

Interreg V-A Czech Republic – Poland

Jan PIKNA, Ministry of Regional  
Development CZ

Interact workshop: *Evaluation – how  
does it go?*

30. – 31. 5. 2017, Helsinki, Finland

# Experience of drafting impact evaluations

...in Czech Republic

# Designing terms of reference: first internal obstacles

- Work on procurement started already before adoption of program's evaluation plan (12/2015) – decision of managing authority, requirement of national coordination authority
- Decision to divide evaluation tasks into three separate tenders – due to believe that specific expertise is needed and because preparing terms of reference containing impact, procedural and communication evaluations together for whole period would take very long time and effort.
- Each of those three tenders to be in most comprehensive regime – Ministry as a one submitter afraid of being accused of splitting the evaluation tender intentionally – all had to be either tendered together or separately but in the most comprehensive regime

# Designing terms of reference: looking for inspiration

Other Interreg programmes? Sure, but...different national legislation or audit position in:

- to what extent to define qualitative assesment criteria
- to what extent to set ratio beetween lowest price criteria and qualitative criteria

Other Czech operational programmes? Sure, but...different internal tender regulations on each Ministry

...still both very helpful and inspirational!

# Final structure of the tender

- 4 separate evaluation task to be delivered between 2017 – 2019:
  - Three evaluations + one monitoring of result indicator
- Two language versions – In CZ and Polish;
  - In order to open the tender for experienced Polish companies
  - Considered as of significant risk by our lawyers due to possible language discrepancies (allowed, with worries&doubts)
- Detailed description of all four tasks (46 p.) as an annex to the contract
- Evaluation tasks defined up to details of particular evaluation questions – however, **no methods indicated**

# Evaluation questions

## Verification of program's intervention logic:

- ❑ *What are the main common problems / opportunities of the program territory that can be addressed through the ERDF financial intervention?*
  - *How can these problems / opportunities be addressed through financial intervention?*
- ❑ *Which of those identified main problems / opportunities of the program territory are involved in the program's intervention logic?*
  - *Is the program solving / developing them in the right way?*
- ❑ *Are the program's specific objectives relevant and valid in line with the conclusions of previous evaluation questions?*
- ❑ *Are the program's synergic and complementary links to other funding instruments still valid?*
  - *If not, which new synergic and complementary links should the program set up?*

# Evaluation questions

## Impact evaluation:

Questions on program's impact...

- ☐ *Has the cross-border capacity to deal with emergencies and crisis situations increased due to Interreg V-A Czech Republic – Poland program?*
- ☐ *Has the regional tourist turnout increased due to Interreg V-A Czech Republic – Poland program?*
- ☐ *Has the level of employment of graduates improved due to Interreg V-A Czech Republic – Poland program?*
- ☐ *Has the intensity of cooperation between institutions and communities in the border region increased due to Interreg V-A Czech Republic – Poland program?*
  - *If so, how much?*
  - *If so, how?*
  - *If so, why?*
  - *If so, is the benefit sustainable in the long term?*
  - *If so, is the benefit adequate to the finances expended?*
  - *If not, why?*
  - *If not, how to adjust the intervention logic and / or the functioning of the investment priority of the program?*
- ☐ *Which impacts of interventions implemented can be expected in the program area with a longer time span?*
- ☐ *Are there any unintended (positive and negative) effects of interventions?*
- ☐ *Has program's complementary links contribute to more effective achievement of its objectives?*
  - *If so, which links do contribute, with which program or funding instrument and within which of the thematic objectives?*
- ☐ *What is the most common (typical) intervention in each of the investment priority? (In terms of frequency of occurrence)*
- ☐ *Do these typical interventions contribute to meeting the goal of the investment priority?*
  - *If so, under what circumstances?*

# Assesment criteria

40% Lowest price

30% Experience of the implementation team members

30% Sample exercise on impact evaluation



About the exercise:

Sample ski resort given (Dolní Morava - small mountain village up to 150 inhabitants, disconnected from TEN-T network, in the program territory); which was virtually exposed to the program intervention in 2007 (modernization of ski infrastructure, including accomodation facility).

Supplier's task was:

- to suggest nonexperimental counterfactual research method, most suitable for answering evaluation question: *How did the modernization of ski infrastructure in the village of Dolní Morava attributed to the creation of new jobs in local tourism sector?*
- to outline particular research steps
- to submit hypothesis of answer, based on desk-research

# Assesment criteria: the excercise

No.	What did we asses?
1	Choice of (one or more) variables suggested to answer the evaluation question → its connection to employment in local tourist sector
	Logical rationale of the choice
	Availability of data for the variables chosen
2	Choice of research method → its internal validity in relation to chosen variable(s)
	Logical rationale of the choice
3	Choice of (one or more) control groups → how good proxies they are to Dolní Morava
	Logical rationale of the choice
4	Choice of (one or more) control variables → its connection to the relevant extenal factors
	Logical rationale of the choice
	Availability of data for the variables chosen

# Timeframe

- 2/2016 – 5/2016 – ToR, consultations, negotiation with lawyers
- 5/2016 – 7/2016 – approval (1st level control - deputy minister - minister)
- 7/2016 – initiation of award procedure
- 9/2016 – opening of envelopes (invalid)
- 9/2016 – termination and re-initiation of award procedure
- 11/2016 – opening of envelopes
- 11/2016 – 12/2016 – qualification and quality assesment
- 1/2017 – contract signed (Best offer: KPMG CZ won with 106.962 € (excl. VAT))

# Major difficulties

- Qualification prerequisites (crime, taxes and social security fees) had to be\* proven negative by official registers extract already when suppliers submitted their offers – **administrative obstacle for Polish companies;**
- Due to the value of the tender most comprehensive procedure imposed - **51 calendar day period, huge delay eventually;**
- Quality assesment complicated, eventualities unforeseen - **some variables good, some bad → how many points to award?!**)
- Paradox: *When you tender expertize, which you don't have, how can you objectively and rigorously asses its proposed quality?*

\*According to the Czech procurement law, that time in force (No. 174/2006). Currently, solemn declaration shall by enough, as a result of EU directive on public procurement 2014/24/EU

# Lessons learned → Recommendation

- write ToR in English, seek for EU-wide experience
- demand some previous experience with evaluating Interreg programmes
- thoroughly examine contractors knowledge of partner country/countries\*
- thoroughly examine contractors ability of communication in partner languages
- familiarize yourselves with evaluation methods and tools\* - so you can asses quality of offered services properly
- make sure that contractors counts in their budget and timeframe with translation of evaluation outputs to all relevant languages
- thoroughly think trough all potential obstacles, your quality assessment criteria might be challenged by

\* especially when running macroeconomical studies / intervention logic evaluations

\*\* interviews, focus groups, surveys,...

Still awake?! 😊



Thank you for your attention and all your questions or comments