Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/energy/evaluations/annual\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/energy/evaluations/annual_en.htm)

## Report of the Mid-term Evaluation on the Background study for energy supply side efficiency framework

<b>ABB activities:</b>	32 04 Conventional and renewable energies
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	December 2011
----------------	---------------

### Background, scope and focus

The mid-term evaluation part of this study reviewed the implementation of the cogeneration Directive (2004/8/EC) and the supply side related provisions of the energy services Directive (Directive 2006/32/EC).

The evaluation was conducted as a preparation for the new energy efficiency Directive which will recast Directive 2004/8/EC and Directive 2006/32/EC once adopted.

The evaluation period covers the years of 2004-2011 for Directive 2004/8/EC and 2006-2011 for Directive 2006/32/EC. No previous evaluation of this legislation has been conducted.

The main objective of the evaluation was to get feedback for the revision of Directive 2004/8/EC and the supply side provisions of Directive 2006/32/EC.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

**The main findings of the evaluators** were in relation to the cogeneration Directive

1. The effect of the cogeneration Directive on the uptake of high-efficiency cogeneration has remained limited. Its impact on national policy and market developments varies greatly in different Member States, especially in support schemes and electricity grid system rules.
2. Little binding provisions were provided to help realise national potentials; instead the focus is on the analysis of potentials and evaluation of barriers. This helped develop policy experience, but contributed to the fact that growth in combined heat and power (CHP) has been significantly less than anticipated and often below economic potentials.

3. The Directive successfully established a common framework for defining high-efficiency cogeneration and calculating electricity from cogeneration. The Guarantees of Origin systems based on this framework proved however not fully operational everywhere to drive market differentiation or better value.

4. The Directive is silent on district heating and cooling, which acts as enabler creating viable heat loads for CHP plants and waste heat and is a vital element for achieving energy savings. The development of these networks remained uneven and overall at a low level of 10% of total energy supply in the EU (2009).

**The main findings of the evaluators were in relation to the energy services Directive (Articles 6, 7.2, 10, 13)**

1. The impact of provisions on energy companies (Article 6) has been moderate. The market for energy efficiency services did not develop much and energy efficiency still plays a minor role in most energy companies' business model.

2. The provisions on information and advice on energy efficiency for final consumers (Article 7.2) were implemented in general through soft measures, such as information campaigns to general public mainly by government agencies.

3. The role of network tariffs and regulations in enabling energy efficiency measures remained limited. There was no consensus on the interpretation of the relevant provisions (Article 10) and tariff methodologies failed to recognise the value of energy conservation and efficiency.

4. The broad general wording of the provisions on metering and informative billing (Article 13) left too much room for interpretation allowing Member States to justify not taking action.

**Main recommendations by the evaluators**

1. Focus should be given to a common policy framework for the effective promotion of cogeneration to stimulate national policies, to give cogeneration and district heating & cooling equal basis to compete in the internal energy market and to realise cost-effective national potentials

2. Policy measures are needed to enhance the market for energy efficiency services, such as energy saving obligations, support for ESCOs and energy performance contracting and providing for dedicated funds and programmes,

3. The potential for energy savings through network should be better pursued by using network tariffs and regulations and, inter alia focus on enabling demand response.

4. Feedback, information and advice on actual energy consumptions to consumers are needed to enable savings by end-users. This can be done by e.g. more frequent billing, real-time information in conjunction with feedback, such as on visual displays, offering financial reward for consumption reduction and load shifting.

**The findings of the mid-term evaluation have been incorporated into the draft for the present proposal for an Energy Efficiency Directive.**

**Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/energy/evaluations/annual\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/energy/evaluations/annual_en.htm)

## Report on the final evaluation of the Intelligent Energy Europe II

**ABB activities:**

32 04 Conventional and renewable energies

**Timing:**

September 2011

### Background, scope and focus

The Intelligent Energy – Europe (IEE) Programme supports deployment of sustainable energy. The Programme focuses on the removal of market barriers and creating a more favourable business environment for increasing energy efficiency and renewable energy markets (including clean transport), changing behaviour, raising awareness, and making EU energy policy better understood and implemented in Europe's cities and regions.

Intelligent Energy – Europe (2007-2013), with the total budget of EUR 730 million, builds on the experience gained from its predecessor, the first Intelligent Energy - Europe (2003-2006) Programme. Since 2007, Intelligent Energy – Europe has been included in the overall Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP)<sup>1</sup> in order to better contribute to achieving the objectives of EU energy policy and to implementing the Lisbon Agenda.

The IEE Programme objective is to support sustainable development and to contribute to the achievement of the general goals of environmental protection, security of supply and competitiveness, by providing for action in the fields of:

- fostering energy efficiency and the rational use of energy resources ('SAVE');
- promoting new and renewable energy sources and to support energy diversification ('ALTENER');
- promoting energy efficiency and the use of new and renewable energy sources in transport ('STEER').

The main aim of the final evaluation was to analyse the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and synergies, sustainability, utility, and impact of the actions supported and financed by the programme.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

**Main findings:**

<sup>1</sup> Decision No 1639/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 2006 establishing a Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (2007 to 2013), Besides of IEE II, the following two programmes are also included in the CIP: (1) The Entrepreneurship and Innovation Programme (EIP) (2) The Information and Communications Technologies Policy Support Programme (ICT-PSP)



Relevance: the programme's objectives and funding priorities are perceived as relevant to the needs, barriers and issues it was designed to address. Flexibility and adaptability of the programme objectives are reinforced by the prioritisation process (annual work programmes) that allows the programme to evolve over time and adapt to policy developments and budget increases.

Effectiveness: the legal framework establishing the IEE II programme is clear, understandable and effective. Based on the progress of the activities supported by the programme, it is likely that they will achieve their objectives. The efforts made by the EACI to simplify the management process might increase the effectiveness of the projects. However there is room for improvement in the effectiveness of programme level communication and it is difficult for project coordinators to quantify the objectives and their related indicators and to collect data to feed them.

Efficiency: The adequacy of the level of funding under IEE II to achieve the programme's objectives is difficult to determine at the overall programme level (macro level) given the fact that impacts cannot easily be identified for IEE within the overall EU energy framework. Nonetheless, the activities funded by the programme are perceived as better value for money than alternatives where these exist. The means put in place are not excessive, and could be increased to better facilitate achievement of the overarching objectives of the programme. Moreover the EACI is overall perceived as efficient.

Coherence and synergies: there is evidence of interactions and synergies between IEE II and other EU initiatives in the field of sustainable energy development.

Sustainability: the actions co-funded/funded by the programme should generate impacts which are likely to have a lasting effects. However, the expected (lasting) impacts of the actions supported are unlikely to be quantified or directly imputable to the sole action of the programme.

Utility: the programme is perceived as bringing added-value. The main added-value reported are the transnational dimension of the action supported, the transfer of knowledge and best practices from more advanced Member States in energy issues to less advanced Member States helping them preparing the path to achieve European objectives and its adequate combination of actions.

Impact: it is likely that the actions supported by the programme will have an impact on both EU and national level policy development and implementation.

**Main recommendations:**

1. Programme-level communication on the IEE II programme should be consolidated for all programme components to ensure sufficient visibility and consistency.

2. A single consolidated overview of target groups for the different programme components should be created, and used as the basis for follow-up of the programme and project communication.

3. The training for National Contact Points should be developed further, and they should receive more programme support.

4. An upfront indicative prioritisation for the two remaining work programmes (2012 and 2013) should be considered.

5. Market replication projects: target groups for the dissemination of the experience should be clearly defined and an alternative selection method should be envisaged once it is considered that a sufficient number of "pilot projects" have been established.

