

PHARE/2005/017-553.05.03

PROJECT FICHE FOR PHARE 2005

**For
Implementation of the National Evaluation Strategy**

Index of contents

1.	Basic Information.....	3
1.1	CRIS Number:	3
1.2	Title:	3
1.3	Sector:	3
1.4	Location:	3
1.5	Duration:	3
2.	Objectives	3
2.1	Overall Objective(s):.....	3
2.2	Project purpose:	3
2.3	Accession Partnership (AP) and NPAA priority	3
2.4	Coherence with National Development Plan	4
2.5	Cross Border Impact	4
3.	Description.....	4
3.1	Background and justification:	4
3.2	Sectoral rationale	9
3.3	Results.....	9
3.4	Activities (including Means).....	10
3.5	Linked Activities:.....	11
3.6	Lessons learnt:	12
4.	Institutional Framework.....	12
5.	Detailed Budget	12
6.	Implementation Arrangements.....	14
6.1	Implementing Agency.....	14
6.2	Twinning	14
6.3	Non-standard aspects	14
6.4	Contracts	14
7.	Implementation Schedule.....	15
7.1	Start of tendering/call for proposals.....	15
7.2	Start of project activity.....	15
7.3	Project completion	15
8.	Equal Opportunity.....	15
9.	Environment.....	15
10.	Rates of return.....	15
11.	Investment criteria (applicable to all investments)	15
11.1	Catalytic effect.....	15
11.2	Co-financing	16
11.3	Additionality	16
11.4	Project readiness and size	16
11.5	Sustainability.....	16
11.6	Compliance with state aids provisions.....	16
12.	Conditionality and sequencing.....	16
	Annexes to project Fiche	16

1. Basic Information

1.1 CRIS Number:

PHARE/2005/017-553.05.03

1.2 Title: Implementation of the National Evaluation Strategy

1.3 Sector:

Evaluation

1.4 Location:

Romania

1.5 Duration:

12 months

2. Objectives

2.1 Overall Objective(s):

To adopt and implement the EU best practices in the field of evaluation of public interventions

2.2 Project purpose:

To enhance relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of programmes/projects financed by public funds, both EU and national budget

The project purpose will be achieved through following tasks:

1. **PHARE Interim evaluation scheme**
2. **Development of a professional evaluation community**
3. **Evaluation Facility**

2.3 Accession Partnership (AP) and NPAA priority

(and implementing measures envisaged by the Action Plan for AP priorities related to strengthening administrative and judicial capacity)

All documents underline the need for setting up efforts to ensure evaluation of pre and post-accession funds as a key indicator of Romania's ability to implement the **financial control acquis**.

They state that Romania has to set up the evaluation system for the programmes to be funded under the Structural Instruments in compliance with the requirements of **Chapter 21 "Regional Policy and Coordination of Structural Instrmens"**.

The project will contribute to the increase of the accountability of civil servants and enhancement of policy formulation, as key elements of the Political criteria.

2.4 Coherence with National Development Plan (and/or Structural Funds Development Plan)

Not applicable

2.5 Cross Border Impact

Not applicable

3. Description

3.1 Background and justification:

Chapter 28 (Financial Control), Financial Regulation/Coordination Regulation/ EDIS guidelines and Chapter 21 (Regional Policy/Structural Funds) set the framework of requirements for carrying out evaluations and developing evaluation local capacities.

Presently, the capacity for evaluation is extremely limited in Romania even if it is of major importance for exercising a *sound financial management* required by the financial *acquis* (Chapter 28), for participation in EC funded programmes under *EDIS* and also in the context of *Structural and Cohesion Funds*, which require ex ante, interim/mid-term and ex post evaluations.

The proximity of accession and the *acquis* obligations of managing public funds mean that the *evaluation task is urgent*.

In this respect, in the mid of the year 2005 the work for elaboration of a national evaluation strategy will start under the framework of a 15 months technical assistance contract funded by PHARE 2003. Because developing evaluation capacity is necessarily a shared concern of the wider evaluation community, including those who manage and commission evaluations, those who have an interest in evaluations at a policy and programme level and those who undertake evaluations, parallel activities will also be carried out within this contract in order to enhance the evaluation capacity of Romanian public administration (policy and decision makers); potential evaluation commissioners; potential local evaluation companies and evaluators; academic environment and supporting organisations.

