



**European Union**

European Regional  
Development Fund  
Investing in your future

## **INTERREG IVA Programme**

# **GUIDANCE NOTE 12 ON MONITORING, REPORTING AND EVALUATION**

## **G12/IIVA**

### **1.0 Introduction**

This guidance note sets out the monitoring and reporting requirements for the delivery of the INTERREG IVA Programme and it informs the Intermediate Body and other programme authorities of their responsibilities in relation to providing information to the Managing Authority for reporting purposes. The purpose of this guidance note is to provide notice of the key elements of the reporting calendar to enable programme bodies plan their reporting activities.

### **2.0 Maintenance of the database.**

The primary reporting tool for the programme is the System 2007 database. Where possible the Managing Authority will commission reports from the database to supply the information required. Consequently, it is essential that the database is maintained and kept up to date, particularly in relation to the approval of projects and reporting against indicators.

### **3.0 Managing Authority Reporting Requirements**

The Managing Authority has a number of key reporting cycles:

#### **3.1 Monthly Reports for Monitoring Committees**

In order to ensure that Monitoring Committee members are updated regarding programme implementation, the Managing Authority issues a monthly report during the first week of the following month. This report provides information relating to both the physical and financial progress of the programme and also highlights any programme management issues which are being addressed by the Managing Authority and the Intermediate Body. A table of information requirements to complete the monthly report is below:

<b>Information Need</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Responsible Manager</b>
Dates of Steering Committees	Supplied Manually	JTS Programme Manager (Monaghan) JTS Programme Manager (Belfast)
Details of applications received	Systems 2007	
Details of projects approved by Steering Committee	Supplied Manually	
Details of LoO's issued	Systems 2007	
Date of next Steering Committee (if known)	Supplied Manually	
Dates of future planned calls (if known)	Supplied Manually	
Expenditure details	Systems 2007	

The Managing Authority expects to move to quarterly reporting during 2010 when it is expected that full programme implementation will be in place.

#### **3.2 Monitoring Committee Papers**

Monitoring Committees are usually held on a bi-annual basis in April and October each year. Papers are required to be distributed 3 weeks in advance of the meeting; therefore, the Managing Authority requires updated information 1 month prior to the

meeting, in September and March each year. The table below outlines the information required and responsibilities for producing it:

Information Need	Source	Responsible Manager
<b>Programme Implementation Information</b>		
Dates of Steering Committees	Supplied Manually	JTS Programme Manager (Monaghan) JTS Programme Manager (Belfast)
Details of applications received	Systems 2007	
Details of projects approved by Steering Committee	Supplied Manually	
Details of LoO's issued	Systems 2007	
Date of next Steering Committee (if known)	Supplied Manually	
Dates of future planned calls (if known)	Supplied Manually	
Project Summaries	Supplied Manually	
<b>Managing Authority*</b>		
Programme monitoring information*	Systems 2007	Managing Authority Programmes Manager in consultation with NISRA
<b>Programme Finance</b>		
Commitment figures	Systems 2007	Programmes Manager (Managing Authority)
Expenditure details	Systems 2007	Programmes Manager (Managing Authority)

\*Programme monitoring information must be updated on the System 2007 database quarterly. It is the responsibility of the relevant Intermediate Body manager to ensure that this is done in time to meet programme reporting requirements.

### 3.3 Annual Implementation Report

The Annual Implementation Report (AIR) is due to be with the Commission by 30<sup>th</sup> June each year<sup>1</sup>. Ongoing work begins on the AIR in January each year with the target that a draft report will be tabled at the April Monitoring Committee meeting for approval. Therefore, the Managing Authority requires up to date information on the preceding year

<sup>1</sup> Article 67 – Annual Report and Final Report on Implementation – Council Regulation (EC) No: 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006.

by the end of February. The table below outlines the information required and the responsibilities for providing it:

<b>Information Need</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Responsible Manager</b>
<b>Managing Authority</b>		
Summary of Monitoring Committee activity	Supplied Manually	Managing Authority Programmes Manager
Summary of Working Group activity	Supplied Manually	
Report on Managing Authority implementation	Supplied Manually	
Summary of economic and political context	Supplied Manually	
Report on complementarity with other instruments	Supplied Manually	
Analysis of implementation of Priority 3 (Technical Assistance)	Supplied Manually	
Cumulative Breakdown of allocations of the Community contribution by category (see template below) <sup>2</sup>	Supplied Manually	
Priority Axis by Sources of Funding (see template below) <sup>3</sup>	Supplied Manually	
Report on indicators <sup>4</sup>	Systems 2007 / Manual Commentary	Managing Authority Programmes Manager in association with NISRA
Report on context indicators	Supplied Manually	
Development Path Analysis report	Supplied Manually	
<b>JTS</b>		
Qualitative report on implementation by Theme	Supplied Manually	JTS Programme Manager (Monaghan) JTS Programme Manager (Belfast)
Case studies by theme	Supplied Manually	