6.The national specificities/needs should continue to be taken into account when prioritising projects.

7.There should be further follow up of the management costs per programme component and reporting on this to the programme committee.

8.There should be continued close monitoring of the potential overlaps between IEE II and the SF/CF INTERREG IVC, as well the LIFE+ programmes;

9.The synergies of IEE II with other EU programmes should also be continued.

**Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/energy/evaluations/annual\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/energy/evaluations/annual_en.htm)

## 33 – Justice

### COM(2011)254 REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL AND THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT Report on the interim evaluation of the "DAPHNE III Programme 2007-2013"

**ABB activities:**

33 02 Fundamental rights and citizenship

**Timing:**

11/05/2011

#### Background, scope and focus

As required by Article 15 of Decision n° 779/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council<sup>1</sup>, this report presents the results obtained in the course of the implementation of the DAPHNE III programme since its approval on 3 July 2007 until 2010.

The evaluation of the programme assessed: (1) The relevance in terms of the programme's objectives and approach including its EU added value; (2) The effectiveness of the programme; (3) The efficiency of the programme.

The results of the evaluation will be used:

1. To improve the implementation during the reminder of the current programme; and,
2. To improve the design of the programme in view of the "successor programme".

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

In terms of relevance, the evaluation concludes that overall the Daphne III programme is highly relevant to the problems it was designed to address. The level of violence is still prevalent and the demand for the programme is high.

In terms of effectiveness, the Daphne programme has a considerable impact and has managed to make progress towards achieving its objectives. However, a number of procedural and substantive challenges have been identified which affect progress.

In terms of efficiency, the financial resources currently provided by the programme to

<sup>1</sup> Decision No 779/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 June 2007 establishing for the period 2007-2013 the specific programme to prevent and combat violence against children, young people and women and to protect victims and groups at risk (Daphne III programme), as part of the General Programme Fundamental Rights and Justice.

implement actions are appropriate in that they allow high quality projects to be funded, while greater use could be made of Commission initiatives to support the programme administration and the dissemination of results.

On the basis of the main conclusions/recommendations of the evaluation, the improvement of the programme should focus on the following aspects:

- Improved focus on EU policy priorities,
- Better dissemination and sustainability of projects' results,
- Balanced participation in the Daphne programme,
- More efficient management of the Daphne programme.

In order to improve the reach and impact of the programme the Commission will strengthen the links of the programme with policy developments, ensure balanced participation and improve the dissemination of the results of the projects and the management of the selection process. Lessons learned during this evaluation will be integrated into the reflection and preparatory work for the next multiannual financial framework.

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

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0254:FIN:EN:PDF>

### **COM(2011)249 REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL AND THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT Report on the interim evaluation of the "Fundamental Rights and Citizenship Programme 2007-2013"**

**ABB activities:**

33 02 Fundamental rights and citizenship

**Timing:**

05/05/2011

**Background, scope and focus**

As required by Article 15 of the Council Decision 2007/252/EC<sup>1</sup>, this report presents the results obtained in the course of the implementation of the Fundamental Rights and Citizenship (FRC) Programme. It is based on data from 2007 to 2010.

The overall aims and objectives of the evaluation were:

- To provide an overview of the results obtained in the first three years of the programme;
- To provide an assessment of qualitative and quantitative aspects of the implementation in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency;
- To provide recommendations and guidance on how implementation in the remaining years of the programme could be improved.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

In terms of relevance, the evaluation concludes that the FRC programme is highly relevant to the needs it was set out to address. It has contributed to the development and strengthening of EU actions in the areas of freedom, security and justice and specifically responded to the need to protect fundamental rights and promote EU citizenship.

In terms of effectiveness, at the stage of the interim evaluation any far-reaching conclusions regarding whether the programme is reaching its objectives would be somewhat premature, in view of the limited number of finalised projects. Furthermore, the programme, due to its structure, varied priorities, and thematic fields, range of target groups and breadth of stakeholders makes the setting of meaningful and useable indicators complex and the extraction of revealing information somewhat illusive. Overall, no major obstacles that would be considered as a detriment to the progress in implementing the activities were identified by the beneficiaries. It remains evident that the projects have as much led to the deepening of collaboration between existing partners as to the creation of new partnerships.

In terms of efficiency, the Commission's general management ability was considered appropriate. Some problems were identified concerning the efficiency of the delivery in terms of selection procedures, including aspects related to the plethora of documents required for submission and the lengthy evaluation procedure that follows.

On the basis of the main conclusions/recommendations of the evaluation, the improvement of the programme should focus on the following aspects:

- Improved focus on EU policy priorities
- Concentration on projects with a strong European dimension
- Balance of participation in the FRC Programme
- More efficient management of the FRC Programme
- Improved dissemination and exploitation of results

Although the evaluation also highlighted some challenges in the implementation of the FRC programme and identified a number of improvements that could be made, there is no denying of the intrinsic quality of the programme, its relevance to current European policy priorities, to the needs of its chosen target groups and stake-holders, as well as its added value.

<sup>1</sup> Council Decision 2007/252/EC of 19 April 2007 establishing for the period 2007-2013 the specific programme 'Fundamental Rights and Citizenship' as part of the General Programme 'Fundamental Rights and Justice'.

Therefore, in order to further improve the impact and effectiveness of the programme, the Commission will further focus the programme, ensure a stronger coherence between result driven projects and policy developments, spread the reach of the programme to the EU12 Member States, rationalise the management processes of the programme and emphasise the dissemination of its achievements.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0249:FIN:EN:PDF>

### The Mid-term Evaluation of PROGRESS - Final Report

<b>ABB activities:</b>	33 06 Equality
------------------------	----------------

<b>Timing:</b>	22/12/2011
----------------	------------

#### Background, scope and focus

The PROGRESS was adopted by Decision No. 1672/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the 24th October 2006 and it intervenes in five areas: 1. Employment, 2. Social protection and inclusion, 3. Working conditions, 4. Anti-discrimination and diversity, 5. Gender equality. The PROGRESS Programme is managed by DG EMPL and since 01.01.2011 the strands Anti-discrimination and diversity and Gender equality are managed by DG Justice.

The objective of the mid-term evaluation is to measure the degree to which PROGRESS is meeting its objectives, the efficiency of its use of resources and its European added value. The evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and European added value were used. The period covered by the evaluation is from 2007 until 2009.

The lessons, conclusions and recommendations will be used to:

- Improve the on-going implementation of PROGRESS until 2013;
- Assist in preparing and designing the approach for the post-2013 programming period.

## Summary of findings and conclusions

The conclusions of the mid-term evaluation in the field of Anti-discrimination and Gender Equality are the following:

### *Antidiscrimination*

The evaluation showed a reasonable to good overall score for antidiscrimination. The quality of information and communication activities is high, not least through the FDAD campaign, although the dissemination of some activity products could be improved or amended. There is a good achievement of both Immediate and Intermediate Outcomes, and the quality of outputs is good. There is room to improve some aspects of stakeholder engagement however, as well as aspects of added value such as agenda setting.

### *Gender equality*

The overall assessment scores for this policy field are average to good. The needs clearly remain relevant. The quantity of outputs is overall satisfactory: particularly high for monitoring outputs and lowest for statistical tools. High quality outputs were found particularly in training, monitoring, policy advice and NGOs/networks, but were of a more mixed level for information/communication and identification/dissemination of good practices. The quantity and quality of outputs from both the expert networks and NGO were particularly high. Evidence of effective partnerships was more limited.

