

Evaluation of mid-term progress within Operational Programme Technical Assistance

Summary of outputs

1 BASIC INFORMATION

1.1 Identification of contracting authority and contractor

Contracting authority:

Czech Republic, Ministry for regional development

Staroměstské náměstí 6

110 15 Praha 1

www.mmr.cz

Contractor:

EUFC CZ s.r.o.

Popelova 75

620 00 Brno

IČ: 269 42 364

www.eufc.cz

1.2 Aim and purpose of evaluation

Aim of the contract „*Evaluation of mid-term progress within OPTA*“ was the identification of the progress achieved in implementation of OPTA and evaluation of fulfilling programme objectives regarding financial management, as well as factual benefit of supported activities. On basis of factual and financial progress in framework of OPTA the public contract further concentrated on identification of a recommendation set for streamlining of OPTA implementation and of its possible revision.

Output of contract execution is a final report of the project containing a complex assessment of financial and factual progress, achieved through present implementation of OPTA, as well as relevance of this programmes in view of development of external environment. Based on found facts recommendations for current programming period and possible adjustment of programming documentation and transfer of allocated sums among areas of intervention have been formulated, as well as recommendations for optimisation of implementation system and recommendations for next programming period 2014+.

Evaluation study „Evaluation of mid-term progress within Operational Programme Technical Assistance“ constitutes a part of project „Organisational provision of coordination NSRF and OPTA“, which is funded from Structural funds of the European Union – Operational Programme Technical Assistance (OPTA 2007-2013). Project registration number is CZ.1.08/1.1.00/08.00023.

1.3 Used methodology

On the basis of contract order and acquired evaluation experience the contractor decided for double approach:

- time oriented: progress of project implementation in time structured in phases.
- system oriented – seen from substantial basis of evaluation.

On grounds of system approach 3 partial thematic areas have been identified for which the evaluation was aimed:

- 1) Programme relevance
- 2) Financial progress in implementation of OPTA

3) Factual progress in implementation of OPTA

Methodical approach was based on collection of relevant data and information and their analysis, at the same time a collection of both qualitative and quantitative data had been carried out. Based on the mentioned data an analysis focused on answering relevant evaluation questions was carried out.

Used methodological approaches differed in individual phases of the project according to current needs and assessed principles. From general perspective these were activities related to the launching of evaluation process – collection of primary and secondary data sources. Further on these were followed by field enquiry in form of questionnaire examination among implementation structure bodies and beneficiaries in OPTA complemented by individual interviews in view of clarification/completion of information acquired through questionnaire examination. Acquired data and information had been analysed, the results of these analyses were evaluated in the final phase via method of synthesis of knowledge and findings and assessed by expert panel.

Contract for Evaluation of mid-term progress within Operational Programme Technical Assistance has been processed in three main phases and in line with terms of reference of relevant public contract:

1. phase

Within the first phase of project treatment the implementation team concentrated mainly on collection and further sorting of accessible data sources (publicly accessible documentation, non-public data sources submitted by the contracting authority and individual consultations). Simultaneously, an analysis of stakeholders was carried out.

2. phase

Second phase of the evaluation focused on collection of primary data, work with secondary data sources and analytical part of work. This phase was further divided into three parts which reflected logical succession and sequence of individual steps in the evaluation process:

- 1) Collection of primary data and utilization of secondary data sources
- 2) Analysis and assessment of acquired data
- 3) Proposal of partial results

3. phase

Third phase of contract execution concentrated on complex evaluation of achieved results of analyses and examinations. On grounds of discussions within expert panel the contractor realised a relevant summary and formulated well-founded complex results into a proposal of final report. At the same time recommendations for current programming period 2007-2013 as well as for the next period 2014+ have been proposed.

Output of the third phase of contract execution was a final version of the Final report in Czech language that summarises results and conclusions of previous phases and contains partial conclusions, complex conclusions and recommendations.

2 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

Aim of the project „*Evaluation of mid-term progress within OPTA*“ was the identification of the progress achieved in implementation of OPTA and evaluation of fulfilling programme objectives regarding financial management, as well as factual benefit of supported activities. On basis of factual and financial progress in framework of OPTA the project further concentrated on presenting a set of recommendations for streamlining of OPTA implementation and of its possible revision to the contracting authority.