However, it takes time to develop such capacity and the needed structures cannot be put in place once and for all. They need continuous nurturing to deliver sustainable benefits.

Need for independent evaluation and a functional warning system on the implementation of PHARE programme

In the near future, a further decentralization of responsibilities for the EU funds management from Commission to Romanian institutions will take place. This process is called moving to the Extended Decentralised Implementation System (EDIS). Moving to EDIS includes among others the transfer of responsibility for PHARE interim evaluation.

Interim evaluation has to provide the PHARE programme managers with an independent analysis of facts and findings on the implementation of on-going programmes and to serve as an early warning system for programme implementation. Interim Evaluation is a very useful means of helping to manage the monitoring and implementation of programmes and to foster sound financial management.

In this respect it is a need to continue the Interim Evaluation Scheme developed by DG Enlargement to help in improving the relevance, effectiveness, impact and accountability of Phare pre-accession funds. Specifically the purpose of the Scheme is to provide National Aid Coordinator and PHARE managers with assessments of the state of implementation of their programmes including programme performance, efficiency and sustainability against stated objectives, and lessons learned with a view to improving programme implementation and the design of future programmes.

Evaluations need to be carried out by external contractors operating under the responsibility of the Evaluation Central Unit which is established separately from programming and monitoring functions within the Managing Authority for Community Support Framework.

Need for development of a professional evaluation community

Performing evaluations will require robust professional skills and standards both for evaluation managers (demand side) as well as evaluators (supply side).

Therefore, evaluation must be demanded and supplied professionally by people that possess the relevant skills and expertise, including the ability to understand both “sides” of the evaluation business. Professional strength is a crucial factor in securing credibility and demonstrating independence and impartiality vis-à-vis the different and sometimes very powerful interests involved in a programme and/or policy. The sources of professional strength and independence are varied. They include:

- Professional norms of behaviour;
- Ethical codes that are widely recognised and disseminated;
- Independent and well-established institutions within which evaluators work can lend their judgements greater weight and allow them to resist external pressures;
- High quality education and training is usually a pre-requisite for professional recognition;
- Professional societies that bring together evaluators with different levels of expertise and experience can be shared and practical problems discussed.

In this respect, it is a need for establishing a sustainable mechanism through which the development of a professional evaluation community may be possible.

Need for encouraging the evaluation commissioning

The poor evaluation experience in Romania is a cause of rather limited acquaintance among the potential users of evaluation’s benefits. Evaluation managers and commissioners are the first people that must be convinced of the need for evaluation, especially concerning the facts that the benefits of the evaluation are higher than the costs. On the other hand, policy and decision makers have to become accustomed to

requesting for independent evaluations whenever this could help them in the decision making. Furthermore, they have to accept that the evaluation must be integrated within regular decision making and implementation processes and ought to appreciate the usefulness of impartial and independent evaluations that are closely connected to regular management processes.

In this respect, it is a need for the setting up of an *evaluation facility* which encourages the policy and decision makers to commissioning evaluations and which supports a good management of evaluation exercises. The implementation of the evaluation facility will be based on the experience gained by MACSF with the Project Preparation Facility mechanism. In this respect, the evaluation facility may provide short-term evaluation experts performing independent evaluations of policies and programmes elaborated and/or implemented by institutions of Romanian Public Administration. Romanian institutions may submit to MACSF proposals in order to access this facility, while decisions on eligibility will be taken by common agreement between the Commission Services and the Romanian National Aid Co-ordinator. The implementation of evaluation assignments will be closely monitored by the Evaluation Central Unit which will perform a quality control of the evaluation reports.

By including the condition to have Romanian expertise in the evaluation team to be contracted under the Evaluation Facility, this mechanism may indirectly support the transfer of know how from high calibre international evaluators to local evaluators.

Current state of play in the evaluation field

Aware of the need to take urgent and effective measures to ensure due decentralisation of the interim evaluation as means to reach increased accountability of the public administration and transparency of the processes of EU funds management, the Romanian Government undertook significant steps on the way to establish a National Evaluation System in Romania, represented by:

- The definition of a **National Evaluation Strategy**
- The elaboration of an **Action Plan** for the implementation of the National Evaluation Strategy

The Action Plan is structured under five main phases, describing the main *actions* and establishing corresponding *milestones* for their implementation.