## Availability of the report on Europa

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?type=0&policyArea=86&subCategory=987&country=0&year=0&advSearchKey=progressevaluation&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en>

## Evaluation of the impact of the EU instruments affecting children's rights with a view to assessing the level of protection and promotion of children's rights in the EU

**ABB activities:**

33 02 Fundamental rights and citizenship

**Timing:**

June 2011

## Background, scope and focus

The main objective of this evaluation was to identify EU actions in the area of children's rights

and to assess whether the EU had taken effective account of the children and their rights in developing internal and external actions that affect them.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

Several shortcomings were identified in particular due to the fact that children's rights policy cuts across many policy areas. There were problems within each responsible DG, and between the different DG concerned as the roles were not clearly defined, there was insufficient communication with relevant stakeholders.

Several recommendations were made: development of a comprehensive Action Plan, including guidelines and capacity building for the DG, better monitoring in particular regarding the funding programmes, and improvement of the stakeholder's consultation.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat\\_general/evaluation/search/search.do](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/evaluation/search/search.do)

## **Communication from the COM to the EP and the Council Consular Protection for EU citizens in third countries: state of play and way forward**

*Evaluation related study*

<b>ABB activities:</b>	33 02 Fundamental rights and citizenship
------------------------	--

<b>Timing:</b>	23/03/2011
----------------	------------

### **Background, scope and focus**

The right to consular protection adds an external dimension to the concept of Union citizenship. Due to several reasons the number of Member States' citizens living in third countries is ever increasing and only in the USA, Russia and China are all Member States represented. The Treaty of Lisbon reinforced this right and the competence of the Union to act.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**



Citizens are not sufficiently aware of this right. Furthermore, implementation of this right was not correctly ensured by the Member States services.

The COM proposes to act under three pillars: increase awareness through targeted communication measures, draft proposals under the new legal framework of the Treaty of Lisbon, improve burden sharing and optimise the use of resources, including in crisis situations.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/citizenship/diplomatic/docs/communication\\_consular\\_protection.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/citizenship/diplomatic/docs/communication_consular_protection.pdf)

### **Study for an external, independent assessment of the European Action on Drugs**

*Evaluation related study*

<b>ABB activities:</b>	33 04 Drugs prevention and information
------------------------	--

<b>Timing:</b>	31/08/2011
----------------	------------

#### **Background, scope and focus**

In 2010, drug use levels reached historically high levels. While this affects some Member States more than others, drug use generates adverse impacts on EU society with regards to public health, education levels attained, employments, and crime levels.

Fight against cross-border crimes, including illicit drug trafficking, is one of the main priorities identified in the Stockholm Programme.

#### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The European Action on Drugs (EAD) responds to the need to mobilise civil society around the prevention of drug use and abuse.

Stakeholders found that the objectives of the EAD were relevant to their needs (awareness raising, mobilise civil society), were effectively achieved and were seen as cost effective by most stakeholders. The impacts of the EAD on behavioural change regarding the drugs were

more limited even if the EAD was a catalyst to the creation of national networks of civil society organisations.

The recommendations aimed at setting clear and attainable objectives for the EAD, improving its management and governance arrangements and improving information and communication technologies.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat\\_general/evaluation/search/search.do](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/evaluation/search/search.do)

### **Report from the COM to the EP and the Council on the implementation since 2007 of the Council Framework decision of 13 June 2002 on the European arrest warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States (COM(2011) 175 final)**

*Evaluation related study*

#### **ABB activities:**

33 03 Justice in criminal and civil matters

#### **Timing:**

11/4/2011

#### **Background, scope and focus**

This is the third implementation report since the entering into force of the Framework Decision (FWD). This report is the first to be drafted after the entering into force of the Treaty of Lisbon and the legally binding nature of the Charter of Fundamental rights of the EU. Being a ex third pillar legal instrument, these implementation reports are the only way the Com has to check the correct implementation of the FWD as no infringement procedures were allowed.

#### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

Despite operational success, the system still has shortcomings. Transposition of the FWD in some Member States is still not complete or correct in spite of the fact that the situation has improved as other Member States followed the recommendations made by the COM in previous reports.

The implementation of the FWD at national level presents some problems from the fundamental

rights point of view which led the COM to reinforce the ongoing work on the strengthening of the procedural rights of the suspected or accused persons in criminal proceedings.

Other measures were also proposed as work ahead such as training, better definition of the proportionality on when to issue an European Arrest Warrant, reinforcement of the transposition and implementation of the FWD.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat\\_general/evaluation/search/search.do](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/evaluation/search/search.do)

### **Report from the COM on the functioning of Council Decision 2005/387/JHA on the information exchange, risk assessment and control of new psychoactive substances (COM(2011) 430 final)**

*Evaluation related study*

#### **ABB activities:**

33 04 Drugs prevention and information

#### **Timing:**

11/7/2011

#### **Background, scope and focus**

The assessment is a follow up of the recommendations of the EU Drugs Action Plan 2009-2012.

It focuses on the functioning of the Council decision to address the new changing reality of new psychoactive substances.

#### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The report indicates that the market for new psychoactive substances has changed dramatically: significant increase in the number of substances detected, variety and diversification of their distribution channels in the Member States. The Council Decision does not provide for a system that is quick enough to deal with the changing reality. It concludes therefore that the Council Decision is not an adequate instrument to address the new challenges.

## Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat\\_general/evaluation/search/search.do](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/evaluation/search/search.do)

## COM(2011)246 REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL AND THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT Report on the interim evaluation of the specific Programme "Drug prevention and information"; (DPIP) 2007-2013

### ABB activities:

33 04 Drugs prevention and information

### Timing:

5/5/2011

### Background, scope and focus

As required by Article 15 (3) (b) of Decision No **1150/2007/EC** of the European Parliament and of the Council<sup>1</sup> (hereinafter referred to as the *basic act*), this report presents the results obtained in the course of the implementation of the **Drug prevention and information programme** (hereinafter referred to as *DPIP or DPI Programme*) since its approval on 25 September 2007 till 2010. Based on the findings of the qualitative and quantitative analysis of the DPIP's implementation, on its main achievements while taking into account the main challenges, the report provides recommendations concerning the remaining period of implementation.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

The Interim evaluation confirmed the relevance of the DPIP. Its assessment has proven that both the general and the specific objectives are pertinent to the needs and problems of the target groups. It also concluded that during the first 3 years of its implementation, the DPI Programme could boast certain achievements in terms of reaching its originally-set objectives, and it has shown the potential to achieve good results in the field, despite its limited financial resources.

<sup>1</sup> Decision No 1150/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 September 2007 establishing for the period 2007-2013 the Specific Programme Drug prevention and information as part of the General Programme Fundamental Rights and Justice

The limited budget however is preventing the achievement of an impact at a large scale with considerable EU dimension which has also limited the number of participating organisations.

The findings of the evaluation confirmed that there are no major difficulties hindering the successful implementation of the programme. However, in order to maximise the potential of the DPIIP within its existing framework, to strengthen its impact and to optimize the implementation there is a need for certain adjustments. The Commission proposes the following measures to address these:

#### **Increased EU dimension and EU added value and impact**

In order to gain visibility for the programmes and to ensure that the projects achieve an impact not limited to local or regional level, broader and better elaborated projects with a higher EU added value and sustainability should be favoured. To deliver activities with a broad European dimension, coverage and sustainability, the financing possibilities within the DPIIP should be streamlined and the limited available funding should be concentrated on multiannual actions implemented by several partners. To this end the Commission will assess the added value of the operating grants provided for organisations only for one budgetary year which have had limited impact so far.

The Commission should further strengthen the synergies between the financial instruments supporting the objectives of the EU Drugs Strategy. The cooperation and communication among the programmes should be enhanced (in particular between ISEC and DPIIP and DPIIP and the Public Health Programme) at the level of programming during the formulation of the annual work programmes in order to avoid duplications and to allow potential beneficiaries to target their applications more efficiently.