The contractor processed a relevant summary depending on results of individual thematic analyses and formulated recommendations for streamlining of OPTA implementation and possible revision of OPTA, as well as recommendations for the next programming period 2014+.

2.1 Main conclusions from partial analyses and answers to evaluation questions

Main / partial evaluation questions	Findings, answer to evaluation question	Connection to recommendation area
1. Does the programme proceed to fulfilling of its quantifiable and factual objectives given by the Programming document OPTA ?	OPTA proceeds to fulfilling its quantifiable and factual objectives given by the Programming document OPTA, but fulfilling indicators on programme level /priority axes OPTA does not correspond to financial progress and fulfilling objectives and generally predate financial absorption.	Cross-sectional
How did the programme implementation contribute to the fulfilment of National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) objectives?	Programme implementation contributes to the fulfilment of NSRF objectives by OPTA support to effectiveness of NSRF management, its control and monitoring of the implementation. Shortcomings may be seen mainly in provision and stabilization of administrative capacity necessary for meeting NSRF objectives, as well as in efficiency of instruments for increasing absorption capacity for provision of assistance from EU funds and publicity.	Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA
Does the fulfilling of indicators on programme/priority axes level correspond to financial progress? How does the OPTA implementation according to fulfilment of monitored indicators on programme/priority axes level advance towards the set global and specific objectives?	Fulfilling of indicators on programme/priority axes level OPTA does not correspond to financial progress; fulfilling objectives generally predate financial absorption. It may be expected that monitored indicators on programme and priority axes level will be met and OPTA implementation shall, from this viewpoint, fulfil the set global and specific objectives.	Indicator scheme Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA
2. Does financial and factual progress of the programme in mid-term of its implementation reach such a pace that will ensure absorption of allocation and meeting programme objectives at the end of the programming period?	Financial progress of OPTA in mid-term of its implementation does not reach such a pace that will ensure absorption of programme allocation at the end of the programming period, but factual progress reaches such a pace that will ensure meeting programme objectives at the end of the programming period.	Cross-sectional
Does financial progress of the programme in mid-term of its implementation reach such a pace that will ensure absorption of programme allocation at the end of the programming period? Is there a threat that in some intervention areas their allocation will not be fully absorbed at the end of the programming period?	Financial progress of the programme in mid-term of its implementation does not reach such a pace that will ensure absorption of programme allocation at the end of the programming period. Especially in case of areas of intervention 1.3, 3.2, 4.1 a 4.2 and to less extend also in area of intervention 1.1 a 1.4, there is a threat that at the end of the programming period their allocation will not be fully absorbed.	Financial plan of OPTA, absorption capacity Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA
Are all areas of intervention sufficiently covered by approved projects? In which areas of intervention was identified an overhang or shortage of project proposals	Considering the fact that projects implementation in OPTA is carried out on the basis of one complex continuous call for all areas of intervention for the whole programming period, it cannot be clearly assessed if all areas of intervention are sufficiently covered by approved projects.	Financial plan of OPTA, absorption capacity Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and