The main axes of intervention and the current state of implementation can be summarised as follows:

I. Legal framework for regulating the Phare interim evaluation (IE) activity

Under this frame the main actions are:

- **I.a.** Elaboration and adoption of the necessary legislation to assign the Phare interim evaluation function and responsibility

Current State: Governmental Decision 208/2005 regarding the organization and functioning of the Ministry of Public Finance was adopted in March 2005 including a new organizational chart for the Managing Authority for Community Support Framework (MACSF), stating the establishment of an evaluation function within MACSF.

- **I.b.** Elaboration of secondary legislation to establish the IE management structure within **MACSF** (Evaluation Coordination Unit – ECU).

Current state: the necessary norms for establishing the Evaluation Coordination Unit – ECU, establishing its role, the main attributions and working system. The definition of the position of ECU was made so as to ensure the necessary *segregation of duties* between the different structures involved in management of EU funds – i.e. its autonomy in relation with the structures in charge with programming, monitoring and implementation. For this purpose ECU was designed as a separate entity with own staff and decisional autonomy.

There have been already assigned dedicated staff, under the coordination of experienced senior staff from the **MACSF** services, gained through both coordination of monitoring and implementation work experience. The Ministry of Finance has also allocated the necessary office facilities, equipment and resources needed for the effective operation of ECU.

The second axe for intervention in the Action Plan is:

II. Evaluation Capacity Building at ECU - MACSF level to ensure the Management/coordination of the Phare IE in accordance with EU requirements and standards, comprising the following main actions:

- **II.a.** Needs assessment for Evaluation Capacity Building, in line with best practices in EU, at ECU/**MACSF** level (to cover necessary secondary legislation, organizational structure for ECU, staff, necessary working procedures for ECU, etc.)
- **II.b.** Design (based on II.a.), at **MACSF** level, of the organizational structure of ECU (including its hierarchical and horizontal relationships with other departments/directorates within **MACSF** and with other public administration bodies involved in Phare Programme management/future management structure for Structural Funds in order to ensure the observation of EC requirements regarding the segregation of duties –monitoring, evaluation, and audit- and regarding the supervision of the evaluation management process
- **II.c.** Identification of a set of objectively verifiable indicators for ECU’s activity
- **II.d.** Elaboration of the map of attributions and responsibilities with regard to the Phare IE function:
 - ✓ Attributions and responsibilities of ECU
 - ✓ Revised attributions and responsibilities of monitoring function in order to better serve the evaluation purpose (SMSC, JMC, MIS –existing monitoring IT application- development of reporting capabilities, establishment of new bodies if necessary)
 - ✓ Revised attributions and responsibilities of Phare management structure within line ministries and other public administration bodies
- **II.e.** Conducting a TNA for ECU’s staff, design and delivery of needed training (know how transfer).

- **II.f.** Elaboration of written internal procedures for evaluation planning and for management of the evaluation process (to cover programmes evaluation planning, planning for needed resources for evaluation work, management of evaluation activities, feed-back and utilization of results, establishment of steering groups if needed, elaboration of ToR for evaluation, checking quality of evaluation reports against standards, exchange information with the Commission etc.).

Current state: for implementing these actions there is an obvious need for support, to be provided by means of technical assistance. The dimensioning of the intervention will be achieved through the TA Contract for Programming, Monitoring and Evaluation (foreseen to start in August 2005), and will be continued with the support to be provided through the financing from Phare 2005. The technical assistance and the grant facility designed to be financed under Phare 2005 will play a major role in the implementation of the two other axes, namely:

Axe III. Raising awareness and visibility regarding Phare IE evaluation responsibility taking over from the Commission, to be achieved by:

- **III.a.** Conducting seminars and round tables with decision makers and staff within the Phare programme administration system/ future management structure for Structural Funds in order to present the new decentralized mechanism for Phare IE, attributions that derive from this new responsibility, communication and collaboration mechanisms, feed-back provision, the need for a better use of evaluation results, especially for ex-ante evaluation (relevance of intervention proposed, indicators of achievement, risk analysis)
- **III.b.** Conducting round tables with decision makers from the public administration bodies in order to rise awareness regarding the need for evaluation of public money expenditure, to present the principles and the process of Phare IE and how this approach could constitute a model for future National Evaluation System development.
- **III.c.** ECU's web page developed within the web site of **MACSF**.