#### **Increased efficiency of management of DPIIP**

The lengthy and administratively demanding procedures have been identified as major obstacle to success. To this end the Commission will take measures to reduce the time spent between the publication of the calls for proposals and the actual conclusion of the grant agreement to quicken the provision of funding. Further consideration should be to address the procedural obligations imposed by the basic act, namely the consultations on the outcome of the selection of grant beneficiaries with the DPIIP committee and the European Parliament, which should also be viewed in the context of the future financial perspectives.

It was confirmed that abolishing of the paper-based application process had a positive impact on the management, and was perceived positively by the target audience of the DPIIP. The new PRIAMOS system has proven its usefulness.

#### **Improved dissemination and better use of results**

The evaluation identified certain deficits in relation to the exploitation of the result of the projects financed under the DPIIP. It was indicated that making the results centrally available for the public would not only directly contribute to one of the specific objectives of the DPIIP but also would allow the generation of better projects. This would help the current and future beneficiaries as well as the Commission to avoid duplications and allow to build on already existing achievements.

## Availability of the report on Europa

[http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Result.do?T1=V5&T2=2011&T3=246&RechType=RECH\\_naturel&Submit=Search](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Result.do?T1=V5&T2=2011&T3=246&RechType=RECH_naturel&Submit=Search)

## COM(2011)351 REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL AND THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT Report on the interim evaluation of the specific Programme "CIVIL Justice"; (JCIV) 2007-2013

### ABB activities:

33 03 Justice in criminal and civil matters

### Timing:

15/6/2011

### Background, scope and focus

As required by Article 16 (3b) of Decision No **1149/2007/EC** of the European Parliament and of the Council<sup>1</sup> (hereinafter referred to as the *basic act*), this report presents the results obtained in the course of the implementation of the **Civil Justice programme** (hereinafter referred to as *JCIV or JCIV Programme*) since its approval on 25 September 2007 till 2010. Based on the findings of the qualitative and quantitative analysis of the JCIV's implementation, on its main achievements while taking into account the main challenges, the report provides recommendations concerning the remaining period of implementation.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

The programme started up little more than three years ago and few of the initiatives financed have been completed. It is thus still too early to make an in-depth analysis of the programme's impact and results. However, it can be seen already that the projects financed, both those undertaken at the initiative of the Commission and specific projects, are contributing to the fulfilment of its objectives and, more generally, respond to the Commission's desire to promote knowledge of European law in the field of civil justice and its correct implementation. Major

<sup>1</sup> Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 September 2007 establishing for the period 2007-2013 the Specific Programme 'Civil Justice as part of the General Programme Fundamental Rights and Justice

Commission initiatives already under way (the Judicial Atlas, database, information campaigns, conferences and studies) are designed to keep legal professionals, and even the general public, informed about recent developments in European civil law in various complementary ways. Particular emphasis is laid on practical and relevant information that can be accessed using new communication technologies.

The possibility of cofinancing NGOs' work programmes, which has a more limited share of the budget, attracted only a few applications in the first three years and of those only six organisations were selected. There is no doubt about the relevance of the objectives of the Civil Justice Programme, which extends the impact of the legislative work of the Commission and sometimes provides inputs upstream. Like previous programmes, the Civil Justice Programme plays an important role in supporting European justice policy. The activities financed with quite modest grants help civil society organisations and Member States to make an effective contribution to the formulation and smooth implementation of European law. In addition, the programme is efficiently managed, despite the limited human resources, as the Commission's partners generally agree.

There are still some **recommendations** that could be made to make the programme even more effective, however.

**How can the programme be made more attractive?** While the quality of the projects financed appears indisputable, it must be admitted that not many proposals are received and their geographic spread is not very wide. The Commission has received just over 150 proposals in four years whereas it was expecting between 100 and 150 in the first year. The difficulties were identified as follows: • the very technical nature of the topics covered by the programme, which means that only the 'initiated' submit proposals; • small organisations have difficulty in finding partners and their own sources of cofinancing; • the programme is little known outside the inner circle of 'clients'; • potential candidates' fear of complex procedures.

*While the first of these difficulties is intrinsic to the very nature of the programme, it is possible to deal with the three others by doing two things: - better publicising the programme, particularly through presentations in the Member States to reach more grassroots organisations and tell them how to apply, how to design a good project and how to find partners. The Commission works in partnership with the national authorities concerned, which are responsible for bringing together the relevant associations. - simplifying procedures. Desired by all stakeholders, simplification is an exercise that must unite the requirements of transparency, sound financial management and equal treatment of partners. Current procedures lead to unacceptably long delays between the publication of calls for proposals and the start-up of projects. They are caused by a plethora of administrative steps that are disproportionate to the amounts involved.*

**Better defined priorities that are more in line with the Commission's policy priorities:** The setting of priorities should focus more on political activities and promote projects that meet these priorities. More attention should be paid to the dissemination of project results in order to ensure better visibility of both the results and the programme as a whole.

**More European added value** Financing should be concentrated on projects that have a real European dimension and offer the most significant European added value. To achieve this objective we should finance larger projects. To do this the necessary provisions should be incorporated in the annual work programmes and the next basic decision. The Commission's proposed basic decision for the current programme required the participation of at least three States, while the final text provides for no more than two.

**Operating grants** - The operating grants component of the programme has so far produced disappointing results, which may be attributable to declining enthusiasm for this type of grant, but another reason is the fact that most of the proposals received tend to be closer to specific projects than annual work programmes. In addition, the European dimension is very difficult to

identify in this type of activity (except for the true European networks which were the main target of the Commission's proposal). Given the workload created by the publication of an annual call for proposals for operating grants and the results obtained, the Commission should consider discontinuing this in 2014.

**Links between the programmes: should they be merged?** Various ways of reforming the programme may be considered with an eye to the next financial programming period starting in 2014, including a merger with the twin Criminal Justice programme. The programmes were kept separate in 2007 because of their different legal bases, which called for different adoption procedures, but this is no longer the case since the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty. Accordingly, the Commission might consider proposing a 'Justice' programme bringing together the current Civil and Criminal Justice programmes.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0351:FIN:EN:PDF>

### COM(2011)255 EVALUATION REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL "Interim evaluation report on the Criminal Justice Programme"

#### ABB activities:

33 03 Justice in criminal and civil matters

#### Timing:

11/5/2011

#### Background, scope and focus

As required by Article 16 (3b) of Decision No **2007/126/JHA** of the Council<sup>1</sup> (hereinafter referred to as the *basic act*), this evaluation report provided an overview of the results obtained in the period 2007-2010 and presents the qualitative and quantitative aspects of implementation of the programme. The evaluation was carried out by the Commission, which analysed the strengths and weaknesses of the programme by trying to answer the following questions:

2. What improvements can be made to implementation of the programme for the period

<sup>1</sup> Decision No 2007/126/JHA of the European Parliament and of the Council of the European Union dated 12 February 2007 establishing for the period 2007-2013 the Specific Programme Criminal Justice as part of the General Programme Fundamental Rights and Justice



remaining?

3. What improvements can be made to the design of the programme with a view to drawing up the succeeding programme(s)?

The evaluation examined: :

- the relevance of the programme, assessing how far the programme objectives succeed in meeting needs and resolving problems;
- the effectiveness of the programme, determining how far the programme objectives have been achieved;
- its efficiency, verifying whether the effects were obtained at a reasonable cost.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The evaluation of the programme concludes that there is a need to continue this funding, insofar as the actions supported tackle specific and genuine problems and make a positive contribution to and complement the national measures implemented in this field. However, it also identified several weaknesses that need to be addressed if European actions in this field are to be even more effective.