Main / partial evaluation questions	Findings, answer to evaluation question	Connection to recommendation area
that correspond at least to acceptability criteria?	Nevertheless on the basis of analyses of current and planned needs of beneficiaries and related requests for financial means a potential overhang has been identified in areas of intervention 2.1 and 3.1 and on the contrary shortage of project proposals in remaining areas of intervention.	objectives; programming document OPTA
What are the reasons of insufficient absorption of means from an area of intervention (if any) and how can this situation be amended?	Reasons of insufficient absorption of means lie especially in: unsuitably set indicator scheme of OPTA, frequent priority changes, cancellation of previously planned activities on the side of beneficiaries, changes in managing documentation to OPTA, in error rate of methods at projects implementation (and mainly at implementation of public procurement within projects), which result in generation of noneligible costs, scarcely in discrepancies, then in administratively and time consuming procedures connected with the implementation of public procurement, as well as deficits in personal capacities both on the side of implementation bodies and beneficiaries (concerning both number and skills).	Implementation structure of OPTA, administrative capacity Financial plan of OPTA, absorption capacity Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA
What are the reasons of demand overhang within areas of intervention (if there is any)?	Reasons for potential demand overhang in priority axis 2 arise mainly from preparation and acquisition of new monitoring system for period of 2014+, when at this moment no exact requirements for its future shape and utility have been defined and therefore it is not possible to specify with sufficient exactness future financial requirements (-that may be significantly different from current estimates). Potential demand overhang in priority axis 3.1 is connected with current insufficient administrative provision of coordination and implementation of NSRF.	Implementation structure of OPTA, administrative capacity Financial plan of OPTA, absorption capacity Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA
Which instruments and incentives for ensuring sufficient amount of submitted projects have been used so far? What modification of these instruments could be used to solve potential insufficient absorption capacity in areas of intervention? Are there other instruments/incentives suitable for solution of insufficient absorption capacity?	Among most significant instruments and incentives used so far for ensuring sufficient amount of submitted projects belong primarily: introduction of regular monitoring of needs via working groups, regular meetings of Managing Authority(MA) with beneficiaries, cancellation of Framework projects Schema and its replacement with more flexible instruments, keeping a list of risk projects that are risky in framework of monitoring financial plans fulfilment, etc. Spectrum of used instruments appear to be sufficient, necessary precondition for the strengthening of absorption capacity of OPTA lies in the ability to react flexibly to continuously identified new needs and transform them in suitable manner into project activities, which are then implemented within OPTA.	Implementation structure of OPTA, administrative capacity Financial plan of OPTA, absorption capacity Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA
Does the system of financial management, or financing of projects, correspond to the needs of both beneficiaries and bodies involved in OPTA management? <i>(completion of the evaluator)</i>	Current system of financial management or financing of projects corresponds to the needs of both beneficiaries and subjects involved in OPTA management, which are mostly public administration organisations.	

Main / partial evaluation questions	Findings, answer to evaluation question	Connection to recommendation area
Does factual progress of the programme in mid-term of its implementation reach such a pace that will ensure meeting programme objectives at the end of the programming period? It there a threat that some of the objectives will not be met at the end of the programming period?	When regarding the fulfilment of indicators, factual progress of the programme in mid-term of its implementation does reach such a pace that will ensure meeting programme objectives at the end of the programming period. The evaluators do not expect that with any of the objectives there would be a threat that they would not be met at the end of the programming period.	Indicator scheme Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA
3. Is it necessary to adjust objectives or priority axes and areas of intervention within the programme? Are the objectives realistic and correctly hierarchized? With regard to the evaluation of absorption and progress in fulfilling of programme objectives is it suitable to move allocated amounts among measures? At what rate is it necessary to carry out increase/reduction of commitment with areas of intervention, priority axes? What other possible changes should be done in the programme?	According to the evaluator's view it is not necessary to adjust OPTA objectives, however it is required to specify or possibly widen and complete activities within areas of intervention, as well as carry out an adjustment of indicator scheme of OPTA. It can be generally said that OPTA objectives are realistic and correctly hierarchized. With a view to evaluation of absorption and progress in fulfilling of programme objectives it is suitable to move allocated amounts. Specific needs regarding the commitment within individual priority axes and areas of intervention are described in the corresponding chapter of this evaluation study (Financial progress in Framework of OPTA).	Cross-sectional
Are there any changes of initial conditions that were valid in the time of OPTA programming? If there are, what are these changes? Do these changes have a significant impact on OPTA strategy?	There was no significant change of initial conditions in mid-term of the programming period 2007-2013 when compared to the programming phase of OPTA. The programme is still relevant and in formulation of its strategy it complies with current conditions. Legislative changes that had naturally in between taken place were constantly reflected in the programme, although in some cases with certain delay, which caused the OPTA documentation to be temporary outdated/incompatible.	Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA
As a result of these changes would it be suitable to modify the OPTA objectives? In what manner should the objectives be modified?	Needs, on the basis of which OPTA was conceived, may be retrospectively considered fully justifiable and at the same time necessary. OPTA objectives correspond to the needs defined in the beginning of the programme it is not necessary to modify them.	
As a result of these changes would be suitable to adjust the allocations of individual priority axes (areas of intervention)? If it would, then in what manner?	The evaluator identified a need to adjust allocations of individual priority axes and areas of intervention of OPTA. These measures will have to be undertaken not as a result of changes of initial conditions, but in reaction to incidence of risk factors that have negatively influenced or still are influencing the course of OPTA implementation.	Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA Financial plan of OPTA, absorption capacity
In what way have the key contextual documents on which	Key strategic/contextual documents constituting a conceptual environment of OPTA did not	Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and