<sup>2</sup> In the format specified in Annex 1 of this Guidance Note and Annex II (Categorisation of Funds Assistance for 2007-13) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1828/2006

<sup>3</sup> In the format specified in Annex 2 of this Guidance Note Annex XVI (Financial Plans for Operational Programmes) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1828/2006

<sup>4</sup> In the format specified in Annex XVIII (Annual and Final Reporting) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1828/2006

Dates of Steering Committees held	Supplied Manually	
Dates of calls	Supplied Manually	
Details of applications received	Systems 2007	
Details of projects approved by Steering Committee	Supplied Manually	
Details of LoO's issued	Systems 2007	
<b>Certifying Authority</b>		
Summary of claims, payments and analysis (see template below) <sup>5</sup>	Supplied Manually	Certifying Authority Manager
<b>Communications</b>		
Information and publicity update		Communications Manager

### 3.4 Ad hoc Reports

The Managing Authority frequently receives request for Programme reports on an ad hoc basis. This is to facilitate responses to Assembly Questions (AQs), Parliamentary Questions (PQs), NSMC or requests from the Commission, the Monitoring Committee, Accountable Departments, Member States or other stakeholders. Where possible, the Managing Authority will access this information from the database, however, there may be occasions when information will have to be sought from the Intermediate Body.

## 4.0 Reporting Requirements for Lead Partners

The following are the requirements for Lead Partners to report to the JTS:

### 4.1 Quarterly Reports

The JTS require a quarterly progress report to accompany the quarterly claim for payment from the Lead Partners. These progress reports should be cumulative for the projects and report on progress over the previous quarter.

### 4.2 Evaluation Reports

---

<sup>5</sup> In the format specified in Annex 3 of this Guidance Note

Each lead partner will be required to propose indicators which would be used to monitor and evaluate the operation. These indicators will be drawn from the Programme/Priority indicators, alongside others more specific to the operation. These indicators should emerge from a facilitated meeting with NISRA. To supplement these indicators, each Lead Partner will be responsible for undertaking three concise evaluative reports:

***Evaluation Report 1:*** Agreement of Indicators - This report is to be produced within the first six months of the operation and should detail the results of the facilitated meeting and the agreed project level indicators.

***Evaluation Report 2:*** At the midterm stage of the operation these indicators and progress will be reviewed and an updated report should be produced commenting on progress achieved to date against the indicators and baselines agreed in Report 1.

***Evaluation Report 3:*** Upon completion of the operation/project there is a requirement for a post project evaluation (PPE). The details of this are outlined in section 5.0 below and in Annex IV. The post project evaluation constitutes the final report.

These operation level reports will be used extensively by the Managing Authority in the production of Programme level information for progress reports, AIRs and evaluations. This bottom-up approach should provide a fuller indication of the overall impact of the INTERREG IVA Programme.

## **5.0 Evaluation**

### **5.1 Introduction**

This Guidance Note aims to clarify the role of Evaluation in the INTERREG IVA Programme. It is written to comply with Council Regulation (EC) No: 1083/2006 Articles 47-49 and with the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan that has been approved for the Programme. The Managing Authority recognizes the importance of effective evaluation for the Programme. However, in light of the current economic environment the maximum amount of funding should be made available for front line services and consultants fees kept to a minimum.

## 5.2 Definition of Evaluation

The European Commission in 2006, through EVALSED, the online and interactive resource for the evaluation of socio-economic development, defines evaluation as,

*'Judgement on the value of a (usually) public intervention with reference to criteria and explicit standards (e.g. its relevance, efficiency, sustainability, equity etc.). The judgement usually concerns the needs which have to be met by the intervention, and the effects produced by it. The evaluation is based on information which is specially collected and interpreted to support the judgement.'*

Evaluation is an exercise that assesses the relevance, performance and success of ongoing and completed programmes. An important aspect of evaluation involves the interrogation of the information from monitoring and other sources to find out and explain the effects of the interventions. Article 47[2] outlines that evaluation should centre on two functions; strategic and operational.