However, it has also identified several weaknesses that need to be addressed if European actions are to be even more effective. Separate implementation of the civil justice, criminal justice and other programmes means that they do not maximise real synergies and may even create unnecessary overlaps.

The evaluation report made a series of recommendations that it felt would further enhance its effectiveness, namely:

#### **PRIORITY SETTING**

Monitoring of annual priorities should be improved by increased use of the PRIAMOS online application registration and evaluation system which enables proposals to be classified by priority and specific needs on the ground to be identified as a result. This statistical information can be used to help set annual priorities.

#### **EUROPEAN ADDED VALUE**

The evaluation showed that there are a growing number of projects with European added value in the field of criminal justice. However, this criterion is still one of the hardest for participating organisations to satisfy. It is not interpreted in the same way throughout DG Justice, and it has a low weighting compared with other award criteria (15%).

The Commission plans to encourage a debate to define this criterion more clearly and to determine how much of a role it should play in relation to national funding instruments. The European added value criterion could be given greater weight in the selection procedure.

#### **SIMPLIFICATION OF PROCEDURES**

In order to make the programme more effective without any extra human resources, the Commission plans to continue to harmonise and simplify the guidelines (a practical guide for applicants will be updated annually), the grant application forms and the evaluation criteria.

The provisional timetables of calls for proposals should be published sufficiently well in advance, and the Commission should ensure that all the deadlines are met. Grant applicants should also be informed clearly and in good time about the current procedures and given

sufficient time to prepare their proposals.

In order to increase the number of projects funded per call for proposals, the Commission should plan to publish only one call for proposals for grants for actions every two years.

It should consider no longer using operating grants because they have not proved effective.

In the interests of economies of scale, the Commission should try to channel its financial support towards larger projects. In the interests of harmonisation with other DG Justice programmes and efficient management, certain tasks should be outsourced (e.g. evaluation of the award criteria).

#### **PUBLICITY AND VISIBILITY**

The programme's internet site should be improved to give it greater visibility, for example by sending messages to alert the programme's natural partners (former beneficiaries, members of the programme committee, active networks, etc.). This would be a way of disseminating more widely the results of calls for proposals, announcements of new calls and the list of organisations eligible to take part in the project.

Special efforts (e.g. information sessions, FAQs) should be targeted at Member States that are under-represented in the programme (CY, DK, IR, LT, SK, SE, EE, FI, GR, LU and PL), to raise awareness about the programme and help improve the quality of the proposals.

In order to promote the emergence and resilience of a civil society in the field of criminal law, this awareness-raising campaign should focus on NGOs, which are not sufficiently involved in the programme.

Closer links with other DG Justice programmes should be sought in order to ensure a bigger critical mass and hence greater visibility.

Other types of cooperation through partnership or joint management should be envisaged with organisations with an established reputation in the field, such as the Council of Europe and OECD.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/justice/funding/jpen/interim\\_evaluation\\_report\\_2011\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/funding/jpen/interim_evaluation_report_2011_en.pdf)

### **SECTION 3: PROSPECTIVE EVALUATIONS**

This section provides fact sheets for 6 prospective evaluations in support of proposals for new or renewed EU interventions.

## 04 – Employment and social affairs

### Support for carrying out ex-ante evaluation for the new PROGRESS Programme post-2013

*Evaluation related study*

<b>ABB activities:</b>	04 04 Employment, social solidarity and gender equality
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	October 2011
----------------	--------------

#### Background, scope and focus

A composite impact assessment of the financial instruments under the responsibility of the Directorate-General 'Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion', covering the European Social Fund, the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund, the Progress Programme, EURES and the Progress Microfinance Facility was carried out. The impact assessment considered three options:

- Option 1: no policy change: under this option, the Progress programme, EURES and the Progress micro-finance facility, would continue to exist as separate instruments running alongside the European Social Fund.
- Option 2: a new integrated programme for social change and innovation: the new programme is made up of three separate albeit complementary sections: Progress, EURES and microfinance and social entrepreneurship.
- Option 3: a single instrument for employment and social affairs: such an instrument would have a shared management strand (the European Social Fund) and a direct management strand.

The impact assessment has concluded that option 2 is the preferred option that would bring about the most benefits in terms of efficiency gains, critical mass, coherence and effectiveness, while avoiding political and institutional risks.

As part of the review of the PROGRESS programme, stakeholder consultations and a needs assessment were also carried out to prepare the Commission's legislative proposal and ex-ante evaluation for a new PROGRESS programme (post-2013).

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

The Progress Programme has contributed to delivering effective policy responses. The strengthened policy framework under the new Europe 2020 strategy implies an even stronger need for evidence-based policy-making so that Union policies and legislation are responsive to the socio-economic challenges. The successor to the Progress Programme should assist the Commission in implementing its tasks:

- fact-finding and evidence-gathering about relevant policy developments;
- monitoring and reporting on progress made by Member States towards Union common priorities and objectives;
- ensuring effective and uniform application of Union law;
- –modernising Union law on working conditions in line with the Smart Regulation principles.

EURES aims to improve labour market transparency by making job vacancies available on the EURES Job Mobility Portal and to provide support for information, advice and guidance services at national and cross-border level. At the same time, the role of public employment services (PES) has changed as a result of the recent economic crisis and the need for more tailor-made services. PES should become life-long learning providers, offering a wide range of services (such as skills assessment, training, career guidance, matching jobs and profiles, client counselling (workers and employers) and catering for the needs of those furthest from the labour market. In addition, EURES should promote new working methods with private employment services.

One of the major obstacles to business creation is lack of access to finance, and especially micro-credit, which has been exacerbated by the recent economic crisis. Europe's micro-finance sector has not yet reached maturity. In order to grow, Union micro-finance institutions would need to build and maintain adequate funding models. Therefore, there is a clear need to strengthen institutional capacity-building (especially of non-banking microfinance institutions) in order to cover start-up costs and funding for lending to high-risk target groups.

The European Union Programme Social Change and Innovation should aim to increase coherence of EU action in the employment and social areas by bringing together and building on the implementation of the Progress Programme, EURES and the European Progress Microfinance facility. In addition, the Programme provides for an opportunity to simplify implementation through common provisions covering, inter alia, common general objectives, common typology of actions and rationalisation of reporting and evaluation. At the same time, the Programme provides for a limited set of specific provisions applying to the three sections (Progress, EURES and Microfinance and Social Entrepreneurship) in order to take account of legal requirements (including comitology rules which only applies to the Progress section, geographical coverage and specific reporting and evaluation requirements in the case of the Microfinance and Social Entrepreneurship section).

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

[http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Result.do?direct=yes&lang=en&col=GRP\\_CITATION&value=52011PC0609&whereihm=Instruments%20cited:%2052011PC0609](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Result.do?direct=yes&lang=en&col=GRP_CITATION&value=52011PC0609&whereihm=Instruments%20cited:%2052011PC0609)

## 08 – Research

### State of the Art and Forward-Looking Analysis of Environmental Research and Innovation

*Evaluation related study*

**ABB activities:**

08 06 Cooperation - Environment (including climate change)

**Timing:**

12/2011

#### Background, scope and focus

This is the second of the two studies required to support the preparation of the impact assessment report for Horizon 2020.

The aim of the second group of experts (GoE2) on "State of the art and forward looking analysis of environmental research and innovation" is to provide the rationale for the EU to intervene and to identify future challenges and avenues for environmental research and innovation. This study is based on results of the Group of Experts (GoE1) on "Stock-taking of results and Impacts of EU-funded environmental research".