And Axe IV. Development of local evaluation services supply

- **IV.a.** A pool of individual evaluators selected and trained in Phare IE by the EC selected Contractor for Phare IE.
- **IV.b.** A pool of local companies selected and trained in conducting Phare IE by the EC selected Contractor for Phare IE.
- **IV.c.** Direct involvement of local companies in Phare IE (know how direct transfer from the EU Contractor) ensured by EC selected Contractor for Phare IE.

In implementing the activities foreseen under this fiche, the ECU established within **MACSF** will benefit in implementing the **Evaluation Facility** from the wide experience gained throughout the implementation of the **Project Preparation Facility** by **MACSF**. The same management approach and similar mechanisms for **identification of projects, implementation, monitoring, control and evaluation** will be employed, benefiting also from the technical assistance in managing this scheme.

The Beneficiaries of the scheme will be represented by the structures of public administration in charge with managing programmes and projects financed from EU funds, willing to undertake evaluation exercises for improving the design of:

- Sectoral policies
- Sectoral Programmes or
- Projects in their specific fields.

This will enable the Beneficiaries to steadily gain experience in managing evaluation processes – i.e. in:

- Planning evaluation projects – elaborating ToRs for carrying out evaluations in their sectors
- Contracting evaluation services
- Monitoring and controlling evaluation processes

The scheme will be aimed also at developing the **Evaluation community** in Romania, by involving the **target groups** in quality evaluation exercises by seconding evaluation experts from the European Union. This target group – as described in the National Evaluation Strategy is composed by:

- **Evaluation companies**
- **Evaluators**
- **Evaluation methodological support structures (academic institutions, research institutions etc.)**
- **Evaluators associations**

3.2 Sectoral rationale

Not applicable

3.2.1 Identification of projects

Not applicable

3.2.2 Sequencing

Not applicable

3.3 Results

Task 1 PHARE Interim evaluation scheme

- 2 Interim Evaluation Country Summary Reports
- Evaluation methodologies (2 reports)
- Information provided to DG MACSF – Evaluation Central Unit – thematic/ad hoc evaluation reports
- Interim evaluations – 20 sectoral interim evaluations

Task 2 Development of a professional evaluation community

- Mechanism for development of a professional evaluation community
- Evaluation training courses/workshops/seminars organised

- Evaluation training curricula transferred to the academic environment and trainers trained
- Evaluation networks established

Task 3 Evaluation Facility

- Evaluation facility mechanism
- Projects/programmes evaluated

3.4 Activities (including Means)

Task 1 PHARE Interim Evaluation Scheme will be implemented through a single service contract of 2 MEURO, lasting 24 months, from March 2006 to February 2008. The following activities will be carried out by the contractor:

Activities of Task 1.

- Preparation of a work-plan for PHARE IE which will set in principle the number and types of the evaluations, the resources required for each evaluation, the expected date of issuing the final version for each evaluation report.
- Organisation of the kick-off seminar where it will be decided which programme elements are to be evaluated, explained the procedures to all the stakeholders involved, discussed any specific issues that require further attention, considered possible needs for a short-term technical specialist.
- Carrying out evaluation activities through collecting information and analysis of gathered documents, preparation and circulation of draft evaluation reports.
 - Preparation of evaluation reports after consideration of comments made by different stakeholders.
 - Organisation of dissemination of evaluation results and de-briefing meetings on the evaluation reports.
- Preparation of evaluation reports
- Organisation of dissemination of evaluation results and de-briefing meetings on the evaluation reports

Task 2 Development of a professional evaluation community will be implemented through a single service contract of 1 MEURO, lasting 19 months, from June 2006 to December 2007. The following activities will be carried out by the contractor:

Activities of Task 2.

- Assessment of the capacity and needs of the Romanian evaluation community. This assessment will encompass both demand side (evaluation managers) and supply side (evaluators and evaluation companies) as well as evaluation methodological support structures (academic and research institutions, evaluators associations etc.)
- Designing the mechanism for development of a professional evaluation community. The key components of this mechanism concern evaluation

regulations, procedures and standards, professional norms of behaviour, ethical codes, competencies and skills.

- Implementation of the mechanism which may include elaboration of evaluation guidelines, designing of the evaluation training curricula, selection of the trainees, delivery of training sessions and know-how transfer, training of trainers, networking.