The **strategic** function should assess the contribution of the OP to domestic and European strategies. From an EU perspective, it is important that evaluation can show the contribution of Structural Funds in Northern Ireland and the Border Region. In addition, the impact of the programme needs to be considered in light of the domestic policy context to identify areas of synergy as well as additionality with respect to Structural Funds interventions and the domestic economy. It may focus on macro-economic impacts at an operational level or specific strategic themes within the OP (such as innovation), or horizontal priorities (equality of opportunity, environmental sustainability).

The **operational** function of evaluation is a key mechanism for improving programme implementation. This would focus on how the programmes are delivered and would include analysis of financial and physical data to ensure we are meeting targets, as well as making recommendations to improve performance. It should also assess the administrative functions and the quality of implementing mechanisms.

Evaluation must address a set of specific issues in order to adequately assess the delivery of a programme/project and fulfil the above requirements. Key issues identified by the Commission include:

- **Relevance:** How relevant are the programme/project's objectives in relation to evolving needs and priorities at a national and EU level?
- **Efficiency:** What mechanisms have been used to turn resources into outputs or results?
- **Effectiveness:** How far has the programme/project achieved its specific and global objectives?
- **Utility:** Did the programme/project have an impact on the target groups or populations in relation to their needs?
- **Sustainability:** To what extent can the changes (or benefits) be expected to last after the programme/project has been completed?
- **Added Value:** Would the intervention have happened without financial assistance?
- **Synergy:** Has the programme/project complemented and enhanced in any way the effect of other related domestic policies?

### 5.3 Evaluation at the Strategic/Programme Level

The Managing Authority, where appropriate, will carry out evaluations of the Programme/Theme/Priority/Group of Actions/major projects level throughout the life of the INTERREG IVA Programme. These evaluations will be conducted in line with the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, the requests of the INTERREG IVA Monitoring Committee and the work of the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group comprises of Members and Advisors of the Monitoring Committee and relevant experts. It acts as a source of specialist advice to the Monitoring Committee and has the capacity to commission informative research and evaluations relevant to their area of interest. The Working Group also contributes to

the overall monitoring and planning of actions arising from reviews and is an important contributor to the coordination of the Operational Programmes. All evaluations are presented to the Monitoring Committee and made available on the SEUPB website.

#### **5.4 Evaluation at the Operational/Project Level**

Every project in the INTERREG IVA Programme is required to have a Post Project Evaluation (PPE). This evaluation equates to a final project report and a template for this is enclosed in Annex IV. PPE's should be concise reports and carried out by the Lead Partner. In accordance with The Northern Ireland Guide to Expenditure Appraisal and Evaluation (NIGEAE), the PPE should be completed within six months of the end of the project. Where possible, the PPE should be led by an individual independent of the Project and Project Team. The Managing Authority recognises that this may not be possible for every project and therefore in these instances the Managing Authority will review all PPE's to provide the level of independence required. External or independent consultants should only be employed when it is necessary and offers value for money.

Where it is deemed necessary and in agreement with the Managing Authority, external and independent evaluators may be commissioned in relation to project level evaluation. The principle of proportionality should be applied in that the amount of funding allocated to evaluation should be proportional to the total amount of funding allocated to the overall project. Project budgets may be utilised for evaluation, where these are identified in Letters of Offer. It is envisaged that where external or independent evaluators are utilised that costs would normally be in the range of €3,000 to €6,000.

Where budgets have already been agreed in relation to evaluations that exceed the range listed above, Lead Partners should agree a budget re-profile with the JTS and reallocate funding towards front line services where possible. If contracts have already been agreed with evaluators then Lead Partners will be required to honour those contracts.

#### **5.5 Process of Approval for External or Independent Evaluators**

If it is deemed necessary to commission external or independent evaluators, then the Lead Partner is required to implement the following steps in the approval process:

**Step 1:** A project level evaluation budget will have been approved by the Steering Committee and detailed in the Letter of Offer.

**Step 2:** The Lead Partner will draft a Terms of Reference and forward it to their Case Officer for approval. The Case Officer will consult with the Managing Authority and NISRA to obtain approvals, prior to the project proceeding to advertising or seeking quotes for the contract.

**Step 3:** When all relevant approvals have been granted, the Lead Partner may proceed to tendering for the appropriate external/independent evaluator.