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

This report identifies and appraises future challenges and options for environmental research under the future Horizon 2020.

The GoE2 identified eight grand challenges: Climate change, Loss of biodiversity, Resource constraints and loss of ecosystem services, Urbanization, Ageing society, Environmental health, Social preparedness, and Eco-innovative solutions and their dissemination.

These include cross cutting themes such as the importance of better monitoring, modelling and forecasting methods to design policies and measures, the strong linkages between the environmental social systems, the importance of inter-disciplinary research and the regional nature of many of the challenges, which stress the need for trans-boundary research and policy initiatives.

– International comparisons reveal that the EU27 has an overall lower share of government expenditure on R&D than the US or Japan, but it does allocate a larger share of that R&D budget to environmental categories.

– The GoE2 discussed four possible scenarios for the future Horizon 2020. From the analysis of those scenarios, it appears that a specific, holistic, cooperative environmental programme is

needed to support the increasingly crucial environmental policies, harvesting innovative ideas for business purposes and providing a clear interface to address the above mentioned challenges.

– At the same time the programme places itself firmly at the interface of both ideas-driven environmental research and industry-driven research programmes.

– Regardless of the policy option selected, it is recommended that the environmental research programme is implemented in a manner that protects the competitive nature and equal opportunities principle that have applied to previous framework programmes.

### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index\\_en.cfm?pg=archive#results](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index_en.cfm?pg=archive#results)

## Stock-Taking of Results and Impacts of EU-Funded Environmental Research

*Evaluation related study*

### ABB activities:

08 06 Cooperation – Environment (including climate change)

### Timing:

12/2011

### Background, scope and focus

The aim of this study was to support the preparation of the impact assessment report for Horizon 2020.

The aim of the first group of experts (GoE1) on "Stock-taking of results and Impacts of EU-funded environmental research" is to provide evidence of outputs, results and impact of FP6 and FP7 environmental research.

### Summary of findings and conclusions

1. FP Environment research is mainly relevant to impacts related to policy support and research excellence. Innovation is not at the top of the agenda/priorities of environmental research funded in FPs. The expectations of direct economic benefits cannot therefore be very high, although the

indirect and long-term economic impacts could be huge in several areas.

2. Overall, it appears that FP Environment projects achieve their most positive contributions in research excellence with a very positive contribution to high quality publications significantly supporting leading European countries to compete internationally in terms of publications and citations as well as an upward trend in collaborative publications both within the EU and beyond, mainly with China, Russia and India.

3. Regarding policy impacts, the value of FP environment research is unquestionable especially in terms of EU policy making, and international agreements and conventions. There is ample evidence proving the use of FP environment research results in EU policy documents and for the development of certain EU directives and standards.

4. From the business perspective, FP Environment has brought positive and sustainable changes in the way research is carried out and proved to be a valuable means to access additional funding and thus expand research objectives. FP7 Environment research played a significant role in establishing durable networks and its value in this regard is highly appreciated. Although direct economic impacts are quite limited, there are indications based on participants' judgments of positive economic impacts associated with certain environmental research areas in terms of patents, prototypes and new products and processes. Yet the issue remains that participation by businesses, and especially SMEs, stays at a relatively low level.

5. These results constituted useful background information for the GoE-2.

#### Availability of the report on Europa

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index\\_en.cfm?pg=archive#results](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index_en.cfm?pg=archive#results)

### Fusion Energy - State of Development and Future Role

*Evaluation related study*

**ABB activities:**

08 20 "Euratom – Fusion energy"

**Timing:**

06/2011

#### Background, scope and focus

The aim of this study was to present the current state of development and future role of fusion energy and furthermore analyse socio-economic risks and opportunities related to funding of fusion research. The study was commissioned by DG RTD in the context of preparations of an



impact assessment for next Euratom Research and Training Programme.

### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

1. Fusion research has made considerable progress towards overcoming the scientific challenges, in line with the research resources made available.
2. An increase in resources would speed up the commercialisation of fusion but the prospects are too long term and high risk for commercial companies to fund research yet.
3. The physics which makes fusion power a viable possibility has been demonstrated at the JET facility in 1997 which produced 16MW of fusion power while being driven by 25MW of input power. The challenge now is to demonstrate that fusion works in an integrated power station like facility and to make the reaction stable, produce a net amount of electricity and commercially viable.
4. Fusion offers genuine benefits in comparison to other energy sources that, given the seemingly inevitable growth in energy demand predicted should ensure it a role in the future energy mix.
5. The research and development costs associated with developing fusion are very large but given the scale and value of the global energy market and the benefits fusion could bring, the ongoing resources allocated to other alternative sources of energy (e.g. renewables) fusion is worthy of public support.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index_en.cfm)

## 11 – Maritime Affairs and Fisheries

### **An ex-ante evaluation for the conclusion of a new Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) and Protocol between the European Union and Mauritius**

**ABB activities:**

11 03 International fisheries and law of the sea

**Timing:**

October 2011

#### **Background, scope and focus**

This evaluation provides a prospective ex-ante evaluation for the conclusion of a new Fisheries Partnership Agreement (FPA) between the EU and Mauritius.

#### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The impact assessment of a new fishing agreement and of its protocol of application confirms that the need exists for the European and Mauritius fishing industries, but also to create the conditions for a bilateral sectoral policy dialogue between the EU and the Authorities of Mauritius. The EU has frameworks for policy dialogue at the regional level (IOTC, Indian Ocean Commission) and at a bilateral level with third countries having concluded bilateral fishing agreements with the EU (Comoros, Madagascar, Mozambique and Seychelles).

Without an agreement with Mauritius, the geographic coverage is incomplete. In addition, the impact assessment verifies that the conclusion of a fisheries agreement with Mauritius is coherent with other EU interventions in the region which all have the common general objective to promote responsible and sustainable fishing practices. There are no alternative options to a fishing agreement to satisfy the needs of the two parties. The other option for the EU would be not to act, similar to status quo, with as main disadvantage the lack of framework for bilateral sectoral policy dialogue. Without an agreement, the EU vessels could continue to exploit the Mauritian fishing zone but without the legal security and the visibility provided under a fishing agreement.

The impact analysis does not identify adverse economic, social or environmental incidences. Concerning the economic and social impacts, an agreement will have positive consequences i) by strengthening the viability of the European and Mauritius fishing industries, and ii) by providing the authorities in charge of fisheries with additional funding to support the implementation of the fisheries policy with benefits for the local target populations. Fishing opportunities available for the European tuna vessels in the fishing zone of Mauritius does not mean an increase of fishing effort as the fishing vessels concerned are already active in the Indian Ocean. An agreement will not result in additional fishing capacities, but will support a better spatial distribution of fishing effort. Additionally, the conclusion of an agreement will

give to the EU an instrument to manage its fishing fleets, should emergency measures be required.

The fishing zone of Mauritius does not show any particular biological or environmental sensitivities. Environmental problems in relation with the activities of the fishing fleets must be tackled at the multilateral level of IOTC.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/mauritius/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/mauritius/index_en.htm)

## **16 – Communication**

### **Ex-Ante Evaluation of the European Year of Citizens 2013**

#### **ABB activities:**

16 05 Fostering European citizenship

#### **Timing:**

11/08/2011

#### **Background, scope and focus**

The ex-ante evaluation was part of a proposal for the decision on the European Year being prepared by DG COMM. The aim of this ex-ante evaluation was to ascertain if, how and to what extent the European Year of Citizens (EYC) in 2013 will enhance awareness of the rights attached to Union citizenship, as well as to gather information and carry out analyses that would help to define objectives, to ensure that these objectives can be met, that the instruments used are cost-effective and that reliable later evaluation will be possible.