Task 3 Evaluation Facility will be implemented taking into consideration the experience gained during the running of the Project Preparation Facility mechanism. In this respect a framework contract will be concluded which will support ECU for design and coordination of the Evaluation Facility (EF). However, the great part of the EF will be targeted for evaluations to be commissioned by different public institutions. In order to support the transfer of expertise, evaluations under EF will be performed by high calibre evaluators supported by Romanian experts. Therefore, the EF amounting 1 MEURO will be implemented through a multi-contracts scheme, from February 2006 to December 2007.

Activities of Task 3.

- Hands on assistance to the Evaluation Central Unit with the designing, raising awareness and monitoring of the evaluation facility and quality control of the evaluation reports.
- Carrying out independent evaluations of policies and programmes implemented or to be implemented by various institutions of Romanian Public Administration.

3.5 Linked Activities:

- PHARE RO 2003/005-551.03.03 “Technical Assistance for programming, monitoring and evaluation” will provide a National Evaluation Strategy encompassing evaluation of programmes and projects financed by both EU and National Budget. The project supports also strengthening of the Phare interim evaluation function and raising awareness on evaluation.
- Centralised PHARE interim evaluation facility for EU pre-accession programmes in Bulgaria and Romania and Central Office activities – a contract implemented by DG Enlargement for performing PHARE Interim Evaluation.
- PHARE 2004-016-772.04.03.09 “Ex- ante evaluation” - dealing with the ex-ante evaluation of the operational programmes to be funded under the Structural Instruments.
- Twinning RO02/IB/SPP/01 – “Institution building to support regional development policy implementation” - Twinning to build EU structural fund-compatible instruments and capacities and to build the legal, institutional, budgetary and operational structures required to manage and

implement EU Structural Funds after accession. The ex-ante evaluation of the National Development Plan will be also carried out.

- *Phare RO/2003/005-551.02.03 „Strengthening the capacity for analysis, macroeconomic forecasts and elaboration of economic policies in the National Commission of Prognosis” – will provide the evaluation of the impact of the Structural Funds to be allocated for the programming period 2007-2013.*
- *An important input to the success of the implementation of the National Evaluation strategy will be brought by the training programme provided by ECOTEC on Interim Evaluation under Commission’s centralized IE contract.*

3.6 Lessons learnt:

PHARE Interim Evaluation Scheme – will be based on the guidelines for PHARE Interim Evaluation issued by DG Enlargement and will take into account the lessons learnt from the previous interim evaluations of the DG Enlargement.

Development of a professional evaluation community – will be based on the outcomes of the project PHARE RO 2003/005-551.03.03 “Technical Assistance for programming, monitoring and evaluation”.

Evaluation Facility - Project Preparation Facility proved to be a useful tool for elaboration mature programming documents. A similar mechanism will be applied in the case of EF for evaluation of various programmes and policies. The outcomes of the project PHARE RO 2003/005-551.03.03 “Technical Assistance for programming, monitoring and evaluation” will be taken into account at the stage of designing and implementation of the Evaluation Facility.

4. Institutional Framework

The organization and functioning of the Ministry of Public Finance, regulated through GD No. 1574/2003, was amended through GD 403/2004 to encompass the new structures for managing EU structural instruments, i.e. the Managing Authority for Community Support Framework and the Managing Authority for Cohesion Fund. Following this new GD, the Ministry of Public Finance is in charge with the programming, coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the non-reimbursable financial assistance granted by EU and the member states to Romania and acts as the National Aid Coordinator.

A new GD 208/2005 regarding the organization and functioning of the Ministry of Public Finance was adopted in March 2005 including a new organizational chart for the Managing Authority for Community Support Framework, allowing also the split of activities per functions. The implementation function is ensured through the Technical Assistance Directorate, while the evaluation function is performed through the Evaluation Central Unit.