Main / partial evaluation questions	Findings, answer to evaluation question	Connection to recommendation area
<p>the operational programme was based on changed? <i>(completion of the evaluator)</i></p>	<p>undergo any significant changes, which would in a distinctive manner, influences relevance and strategy of OPTA. There are only partial changes following the needs and requirements resulting from implementation of NSRF and ESC that must be reflected in OPTA as a supportive programme.</p>	<p>objectives; programming document OPTA</p>
<p>Have some new thematic areas come about, in which it would be suitable to intervene via programme measures? <i>(completion of the evaluator)</i></p>	<p>New thematic areas that could be sufficiently reflected by the programme concern for example: execution of detailed analyses and studies of legislative environment in the Czech Republic and conditions that it creates for the implementation of EU Cohesion policy (for example Act n. 218/2000 Coll., on budgetary rules, etc.), then the development of future single monitoring system' architecture, publicity period 2014+, creation and consolidation of cross-sectional methodologies for implementation of programmes (for example introduction of innovative methods of financing), pilot testing and methodical support of new monitoring and evaluation instruments or support of pilot projects in area of innovative and experimental methods focused on strengthening of development potential of regions and forming partnership for effective utilization of their potential. Without doubt during future implementation of current programming period and preparation of the next it will be useful to carry out another revision and up-date of needs that must be reflected on central level.</p>	<p>Other recommendations Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA</p>
<p>Are the individual priority axes and areas of intervention able to absorb allocated amounts (with regard to observing n+2/n+3 rule with emphasis on financial plan of OPTA, updated plans of fulfilment of priority axes allocations and at the same time with regard to 3E criteria – efficiency, effectiveness and economy)?</p>	<p>According to the evaluator's view not all priority axes and areas of intervention are able to absorb allocated amounts (with regard to observing n+2/n+3 rule with emphasis on financial plan of OPTA, updated plans of fulfilment of priority axes allocations and at the same time with regard to 3E criteria – efficiency, effectiveness and economy).</p>	<p>Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA Financial plan of OPTA, absorption capacity</p>
<p>Which areas of intervention are endangered by loss of EC commitment because of not observing n+2/n+3 rule with emphasis on financial plan of OPTA? What are the variants of solution in cases when the n+2/n+3 rule will be endangered? Do the endangered areas have sufficient absorption capacity or it would be useful to perform reallocation of amounts to other area of intervention or priority axis?</p>	<p>According to the evaluator's view areas of intervention most endangered by loss of EC commitment because of not observing n+2/n+3 rule are areas 1.3, 3.2, 4.1 and 4.2 and to less extent also areas of intervention 1.1 and 1.4. Endangered areas of intervention OPTA do not have sufficient absorption capacity; therefore it would be useful to perform reallocation of means. Particular still existing variants of solution in case when N+2/N+3 rule is endangered identified by the contractor are the following: proposal to finance personnel costs of AFCOS (subjects engaged in the notification on the outer level of notification) workers from OPTA means, then proposal of MA to reallocate a part of financial means OPTA in order to use them for pilot testing of JESSICA financial engineering tools on national level and related reallocation „inside“ OPTA in order to ensure methodical support of this measure, and also proposal to place a new activity into priority axis 2 concerning support for preparation and acquisition of monitoring system for programming period 2014-2020.</p>	<p>Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA Financial plan of OPTA, absorption capacity</p>