#### **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The results of the evaluation suggest that EYC focus on enhancing awareness of Union citizenship rights has the potential to contribute to facilitating the exercise of the rights available under EU law in a cross-border context, to the benefit both of the individuals concerned and of European societies and economies. These rights are relevant in economic, societal and political

terms and have the potential to enhance citizens' sense of belonging to the EU. This would also be beneficial for Union citizenship itself, given the positive association between Union citizenship and free movement as one of its core benefits.

**Objectives** - The general objective of the EYC would be a greater sense of belonging of citizens to the EU through the promotion of rights of Union citizens, in particular the right to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States. There were three specific policy objectives proposed.

**Approach** - The EYC would combine an awareness raising campaign directed at the general public as well as at specific target groups (with a focus on multipliers); events targeted at public authorities, practitioners and other key stakeholders; a horizontal strategy for the use of internet/social media in this context; events related to citizens' rights and citizens' participation (that could serve as a run up to the 2014 European elections) organised with the two Presidencies and in close cooperation with the EP and possibly the EESC/CoR). Moreover, innovative – e.g. internet/social media-based – forms of dialogue with citizens could be organised.

Benefits (strengths) of this approach are that the EYC would have a high outreach to the general public and to specific target audiences. It would deliver clear and coherent messages and mobilise stakeholders at both the EU and national level. Member States as well as civil society would be empowered to assume ownership of the theme. This EYC would be a concrete expression of the Commission's strong commitment to putting citizens at the heart of the EU political agenda.

The EYC would be implemented at the EU level and carried out in close cooperation with the other EU Institutions. The Representations in the Member States and the involvement of Member States through a Steering Committee and the relevant Council formations would ensure the linking of the EU initiative with the national level. Civil society would be involved in preparing and implementing the EYC.

**Cost** - No additional funding is sought as the proposal for the EYC aims at activating existing structures. The flexibility for annual priority-setting based on the budget lines and programmes of the DG COMM provides sufficient financial margin for running the EYC on a EUR 1 million budget.

The organisation of the EYC will be based on the lessons learned until now from other years, existing reports on the policy area as well as stakeholder consultation and other, on-going or to-be-launched studies identified with subjects linked to the objectives of the EYC. The findings will be used to identify and promote good practices and, as a basis for recommendations.

There will be an internal evaluation carried out.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat\\_general/evaluation/search/search.do](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/evaluation/search/search.do)

## 20 – Trade

### Trade SIA relating to the negotiation of a comprehensive economic and trade agreement between the EU and Canada

**ABB activities:** 20 02 Trade policy

**Timing:** June 2011

#### Background, scope and focus

The EU-Canada SIA was carried out with the intention of assessing how a Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) between the two sides might affect economic, social and environmental issues in the EU and Canada, as well as in other relevant countries. Its sources of evidence include formal modelling (CGE, E3MG and investment gravity modelling), and quantitative and qualitative evidence collected from desk research and consultations with stakeholders. Causal chain analysis is applied to the evidence base to identify the significant cause-effect links between the Agreement and its economic, social and environmental impacts.

The assessment is based upon a modelled analysis of the likely impact of four different liberalisation scenarios, of differing degrees of ambition; and was undertaken at three levels: (i) macro-economic assessment; (ii) sectoral assessment; and (iii) cross-cutting assessment.

Stakeholder consultation is a core element of the SIA method. The study website, email and phone updates, and the arranging of civil society meetings in Brussels and a local workshop in Canada were used to create awareness of the SIA and elicit feedback from stakeholders. In-depth consultations were undertaken via interviews, soliciting written comments on drafts of study reports and the implementation of steering committee meetings.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

The analysis finds that the CETA will lead to overall gains in welfare, real GDP, total exports and real wages in both Canada and the EU over the long-term. While these gains are expected under the four scenarios modelled in the economic assessment, the gains are expected to be higher under an agreement that offers the highest degree of tariff and services liberalisation.

At the sectoral level, the greatest gains in output and trade appear to be stimulated by services liberalisation and by the removal of tariffs applied on sensitive agricultural products. Both Canada and the EU would benefit from a CETA that provided a high degree of liberalisation in the services sector, particularly with respect to transport, telecom and business services.

The CETA could have a positive social impact where it includes text devoted to better implementation and ratification of the ILO's Core Labour Standards and Decent Work Agenda.

Canada, specifically, could see its standards and rights improved with respect to collective bargaining and freedom of association with provisions that require ratification of the ILO's Convention 98, which provides legally binding measures on such rights.

In terms of the environment, increased agricultural production could lead to a greater degree of intensification and use of chemical inputs, while increased beef production could lead to greater herd size and production of methane. The environmental impact associated with energy and extractive industries is likely to be limited, though it could be exacerbated if the agreement leads to significant increases in FDI in Canada's oil sands and mining industries. Increased trade would likely increase the GHG emissions associated with transport, though this could be mitigated should the CETA replace land transport (notably between Canada and the U.S.) with maritime transport and facilitate the development of Canada's short sea shipping industry.

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

[http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2011/september/tradoc\\_148201.pdf](http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2011/september/tradoc_148201.pdf)

<http://ec.europa.eu/trade/analysis/sustainability-impact-assessments/assessments/>

## 22 – Enlargement

### (Ex-ante) Evaluation to support the preparation of pre-accession financial instruments beyond 2013

<b>ABB activities:</b>	22 AWBL-03 Enlargement pre-accession negotiations
------------------------	---

<b>Timing:</b>	13/06/2011
----------------	------------

#### Background, scope and focus

The main purpose of the report was to assist the Commission in preparing the future pre-accession assistance instrument. The evaluation also helped to inform an Impact Assessment on the successor instrument, which was prepared by DG ELARG after the publication of the evaluation.

#### Summary of findings and conclusions

There is a strong rationale for a future pre-accession financial instrument beyond 2013. Taking account of the relative merits and impacts of the four policy options considered, the preferred option was the continuation of the current programme with similar levels of EU divided amongst seven beneficiaries (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Kosovo, Serbia and Turkey). The evaluation also concluded that the allocation of resources between components and intervention areas should be similar to that envisaged during the current financing period.

The evaluation concluded that the economic and wider benefits to the EU of enlargement involving the current beneficiaries would more than offset the cost of a new financial instrument to the EU. Also, having an EU instrument enables the realisation of European added value, for example: (i) an opportunity to closely link financial support to progress with political criteria; (ii) the means for the EU to act as a catalyst for supranational and interregional cooperation; and, (iii) the means for the EU to act as a broker for drawing on the expertise of different administrations and agencies within the EU (e.g. twinning).

#### Availability of the report on Europa

For internal use of the Commission.

## 32 – Energy

### Report on Ex-ante Evaluation/impact assessment of a possible successor to the intelligent Energy II Programme

**ABB activities:**

32 04 Conventional and renewable energies

**Timing:**

October 2011

#### Background, scope and focus

##### Background, scope and focus of the evaluation

The Directorate General for Energy is in charge of designing and preparing the proposal of the Commission for the successor of the multiannual Community programme in the field of energy, “Intelligent Energy – Europe II” (IEE II) for the next Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020. This proposal will be made on the basis of Article 192 of the Treaty.

The ex-ante evaluation report:

1. Provides arguments, and supporting evidence – quantified wherever possible –based on elements of a public consultation - as input to the forthcoming impact assessment by the Commission.
2. Gives a view on what the potential IEEII successor programme could look like taking into account that the barriers to adoption of energy efficiency and renewable energy sources that were the basis of the adoption of IEE II, and the corresponding EU policy position, may no longer be the same as they were for IEE II. A shift of focus in actions for a successor to IEE II could therefore be necessary.

