

ETC evaluation state of play 2014-2020

David Alba
DG REGIO Evaluation and European Semester Unit

5 November 2019, Budapest

What to cover

- **Where are we with the implementation of evaluations of ETC programmes**
- **Main issues with reviewed evaluations**
- **Findings of evaluations**



Evaluation Library



Evaluation

This library contains selected evaluations carried out by Member States in the 2014-2020 period and evaluations assessing the impact of investments from the 2007-2013 period. For other types of 2007-2013 evaluations or evaluations of interventions from the 2000-2006 period, please visit [this link](#)

EVALUATION

- [Archive of evaluations](#)

Keyword	<input type="text" value="Keyword"/>
Country	<input type="text" value="..."/>
Method	<input type="text" value="..."/>
Fund	<input type="text" value="..."/>
Type	<input type="text" value="..."/>
Thematic Objective	<input type="text" value="..."/>
Programming Period	<input type="text" value="..."/>

Title	Pdf	
...	EP	



Evaluation Library

Policy	Information sources
<p>Thematic objectives: Transport</p> <p>CCI: 2014UK16RFOP005</p> <p>OP Name: OP ERDF West Wales and the Valleys</p> <p>Evaluation type: Impact/Result orientated, Monitoring/progress oriented</p> <p>Evaluation method: Theory based impact evaluation, Other qualitative, QUAN - Other quantitative</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>Summary details: The evaluations assesses the Gowerton Redoubling Project, partly funded by the ERDF OP for West Wales and the Valleys in the 2007-2013 period. The project, which was finished in 2013, was to convert an 8 km stretch of single rail track between Duffryn West and Cockett West to dual-track and to make improvements to Gowerton station.</p> <p>Objectives: The aim was to assess the extent to which the project objectives were achieved, i.e. to relieve a major bottleneck in the rail network in south west Wales; to enable the frequency of trains on the line to be increased from a maximum of two per hour; to improve operational performance and allow more frequent stops to be made at Gowerton station. The study also assessed the impact of the project on users of the station and on passengers on the new double track line.</p> <p>Method-Data: Desk research; analysis of monitoring data; surveys of users; interviews with key project staff.</p> <p>Main findings: The project was delivered at target cost, with minor additional costs because of an extension in scope (e.g. platform resurfacing); synergies with the Loughor Viaduct project were a major means of keeping costs down; robust and suitable risk management procedures were implemented; the regular meetings between the stakeholders involved ensured the project was implemented smoothly; for half of the users interviewed, the improvements to the station have increased the use of the train; the station contributed positively to a shift from road to rail use.</p> <p>Limitations (as indicated in the evaluation): The use of non-standard methods to define targets did not enable accurate impact assessment and benchmarking to be made.</p> <p>Policy implications (as set out in the evaluation): The recommendations identified are to use standard methods to define targets to allow benchmarking of rail projects; to investigate during the project planning stage whether shared activities could be undertaken to reduce costs for those projects implemented at the same location, same time or with the same design; to include indicators to facilitate evaluation of cross cutting themes.</p> <p>Summary findings: TO 7.1 - The Gowerton Redoubling project was delivered at target cost. The risk assessment procedures were suitable and robust. The project did not encounter delays in implementation. Improvements to Gowerton station led to a shift from road to rail use.</p>	

Overall progress in implementation of evaluations

- Evaluation plans indicate widespread delays
- By now twice as many evaluations should have been carried out
- Probably delays caused largely by late start of programmes – so few outcomes to evaluate
- We expect either big increase in evaluations (timing) from now to end of period or substantial revision to evaluation planning (content)

Evaluations

- Overall 25 evaluations. Only 4 2007-13 the rest addressing this period. (this number seems to be low – How do you share the evaluations with the EC?)
- Most evaluations on procedures and implementation of the programmes.
- Limited of them aimed at assessing the impact.
- Two evaluations focused on specific policy area other address the complete OP – does not really enable to draw TO related lessons.

General issues with evaluations questions and methods

- The objectives of the evaluation are clearly stated but not the evaluation questions
- Very ambitious scope but very limited methods applied
- The approach adopted seems only partly suitable for addressing all the objectives of the evaluation, e.g. a proper review of the intervention logic is not carried out.
- No proper triangulation of methods (evidence is not verified from different sources)
- Impact evaluations main limitation is that cannot distinguish between the effects caused by the programme and external factors.

General issues with evaluations - Data

- The evaluation adopts only a qualitative method (what is in the monitoring system?)
- No information on data collection methods (survey ok, but what was the response rate & by whom?)
- Some data are not collected on a regular basis. Performing evaluations before the availability of the data limits its coverage. (timing of evaluations)
- Late start of programmes and insufficient evidence on outcomes (issue has to be addressed)
- Inability to access data – e.g. due to confidentiality issues or admin. complications

Result - use of inferior or inappropriate or no data

General issues with evaluations methods

- more technical

- Theory-based evaluations to failure to spell out theory – of mechanisms or channels by which measure leads to outcome or causal chain
- For counterfactual evaluations to failure to define appropriate control group
- For CBA - to failure to take account of all costs and/or benefits – e.g. cost of maintenance once infrastructure built or social or environmental costs

Good practice

- Fairly open about limitations
- Clear evaluation questions
- Conclusions make reference to the source and quality of evidence
- Conclusions are open about contextual factors and bias
- The choice of methods applied is justified

Examples of findings from ETC evaluations

- Slow implementation
- There is a need to improve synergies between measures, coherence between projects, exchange experience, disseminate results
- Issues with project applications, lack of guidance, high administrative overhead, lack of transparency of selection procedures
- Issues with programmes design (results orientation) monitoring system design (we don't know what is happening) and projects contributing to objectives (especially the cross-border nature of it)