Main / partial evaluation questions	Findings, answer to evaluation question	Connection to recommendation area
Does the current situation show that a modification of indicator scheme is suitable for more efficient monitoring of OPTA objectives fulfilment?	Current situation shows that for more efficient monitoring of OPTA objectives fulfilment it is suitable, or necessary, to modify indicator scheme of OPTA. At the same time it should be regularly evaluated in the future and possible revisions should be carried out in reaction to upcoming needs.	Indicator scheme Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA
What changes (transfers of financial means among areas of intervention or priority axes) have been already made and which are expected? What are the impacts of these changes on programme objectives?	Up to now no changes in form of transfers of financial means among areas of intervention or priority axes have been made. It is expected that there will be reallocations both among priority axes and areas of intervention within OPTA, as well as between OPTA and other operational programmes. These changes will not have negative impact on fulfilment of programme objectives.	Financial plan of OPTA, absorption capacity Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA
Did the financial and factual evaluation of OPTA show a need for transfers of allocated means among priority axes/areas of intervention? Would it be useful to make other changes within OPTA in order to meet the global objective of the programme?	Financial and factual evaluation of OPTA has shown a need for transfers of allocated means among priority axes/areas of intervention.	Financial plan of OPTA, absorption capacity Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA
Are there any areas of intervention (activities) that are rather sensitive to impacts of economic crisis? If there are, which are these?	The evaluator did not identify any areas of intervention (activities) within OPTA that would be rather sensitive to impacts of economic crisis. However, consequences of economic crisis manifest themselves during implementation of OPTA, mainly in relation to adopted government saving measures. These are primarily reflected in savings on the side of administrative capacities ensuring management and implementation of NSRF and also in changes of beneficiaries' strategies at implementation of planned projects (reduction of planned expenses for example in area of absorption capacity, publicity, etc.).	Cross-sectional
<p>Were/are the beneficiaries sufficiently prepared for disbursement of financial means within OPTA? Does MA/Intermediary Body (IB) ensure due support for the beneficiaries?</p> <p>What possible risks on side of applicants may endanger disbursement of financial means within OPTA?</p> <p>Are there obstacles inhibiting access or full usage of</p>	<p>It can be generally implied that beneficiaries were/are sufficiently prepared for disbursement of financial means within OPTA and receive due support from MA/IB.</p> <p>Main risks on side of applicants that may endanger disbursement of financial means within OPTA constitute: not keeping up with project schedule in relation to delay, which arise in connection with changes in ministries (personnel changes, changes of strategies, repeated comment procedures, etc.), not observing rules for selection of suppliers within public procurement and organisational and personal changes including reducing number of workers. No significant obstacles inhibiting access or full usage of programme opportunities with any applicants have been identified.</p> <p>Applicants (eligible beneficiaries according to the Programming document OPTA) are adequately</p>	<p>Implementation structure of OPTA, administrative capacity</p> <p>Financial plan of OPTA, absorption capacity</p>

Main / partial evaluation questions	Findings, answer to evaluation question	Connection to recommendation area
<p>programme opportunities with some applicants?</p> <p>Are the applicants (eligible beneficiaries according to the Programming document OPTA) adequately informed about provision of financial means from OPTA and conditions of financial means absorption from OPTA?</p>	<p>informed about provision of financial means from OPTA and conditions of financial means absorption from OPTA.</p>	
<p>Are the set priority axes and areas of intervention an efficient and effective tool for solution of identified problems and meeting of defined objectives? (<i>completion of the evaluator</i>)</p>	<p>Priority axes and areas of intervention in a way that they have been defined when programming this operational programme, cover all important areas of intervention, although in some cases not with sufficiently particular or extensively focused activities. Objective evaluation of factual efficiency and effectiveness of implemented intervention however run against certain limitations arising mainly from shortcomings in indicator scheme of OPTA.</p>	<p>Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA</p>
<p>4. What factual progress can be expected during fulfilment of OPTA priorities with a view to the end of the programming period?</p>	<p>The evaluator expects that factual progress will lead to fulfilment of all OPTA priorities from point of view of meeting indicators' objective values. Moreover, with most indicators there will probably come to significant overfulfilment of objective values. This prospect however cannot be considered satisfactory, since it indicates potential problems with interpretation of achieved results and tenableness of implemented interventions considering effectiveness and mainly efficiency of spent financial means.</p>	<p>Indicator scheme</p> <p>Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA</p>
<p>Following the end of currently approved projects will it come to filling/overfilling of planned indicators in comparison with current trend of indicator fulfilment?</p>	<p>Based on the assessment of current trend of indicator fulfilment the evaluator believes that following the end of currently approved projects it will come in most cases to filling/overfilling of planned indicators.</p>	<p>Indicator scheme</p> <p>Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA</p>
<p>Is there a threat with some indicators that at the end of the programming period the achieved value will be significantly different from the planned one?</p>	<p>With most indicators there is a threat that at the end of the programming period the achieved value will be significantly different from the planned one.</p>	<p>Indicator scheme</p> <p>Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA</p>
<p>What progress up to the end of the programming period may be expected in the course of meeting OPTA objectives including naming areas of intervention that most contribute to their fulfilment?</p>	<p>From quantitative viewpoint a significant overfulfilment of OPTA objectives (measured by indicators) may be expected by the end of the programming period. From qualitative viewpoint there should appear significant dynamics of activities in area of preparation of new programming period 2014+, in relation with the above also in preparation of a new monitoring system and publicity for period 2014+; an education system for NSRF workers should be introduced and methodical management and coordination of NSRF including increasing public awareness should be</p>	<p>Indicator scheme</p> <p>Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA</p>