5. Detailed Budget

	Phare/Pre-Accession Instrument support	Co-financing			Total Cost
		National Public Funds (*)	Other Sources (**)	Total Co-financing of Project	
Year 2005 - Investment support jointly co funded	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-project 1	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-project 2, etc...	0	0	0	0	0
Investment support – sub-total	0	0	0	0	0
<i>% of total public funds</i>	0	0			

In case of parallel co-funding (per exception to the normal rule, see special condition as indicated below:

Year 2005 - Investment support co funded in parallel	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-project 1	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-project 2, etc...	0	0	0	0	0
Investment support – sub-total	0	0	0	0	0
<i>% of total public funds</i>	0	0			

Year 2005 Institution Building support					
PHARE Interim Evaluation Scheme	2	0	0	0	2
Development of a professional evaluation community	1	0	0	0	1
Evaluation Facility	1	0	0	0	1
IB support	4	0	0	0	4
Total project 2005	4	0	0	0	4

□

6. Implementation Arrangements

6.1 Implementing Agency

Ministry of Public – Central Finance and Contract Unit
44 Mircea Voda Avenue, Entrance B, District 3, Bucharest, Romania
Phone: (0040 21) 32 68 733
Fax: (0040 21) 32 68 730 / 32 68 09
PAO: Mrs. Carmen Roșu
E-mail: Carmenr@cfcu.ro

CFCU will be responsible for all procedural aspects of the tendering process, contracting matters and financial management (including payments) of the contract activities.

Ministry of Public – Managing Authority for Community Support Framework
12 Libertatii Blvd, District 5, Bucharest, Romania
Phone: (0040 21) 335 98 72
Fax: (0040 21) 335 98 78
SPO: Răzvan Cotovelea
E-mail: razvan.cotovelea@mfinante.ro

Managing Authority for Community Support Framework is the Implementing Authority responsible for technical implementation of project.

6.2 Twinning

Not applicable.

6.3 Non-standard aspects

Usually, the beneficiaries of the Evaluation Facility will differ from the Implementing Authority. In order to access this facility, Romanian institutions will submit to the Implementing Authority proposals, decisions on project's eligibility being taken by common agreement between the Commission Services and the Romanian National Aid Co-ordinator.

6.4 Contracts

For Task 1 “PHARE Interim Evaluation”, a single contract for services of MEUR 2 will be concluded. The contract will last 24 months from March 2006 to February 2008.

For task 2 “Development of the evaluation community”, a single contract for services of MEUR 1 will be concluded. The contract will last 19 months from June 2006 to December 2007.

For task 3 “Evaluation Facility”, at least 10 contracts will be concluded, each contract amounting less than 200,000 Euro. The facility will be implemented within 19 months from June 2006 to December 2007.

7. Implementation Schedule

7.1 Start of tendering/call for proposals

For Task 1 “PHARE Interim Evaluation”
Publication of Contract Forecast – October 2005
Terms of Reference ready – October 2005
Publication of Procurement Notice – January 2006

For task 2 “Development of the evaluation community”
Publication of Contract Forecast – October 2005
Terms of Reference ready – January 2006
Publication of Procurement Notice – January 2006

For task 3 “Evaluation Facility”
Terms of reference for hands-on assistance – January 2006
Terms of reference for evaluation – from June to December 2006

7.2 Start of project activity

For Task 1 “PHARE Interim Evaluation” – June 2006
For task 2 “Development of the evaluation community” – June 2006
For task 3 “Evaluation Facility” – February 2006

7.3 Project completion

For Task 1 “PHARE Interim Evaluation” – May 2008
For task 2 “Development of the evaluation community” – February 2008
For task 3 “Evaluation Facility” – February 2008

8. Equal Opportunity

□

An equitable gender participation will be requested to be ensured by the contractor when selecting the target groups of the project. The treatment of this principle will be supervised by the Implementing Authority.

9. Environment

The project has no discernible effects on the environment.

□

10. Rates of return

Not applicable.

11. Investment criteria (applicable to all investments)

11.1 Catalytic effect

Not applicable.

11.2 Co-financing

Not applicable.

11.3 Additionality

Not applicable.

11.4 Project readiness and size

Not applicable.

11.5 Sustainability

Not applicable.

11.6 Compliance with state aids provisions

Not applicable.

12. Conditionality and sequencing

Not applicable.

