



## Executive Summary

**Efficiency assessment of OPTA management system  
and Analysis of correctness of monitoring indicators  
setting in OPTA**

Part 2: Analysis of correctness of monitoring indicator  
setting in OPTA

Efficiency assessment of OPTA management system and Analysis of correctness of monitoring indicators setting in OPTA – Part 2: Analysis of correctness of monitoring indicator setting in OPTA was implemented by eNovation, s.r.o. in the period from September 2013 to December 2013, including the time for comment processing. The objective of this assessment was evaluation of quality and correctness of the monitoring indicators setting in the Operational Programme Technical Assistance (OPTA) in relation with fulfilling the individual OPTA objectives. On the basis of the analysis of the individual monitoring indicators used in OPTA, other OPs, and also in technical assistance programmes used in other EU member states, the next objective was to gain a set of recommendations that would contribute to optimal setting of the OPTA indicator system with regard to the progress of the 2007 – 2013 programming period, and also to preparation of OPTA in the 2014 – 2020 programming period.

Consequently, the assessment was mainly focused on evaluating interconnectedness and consistency of the OPTA indicator system, assessing the implemented changes, and at the same time, proportionality of the indicator system, implementing an analysis for assigning indicators to the individual projects, identification of alternative methods for assessment of results and project outputs, implementing an indicator analysis on national and international levels aiming to find other suitable indicators which could be incorporated into the OPTA indicator system, analysing the draft of the OPTA indicator system in the next programming period with regard to methodology of indicator determination in the new programming period, and assessment of the current indicator performance with regard to meeting their target values.

2

To achieve the stated objectives, the evaluator used a combination of several main evaluation methods, of which it is necessary to mention in particular analysis of data and documents, comparative analysis, methods of statistical analysis, and questionnaire survey. The data base was composed primarily of data provided by the contracting authority from IS MONIT7+ and also by publicly available data sources. During the project implementation, the processor was in contact with the contracting authority, and consulted the evaluation outputs with them.

## **The main findings and conclusion of the evaluation report**

### **Indicator system setting**

The OPTA indicator system is among the smallest indicator systems within the operational programmes implemented in the Czech Republic. This state of affairs corresponds to specific programme content, and low number of implemented projects. The currently used

monitoring indicators of impact, results, and outputs used in different priority axes, and OPTA intervention areas are in line with the objectives of priority axes and areas of intervention. Consistency of these indicators was evaluated as strong or very strong. The indicator system identifies only minimal problems in the area of consistence, and, considering the state of the programming period, any major changes or additions to the IS would be ineffective and problematic. The changes implemented in the indicator system, monitoring system and methodical definition of indicators were carried out efficiently, and they fulfilled their objectives. These changes included improving the monitoring and indicator performance system, adding the missing indicators with regard to securing links between project results and outputs and the OPTA defined objectives, and also methodological clarification of definition of the indicators.

**Recommendations:** 1) Leave the indicator system in its current form despite the detected minor flaws, especially with regard to maintaining comparability and relevance of monitored values and their links to the actually realized project outputs and results.

2) Carry out correction of target values of the current indicators according to the values proposed by the evaluation team (see Table No. 11 of the final report).

3

---

### Link to implemented projects and assessment system of project results and outputs

The current indicator system adequately covers the activities implemented by means of projects. None of the projects examined contained repetitive activities that were not covered by a relevant indicator. Given the limits of the existing indicator system as unilaterally quantitative evaluation, the indicator system setting is sufficient. However, an exclusively quantitative system for monitoring project outputs and results by its very nature cannot cover a range of aspects of these outputs and results. It would be beneficial to complement or combine the current quantitative system for monitoring results and outputs in the form of indicators with other quantitative and especially qualitative methods of evaluation of project results and outputs.

**Recommendations:** 3) In the new period, complement the current system of assessment of the individual project effects with a qualitative method of logical framework.

4) In the new period, complement the current system of assessment of the individual project effects with a quantitative cost-output CEA

method at least in the form of determination of the maximal cost values for implementing a unit of the monitored indicator, and subsequently take this into account when setting target values of indicators (especially the output indicators).

### Draft of the OPTA indicator system setting for the next programming period

Use of the current indicator system in the 2014 – 2020 period is significantly insufficient. Due to modified methodological guidelines for creation of the indicator system for the 2014 – 2020 period, it is necessary to develop a specific form of IS through various indicators in an entirely new way, so that the new rules were fulfilled while respecting the experience with IS operation gained in the current planning period, and especially general characteristics of the current IS.

**Recommendations:** 5) Incorporate new or rephrased indicators proposed by OPTA MA in the draft of the IS for the 2014 – 2020 period.

6) Complement the draft of the IS for the 2014 – 2020 period with indicators proposed by the evaluation team (for example projects obeying formal requirements).

7) When creating the IS for the 2014 – 2020 period, maintain formal characteristics of the current IS – especially economy and efficiency.