The report is based on data collected through four surveys and several interviews with programme stakeholders as well as data collected from the Executive Agency for Competitiveness and Innovation (EACI) and European Investment Bank (EIB) project management databases. It is moreover based on research and review of existing analyses within the area of sustainable energy development in the EU. These inputs were combined in qualitative and quantitative analyses of the defined policy options for a potential successor to the IEE II programme. As is the case with all forward-looking assessments, this assessment of a potential successor to IEE II takes departure in existing experiences with the current programme (as the final evaluation of IEE II was carried out in parallel it has not been possible to leverage all material coming from this evaluation but efforts were made to maximise this). The analysis projects these experiences into the future by taking into account expected evolutions of the IEE II context by 2014.



## **Summary of findings and conclusions**

The evaluation started from the main findings of the final evaluation of IEE II, namely that the current programme (2007-2013) is relevant and useful. The ex-ante report assessed three different policy options which diverged from the status quo addressed in the final evaluation of IEE II: non continuation, a capacity building oriented programme and an investment oriented programme.

The report looked at the marginal benefits and costs of these three policy options. It concluded that continuing the programme in its current form entailed higher net benefits than not continuing the programme. It did not conclude whether a capacity-building oriented or an investment oriented programme would be the most cost-effective option. It stated however that both of these options would imply a higher budget than the status quo but the additional benefits would clearly outweigh the costs in both cases. These two options would be the best from a cost-benefit point of view.

The study suggested that a combination of them could be envisaged, i.e. focusing on both capacity-building and investment mobilisation. Furthermore, given the difficulties Member States face in implementing sustainable energy policies, including EU legislation in the field, the study concluded that there is still a great need for projects that focus on facilitating policy implementation. Projects of this type have been considered as successful in the past, and are expected to provide high marginal returns in the future.

On the opposite, the study showed that the marginal returns from awareness raising activities are probably not as high as in the beginning of the programme although there may still be areas where it is relevant, and in particular some activities may be more relevant in the new Member States than in the old ones.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/energy/evaluations/annual\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/energy/evaluations/annual_en.htm)

**Ex-Ante Evaluation preparing a  
Euratom Council Regulation on Union support for the nuclear decommissioning  
assistance programmes in Bulgaria, Lithuania and Slovakia**

<b>ABB activities:</b>	32 05 Nuclear energy
------------------------	----------------------

<b>Timing:</b>	24/11/2011
----------------	------------

**Background, scope and focus**

The three countries, Lithuania, Slovakia and Bulgaria, operated old soviet design nuclear reactors which the international community concluded could not be upgraded to meet the minimum required safety standards, at an economically acceptable cost. As such these plants required to be closed earlier than their foreseen end-of-lifetime dates.

In the context of the negotiations for accession to the European Union, the three candidate countries took the commitment to close and subsequently decommission these nuclear reactors by a commonly agreed date. This early closure represented an exceptional financial burden for the Member States which was not commensurate with the economic strength of the countries concerned. In recognition of this fact and as act of solidarity the European Union committed itself to continue to provide adequate additional financial assistance for decommissioning of these reactors. The closure commitment of the three Member States as well as the commitment of the EU to provide financial EU support was foreseen in the corresponding Accession Treaties.

This document covers the assessment of the proposal for further financial EU support to Lithuania, Slovakia and Bulgaria, originating in the corresponding Accession Treaties. It fulfils both the requirements for an ex ante evaluation and an impact assessment.

**Summary of findings and conclusions**

In order to allow for safe decommissioning, adequate financial resources should be available when required<sup>1</sup>. Although all three Member States have established national funds to set aside financial resources for decommissioning, those resources are for historical reasons insufficient.

<sup>1</sup> Commission recommendation on the management of financial resources for the decommissioning of nuclear installations, spent fuel and radioactive waste. OJ L 330, 28.11.2006, p.31

Therefore the immediate problem to be addressed is the funding shortfall to progress with safe decommissioning of the nuclear power plants, to ensure that the closure becomes irreversible<sup>1</sup> and at the same time stimulate the beneficiary Member States to gradually take over the responsibility with respect to the full financial cover and ownership. Public intervention is required to assist the Member States with additional financial EU support.

Funding shortfall would jeopardize the safe maintenance of the shut down reactors until they are completely defueled and the seamless continuation of safe decommissioning, because of the risk that further decommissioning steps would be postponed to an undefined date, awaiting the availability of funds and transferring this liability and responsibility to future generations. It also bears the risk of reopening of the nuclear power plants. At most of the reactor units no major irreversible dismantling steps have been implemented. In case of an incident or accident this would inevitably also lead to an environmental degradation.

The necessity for the EU intervention is the fact that adequate funds required for continuing safe decommissioning cannot be made available in due time through the respective national funds. Unlike other Member States in a similar situation but without being confronted to early closure of their plants, it was not possible for them to accumulate sufficient funds from operation of the plants.

It is in the interests of the European Union to ensure that the concerned reactors remain closed and that they are defueled and dismantled in order to reduce the risk of negative consequences for the EU citizen and for the environment. The EU added value lies in the support of measures targeted to reach an irreversible state within the decommissioning process of the concerned nuclear reactor units, in accordance with their respective decommissioning plans, while keeping the highest level of safety. This will contribute to provide substantial and durable support for the health of workers and the general public, preventing environmental degradation and providing for real progress in nuclear safety and security.

No further EU support under the baseline option would stop the decommissioning programmes and consequently jeopardize nuclear safety. The business as usual option would result in a much higher financial EU support with reduced added value. Further support to projects in the energy sector would lead to a distortion of competition and the continuing high level of financial Union support would not be a sufficient incentive for the Member States to take over the full financial responsibility for the completion of decommissioning.

EU partial financing for decommissioning only (option 3) is considered the most appropriate solution following a clear expressed political will. This option maximises the EU added value and supports the transition towards full Member State funding of the safe completion of decommissioning beyond the next multiannual financial framework. Option 3 provides for real improvement in nuclear safety and will help to achieve timely real physical progress in defueling and decommissioning and ensure that the closure is irreversible.

Option 3 combined with the implementation mechanisms B (for Bulgaria and Slovakia) and C (for Lithuania) will provide for a continued strengthening of the Commission's management for the effective, efficient and economical use of EU funds. The specific objectives being aligned with the proposed budget and based on revised/updated decommissioning plans (needs expressed by the Member States) together with the meaningful performance indicators are the basis for achieving the expected benefits from the further financial EU support after 2013. This approach is in full accordance with the recommendations from the European Court of Auditors.

---

<sup>1</sup> Closure to become irreversible means that decommissioning has progressed so far on a technical level, that it would economically no longer be advantageous to consider the re-opening of the concerned reactor units.

**Availability of the report on Europa**

[http://ec.europa.eu/energy/nuclear/decommissioning/decommissioning\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/energy/nuclear/decommissioning/decommissioning_en.htm)

[http://ec.europa.eu/energy/nuclear/decommissioning/doc/sec\\_2011\\_1387.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/energy/nuclear/decommissioning/doc/sec_2011_1387.pdf)

**SECTION 4: REFERENCES TO REPORTING ON PERFORMANCE IN THE ACTIVITY STATEMENTS (AS) TO THE DRAFT BUDGET 2013**

- The AAR 2011 (PART 1): [http://ec.europa.eu/atwork/synthesis/aar/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/atwork/synthesis/aar/index_en.htm)
- The Activity statement PDB 2013:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/documents/2013/DB2013/DB2013\\_WD\\_I\\_%20Activity\\_Statements.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/documents/2013/DB2013/DB2013_WD_I_%20Activity_Statements.pdf)