ANNEXES TO PROJECT FICHE

1. Logframe in standard format
2. Detailed implementation chart
3. Contracting and disbursement schedule, by quarter, for full duration of project (including disbursement period)
4. For all projects: reference list of feasibility/pre-feasibility studies
5. Reference list of relevant laws and regulations
6. Reference list of relevant strategic plans and studies

LOGFRAME PLANNING MATRIX FOR Project Fiche		Programme name and number	
Name of the project Implementation of the National Evaluation Strategy		Contracting period expires	Disbursement period expires
		Total budget : 4 MEURO	Phare budget: 4 MEURO
Overall objective	Relates to Copehagen criterion and acquis chapter	List of other projects with same objective	
Adoption and implementation of the EU best practices in the field of programme evaluation.	<p>Meeting the obligations of the Acquis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of local capacities – chapter 28 (financial Control) - EC Financial Regulations - EDIS Guidelines - Chapter 21 –Regional Policy/Structural Funds - 2002 Communication for the Commission from the President and Mr. Schreyer on evaluation standards and good practice <p>Political criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase of the accountability of civil servants and enhancement of policy formulation 	<p>PHARE RO 2003/005-551.03.03 “Technical Assistance for programming, monitoring and evaluation”</p> <p>Centralised PHARE interim evaluation facility for EU pre-accession programmes in Bulgaria and Romania and Central Office Activities</p> <p>PHARE 2004-016-772.04.03.09 “Ex-ante evaluation”</p> <p>Twinning RO02/IB/SPP/01 – “Institution building to support regional development policy implementation”</p> <p>Phare RO/2003/005-551.02.03 „Strengthening the capacity for analysis, macroeconomic forecasts and elaboration of economic policies in the National Commission of Prognosis”</p>	
Project purpose Enhanced relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of programmes/projects financed by public funds, both EU and national budget. The project’s purpose will be achieved by the following tasks: Task 1 PHARE Interim evaluation scheme	Objectively verifiable indicators Recommendations for improving the quality of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • project design • project implementation % of recommendations successfully implemented	Sources of Verification Evaluation reports Programmes/projects progress reports	Assumptions Increased involvement, support and commitment of authorities for development of evaluation functions Stakeholders generally and key decision-makers are willing and able to use the evaluation outcomes in improving policy and strategy formulation and programmes/

<p>Task 1 specific purpose: Provision of quality information input to the key decision makers and sectors stakeholders.</p> <p>Task 2 Development of a professional evaluation community Task 2 specific purpose: Improving the knowledge and skills of both beneficiaries and providers of evaluation services.</p> <p>Task 3 Evaluation Facility Task 3 specific purpose: Strengthening the capacity to manage and implement evaluation projects.</p>	<p>No. of sectors benefiting of interim evaluation No. of stakeholders from each sector being provided with evaluation information Rate of satisfaction of the stakeholders on the quality of sector evaluation reports</p> <p>No of civil servants participating in training on evaluation implementation No of civil servants participating in training on evaluation management No. of local evaluators participating in training on evaluation implementation</p> <p>Number of successfully implemented projects No of institutions supported with evaluation projects No of Romanian evaluators participating in evaluation exercises</p>	<p>Evaluation projects progress reports Lists of distribution of the Evaluation report Feedback registered within the Evaluation progress reports</p> <p>TA progress reports – lists of participants Evaluation reports</p> <p>Project reports Internal documents of the PIU</p>	<p>projects implementation</p> <p>The evaluation outcomes are disseminated in a transparent manner to all stakeholders</p>
<p>Results</p>	<p>Objectively verifiable indicators</p>	<p>Sources of Verification</p>	<p>Assumptions</p>
<p>Results fulfilling the overall purpose</p> <p>Task 1 PHARE Interim evaluation scheme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interim Evaluation Country Summary Reports • Evaluation methodologies • Information provided to DG MACSF – Evaluation Central Unit • Interim evaluations <p>Task 2 Development of a professional evaluation community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mechanism for development of a professional evaluation community • Evaluation training courses/workshops/seminars organised • Evaluation training curricula transferred to the academic environment and trainers trained • Evaluation networks established 	<p>OVI purpose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two Interim Evaluation Country Summary Reports • Two Reports on the experience in and the applied methodologies to Evaluation • Thematic/ad-hoc evaluation reports as directed by DG MACSF – Evaluation Central Unit • Twenty (20) Sectoral Interim Evaluation Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation guidelines • No. of training topics for implementation/management • Satisfaction of participants on training curricula and delivery • No. of workshops/seminars organised • Association of evaluators and/or evaluation companies 	<p>Final sectoral evaluation reports Progress reports</p> <p>TA progress reports Training reports</p>	<p>All required conditions for a good implementation of Phare are in place.</p> <p>Evaluation cannot function well unless programming, implementation and monitoring are done appropriately.</p> <p>Raising awareness on evaluation is accomplished during the previous project and stakeholders are proactive in making use of evaluation information</p> <p>Due segregation of duties is secured in order to ensure the necessary impartiality of both the evaluation management and implementation and effective use of outcomes.</p>