Main / partial evaluation questions	Findings, answer to evaluation question	Connection to recommendation area
	further improved and strengthen.	

2.2 Recommendation

Area of recommendation	Recommendation for current programming period	Recommendation for next programming period
Relevancy of OPTA, strategy and objectives; programming document OPTA		
	<p>Carry out revision of the Programming document OPTA, in particular:</p> <p>Chapter 3 „Priority axes OPTA“:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adjust indicators (following recommendation from relevant evaluation) – spectrum, definitions, objective values, • specify/complete the list of supported activities at individual areas of intervention, • harmonise supported activities with orientation of relevant areas of intervention within priority axes (namely PA 1 and PA 4), • specify/update lists of beneficiaries in individual areas of intervention. <p>Chapter 4 „Implementation measure of OP“:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • update the scheme of implementation structure and description of tasks of individual bodies of IS. <p>Chapter 6 „Funding of OP“:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adjust allocations and financial plans in connection to approved changes (transfers of financial means). 	<p>Process and periodically update (for example twice a year) an analysis of factual priorities and needs for ensuring a single central management and coordination of programmes cofinanced from EU funds on Czech Republic level and also for focusing the support from EU structural funds in area of technical assistance in the next programming period (2014+) with regard to the course of discussions about future shape of EU Cohesion policy after 2013.</p>
	<p>When necessary make use of expert support (consultations, processing of basic documents) for revision of Programming document.</p>	<p>Keep a separate operational programme, or separate budget for financing activities that ensure top (national) level of coordination and management of ESTC policy in the Czech Republic for period 2014-2020.</p>
	<p>Build up and implement a complex monitoring system of ESC/ESTC policies development and their impact on situation in the Czech Republic (news, legislative environment, statistics, analyses and concepts, etc.) on European level including ICT back-up of the system.</p>	<p>Strengthen the role of National Coordination and Managing Authority in the next programming period. Initiate a discussion about possible „split off“ of implementation structure of future „NSRF“ from current structure of public administration authorities and its autonomisation (for example in form of government agency) having a separate budgetary chapter.</p>
	<p>Introduce a system (tool) for informing applicants/beneficiaries and bodies of implementation structure OPTA about prepared (<i>ex-ante</i>) and on-going (<i>ongoing, ex</i></p>	