**Issue Date: 16 March 2010**

**Annex 1**

**AIR Template 1 - Cumulative Breakdown of allocations of the community contribution by category.**

**Commission Reference No:** CCI 2007 CB 163 PO 047

**Name of Programme** – EU Programme for Cross-Border Territorial Co-operation (INTERREG IVA) Northern Ireland, the Border Region of Ireland and Western Scotland

**Date of last Commission Decision for the Operational Programme concerned:** 6 November 2007

<b>Combination of codes of dimension 1 to 5</b>										
<b>Dimension 1</b> Priority Theme		<b>Dimension 2</b> Form of Finance		<b>Dimension 3</b> Territory		<b>Dimension 4</b> Economic Activity		<b>Dimension 5</b> Location		<b>Amount</b>
Co de	Amount (€)	Code	Amount (€)	Code	Amount (€)		N/A		N/A	
3*		01		08						
5		01		08						
9		01		08						
10		01		08						
23		01		08						
39		01		08						
42		01		08						
43		01		08						
48		01		08						
51		01		08						
54		01		08						
57		01		08						
58		01		08						
61		01		08						
76		01		08						
81		01		08						
85		01		08						
86		01		08						
									<b>Total</b>	

\* For code description, see Operational Programme

## Annex 2

### AIR Template 2 - Priority axes by source of funding (EUR)

	Expenditure paid out by the beneficiaries included in payment claims sent to the managing authority	Corresponding public contribution	Private expenditure	Expenditure paid by the body responsible for making payments to the beneficiaries	Total payments received from the Commission
<b>Priority Axis 1</b> <b>Co-operation for a more prosperous cross-border region</b>  <b>Of which ESF type expenditure</b>  <b>Of which ERDF type expenditure</b>					
<b>Priority Axis 2</b> <b>Co-operation for a sustainable cross-border region</b>  <b>Of which ESF type expenditure</b>  <b>Of which ERDF type expenditure</b>					
<b>Priority Axis 3</b> <b>Technical Assistance</b>  <b>Of which ESF type expenditure</b>  <b>Of which ERDF type expenditure</b>					
<b>Grand Total</b>					
<b>Total in transitional regions in the grand total</b>					
<b>Total non-transitional regions in the grand total</b>					
<b>ESF type expenditure in the grand total where the Operational Programme is co-financed by the ERDF</b>					
<b>ERDF type expenditure in the grand total where the Operational Programme is co-financed by the ESF</b>					

### Annex 3

#### AIR Template 3 - Summary of Claims, Payments and Advances.

Date of Claim / Advance	Amount Claimed €	Paid €	Not Paid €

## Annex 4

# **STRUCTURE OF THE POST PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT**

### **1. Title page**

- Report title, author and date

### **2. Contents page**

### **3. Executive Summary**

- A few paragraphs summarising the report, including key findings, strengths and weakness of the project and recommendations for future actions.

### **4. Information on the Project**

Include the following:

- A Brief history of the project and key stages in development of the project
- Assessment of Need: Provide a brief description of the need for your project (as per application form and any other needs analysis undertaken during the lifetime of the project).
- Relevance: Detail how your project is relevant to the identified need. Include a description of the projects main activities and intended objectives linking them to the overall theme and programme objectives.
- Risk Assessment: Detail the related risks identified for your project, highlighting if any of these has an impact on the outcome of the project (as per application form and any additional analysis undertaken during the lifetime of the project)

### **5. Impacts/Outcomes of the Project**

- Outline the key achievements and impact of the project by reporting against the targets, milestones and project plan as set out in the Letter of Offer. Has the project achieved what it set out to do? This should

include benefits to project participant, benefits to the sector (where appropriate) and potential strategic benefits at a local or national level. Include an explanation of any over or under achievement of targets.

- Comment on the **Value for Money and Added Value of the project.** Could some or all of the outcomes have been achieved without the financial assistance received from Interreg IVA? Could the identified outcome have been achieved at less cost or could a greater output have been delivered for the same cost?
- **Synergy:** How did the project complement other work being carried out in the area sector? What new ways of working/ partnerships/ relationships have been created as a result of this project?
- Outline any learning points, strengths and weaknesses, good practice and methodologies which could be transferred to other projects

## 6. Sustainability

- Briefly outline the project's future, following funding. Will the project continue or has it reached a natural end? If it will continue, how will it be funded in the future?