<p>Task 3 Evaluation Facility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation facility mechanism • Projects/programmes evaluated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum 10 terms of reference drafted in view of commissioning evaluations • Minimum 10 evaluation reports at required qualitative standards 	<p>ToRs approved and contracts signed by the Implementing Agency</p> <p>Final and progress reports of the 10 projects</p>	
<p>Activities</p>	<p>Means</p>		<p>Assumptions</p>
<p>Task 1 PHARE Interim Evaluation Scheme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preparation of a work-plan for PHARE IE - Organisation of the kick-off seminar - Carrying on evaluation activities - Preparation of evaluation reports - Organisation of dissemination of evaluation results and de-briefing meetings on the evaluation reports. <p>Task 2 Development of a professional evaluation community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment of the capacity and needs of the Romanian evaluation community. - Designing the mechanism for development of a professional evaluation community. - Implementation of the mechanism <p>Task 3 Evaluation Facility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hands on assistance to the Evaluation Central Unit - Independent evaluations 	<p>A service contract of 2 millions EURO lasting 24 months, from March 2006 to February 2008</p> <p>A service contract of 1 million euro lasting 24 months, from March 2006 to February 2008</p> <p>A framework contract of up 100,000 euro lasting 24 months, from October 2005 to September 2007</p> <p>Series of framework contracts, each contract lasting maximum 12 months.</p>		<p>National Evaluation Strategy agreed by the main stakeholders.</p> <p>Evaluation Central Unit of MACSF able to manage the project and check the quality of the reports</p> <p>ECU – MACSF is staffed with adequate manpower in both terms of numbers of persons and structure and level of competencies.</p> <p>ECU – MACSF is dully endowed with all the necessary resources, equipments, information mechanisms and working conditions to fulfil its role</p> <p>ECU – MACSF status is fully observing the segregation of duties principle</p> <p>The Action Plan for the Implementation of the Evaluation strategy is dully implemented according to the time schedule</p> <p>Evaluators have open access to all needed sectoral information</p>

DETAILED TIME IMPLEMENTATION CHART FOR PROJECT NUMBER RO-

	2005						2006						2007						2008																																												
calendar months	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D																					
activities																																																															
Task 1 PHARE Interim Evaluation Scheme	D	D	D	D	D	D	C	C	C	C	C	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I																								
Task 2 Development of a professional evaluation community	D	D	D	D	D	D	C	C	C	C	C	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I																							
Task 3 Evaluation Facility																																																															
Contract Hands on assistance					D	D	C	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I																							
Evaluation contracts												D	D	D	D	C	C	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I																								
	<p>D = Design C = Contracting I = Implementation</p>																																																														

CUMULATIVE CONTRACTING AND DISBURSEMENT SCHEDULE (4 MEURO)

DATE:

	31/03/06	30/06/06	30/09/06	31/12/06	31/03/07	30/06/07	30/09/07	31/12/07	31/03/08	30/06/08	30/09/08	31/12/08
CONTRACTED PHARE Interim Evaluation Scheme		2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00		
DISBURSEMENT PHARE Interim Evaluation Scheme		1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.6	1.6	1.8	1.8	2.00		
CONTRACTED Development of a professional evaluation community		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		
DISBURSEMENT Development of a professional evaluation community		0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.00		

CONTRACTED Evaluation Facility	0.2	0.2	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0					
DISBURSEMENT Evaluation Facility		0.2	0.2	0.5	0.7	0.9	1.0					

List of relevant laws and regulations

Through GD No 208/2005 on the organisation and functioning of the Ministry of Public Finance, *the Managing Authority for Community Support Framework* has been re-organised. Related to evaluation, the *Unit for System Coordination and Evaluation* has been set up.

The GD No 497/2004 establishes evaluation attributions for the Managing Authority for Community Support Framework and the Managing Authorities for operational programmes.

List of relevant strategic plans and studies

Action Plan for the take over of PHARE interim evaluation within the general approach of establishing the National Evaluation System

National Evaluation Strategy – to be elaborated within the project PHARE RO 2003/005-551.03.03 “Technical Assistance for programming, monitoring and evaluation”