Area of recommendation	Recommendation for current programming period	Recommendation for next programming period
	<i>post</i>) changes in documentation to OPTA.	
Financial plan of OPTA, absorption capacity		
	On side of beneficiaries carry out an „inventory“ of tasks that must be finished by the end of the programming period with regard to OPTA objectives and ensuring management of NSRF and ESC implementation in the Czech Republic and allocate to these tasks relevant financial requirements. Repeat such revisions in the course of other phases of the programming cycle (for example quarterly/ half-yearly).	
	Realize an analysis of current state of absorption capacity across the whole NSRF.	
	Process an expert analysis which shall assess possibilities and feasibility of reallocation of OPTA financial means with regard to time, administrative, absorption and possible other limits (for example multiobjective form of OPTP, keeping „national“ character of interventions, etc.). Ensure expert methodical support in order to prevent and eliminate generation of possible risks of conflict between implemented measures with all external conditions and environment in which EU Economic and Social Cohesion policy is realised in the Czech Republic.	
	Remaining financial means that ensue from the revision of beneficiaries' tasks then on the basis of results of detailed analysis of NSRF absorption capacity and feasibility analysis reallocate either within the programme or to other thematic operational programmes.	
	Strengthen the system of beneficiaries' education; increase their awareness, primarily in area of public procurement (basic orientation in the issue). Considering this it would be useful to introduce a project in area of intervention 3.2 to support consultations for beneficiaries when preparing public contracts. An applicant would be MA that is in this area mentioned as a standard beneficiary.	
	Recommend to eligible beneficiaries to make full use of opportunities offered to them by OPTA and submit projects (it concerns for example Audit Authority (AA) and Paying and Certifying Authority (PCA) in priority axis 4).	
	Recommend to applicants to make use of ex-ante consultations with IB, or MA already in phase of project proposal/application in order to eliminate potential risks related to not observing rules for projects implementation in OPTA (primarily at public	

Area of recommendation	Recommendation for current programming period	Recommendation for next programming period
	procurement).	
Implementation structure of OPTA, administrative capacity		
	Carry out a revision of current system of systemized places for some implementation structure bodies, mainly with focus on: National Coordination Authority (NCA)/MA NSRF, Section for administration of monitoring system (SAMS) and MA OPTA.	
	Strengthen administrative capacities of MA NSRF/NCA, namely (simultaneously or alternatively): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • directly strengthen personnel of MA NSRF, • delegate chosen parts of the agenda to other section of Ministry of Regional Development (MRD), • outsource chosen parts of the agenda to external body on the basis of tender and under control of MA NSRF/NCA. 	
	NCA/MA NSRF should with the help of MA prepare a task list of tasks which this body performs extra out of its agendas and which bring administrative burden, and introduce a procedure for their delegation to a newly chosen body. This task list should be accompanied by a methodical manual pointing to most frequent mistakes and problems in administration of these tasks so that there would be a transfer of relevant know-how on the basis of present experience and thereby also smoothness of running the exercised agenda.	
	On the basis of previous recommendation NCA/MA NSRF should also utilize internal procedures – i.e. convey information for 1. Deputy Minister and for Minister of Regional Development with a proposal of specific measure – with a view to securing compliance with the procedures when administering projects after „secondary beneficiaries“.	
	Strengthen administrative capacities of departments establishing function of NCA by staff with experience in area of public procurement administration.	
	On top management level of MRD initiate discussion about active involvement of legal experts from Public investment section already in the course of public procurement preparation. Cooperation should concentrate on constructive comments and formulation of proposals of specific recommendations which would subsequently lead to acceptance of contractual documents for public procurement and eliminate the	

Area of recommendation	Recommendation for current programming period	Recommendation for next programming period
	<p>need for further revisions.</p> <p>Within managing documentation to OPTA (Manual for applicants and beneficiaries, Operational Manual) introduce and formalize the term „secondary beneficiary“ meaning a sub body taking part in project implementation in OPTA, define it clearly and explicitly describe duties of these types of beneficiaries, same or very similar to duties of „standard“ beneficiaries. Obligation to observe duties of so called secondary beneficiaries should be embedded for example in a Decision of minister.</p> <p>Strengthen the education system of implementation structure personnel; increase their awareness, primarily in area of public procurement (basic orientation in the issue).</p> <p>In order to eliminate potential risks related to not observing rules for public procurement it is suitable to recommend to applicants ex-ante consultations with IB, or MA.</p>	
Indicator scheme		
	<p>Carry out a revision of OPTA indicator scheme. Factual proposals should arise from an independent evaluation study. General recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • complete on areas of intervention level output indicators for activities which do not have sufficient backing in present indicator scheme, • introduce complement instruments for evaluation of fulfilment of OPTA strategic objectives and priority axis objectives, • adjust target values of indicators with a view to present and expected factual progress within OPTA 	<p>In a new operational programme (if it is established) define multilevel indicator scheme so that it would cover all hierarchical levels. On areas of intervention level propose a wide spectrum of primarily output indicators, directly interconnected with individual supported activities; on priority axis level specify a few (2-3, according to the number of priority axis) result indicators expressing a change of state (in relative terms – for example %); on level of the whole OP determine indicators of result and impact.</p>
	<p>Complete/enhance plans of fulfilment of allocations by plans of indicators fulfilment.</p>	<p>Process „List of unit costs “ according to types of outputs from project implementation in area of technical assistance.</p>
	<p>Evaluate regularly OPTA indicator scheme as well as fulfilment of indicators and carry out possible revisions in reaction to upcoming needs.</p>	<p>Based on the List of unit costs and with regard to the experience with OPTA implementation in the programming period 2007-2013 set realistic target values of indicators in the new OP.</p>
Selection criteria		

Area of recommendation	Recommendation for current programming period	Recommendation for next programming period
	<p>No significant change of system of evaluation and selection of projects may be recommended considering the fact that submitting project applications functions on the basis of one announced joint continual call for the whole OPTA.</p> <p>On the level of evaluation of submitted project applications it would be useful to monitor if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • project has its quantified project objectives (measured by project output and result indicators), • project has due relationship to fulfilment of objective(s) of relevant priority axes, • in most of its particular activities the project leads to meeting its main objective (measured by output and result indicators), • set objectives /indicators of the project have predicative value about most implemented particular project activities and if project indicators (defined for fulfilment of its objectives) are sufficiently optimised with regard to criteria 3E. <p>Binary system „Yes/No“ of evaluation is recommended to be retained, however it is necessary to be particular about projects so that in form of project application they are elaborated in most detail in line: activities – objectives/ indicators (of project) – budget structuralized towards particular project activities, not first in the course of preparation of individual public tenders. It is recommended to emphasize this line in point 6. „Factual criteria of priority axis“ of Evaluator´s manual for selection and evaluation of projects.</p>	<p>Into assessment system of quality of submitted project applications introduce scaling on the basis of point scale and set a minimum limit for project acceptability. Put emphasis on evaluation of planned activities effectiveness using a wide scale/selection of output indicators and list of unit costs.</p>
Other recommendations		
	<p>With regard to rising importance of innovative financing instruments consider enhancing these instruments with other existing initiatives from view of their legislative, legal, organisational, auditing and financial management and attachment in conditions of the Czech Republic and prepare concrete methodical procedure for their testing in order to correct these methodologies on basis of practical testing.</p>	<p>Based on testing of financial instruments with various managing attributes and in various sectors (at different beneficiaries) generalize this experience, single out future OP from which they could be cofinanced and include them in the programming documentation 2014+.</p>
	<p>Consider the possibility of introducing innovative trends in development of analytical approaches to monitoring and evaluation ensuing from new strategic material considering the future of ESC.</p> <p>It would consist of the following: creating methodological and conceptual materials for application of these approaches, their testing on selected OP in present programming</p>	<p>Findings which will ensue from theoretically-methodological concept for implementation procedures of these analyses and primarily pilot testing on selected OP, use for specification of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Priorities, objectives and supported activities

Area of recommendation	Recommendation for current programming period	Recommendation for next programming period
	<p>period (pilot activities), corrections of methodological materials on the basis of tested procedures and creation of general methodological basis for use in the Czech Republic, then ensuring possibility for relevant data collection (for example statistics or Monitoring system for the Structural Funds) and creation of education system and building evaluation and monitoring capacities for the next programming period.</p>	<p>for period 2014+ - General system /methodics for treatment of monitoring and evaluations in period 2014+</p>
	<p>Consider possibility of including a new activity into area of intervention 1.4 or PA 4 related with publicity of new programming period preparation with a view to create a platform for public debate, formation of partnerships and transfer and validity of know-how into period after 2013.</p>	