

PMC/02/03

PEACE III Programme (2007-2013)

Programme Monitoring Committee Meeting

23 April 2008

Agenda Item 7

PAPER: DRAFT MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN

INFORMATION

With regard to recommendations contained in Article 66 of Council Regulation (EC) 1083/2006) and Commission working documents the Managing Authority has developed a detailed draft Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for the programme. The plan will be reviewed by the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group on an on-going basis.

PURPOSE

To provide Monitoring Committee members with information on the Managing Authority's draft Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

Members of The Monitoring Committee are requested to note the content of the draft Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.

PEACE III

**EU Programme for Peace and Reconciliation
2007-13**

Northern Ireland and the Border Region of Ireland

Draft Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

Special EU Programmes Body

January 2007

Contents *Page numbers to be added*

1. Introduction
 2. Role of Monitoring and Evaluation
 3. Ex-ante evaluation
 4. On-going evaluation
 5. Ex-post evaluation
 6. On-going monitoring
 7. Environmental monitoring
 8. Equality monitoring
 9. Quality
 10. Dissemination
 11. Resources
- Annex A Monitoring indicators for PEACE III
- Annex B Definitions and methods of collection
- Annex C Planned evaluations
-

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This evaluation plan results from the recommendations contained in the European Regulations (Article 48[1] Council Regulation 1083/2006) and the European Commission's working documents¹. In the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy presented in the Operational Programme, the Managing Authority gave a commitment to produce a more detailed Evaluation Plan for the Programme. This plan draws on lessons learnt from the previous programmes. The plan will be agreed by the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group (MEWG), a sub-group reporting to the Programme Monitoring Committee (PMC) for the PEACE III Operational Programme (OP), and will be revised on an annual basis.
- 1.2. Evaluation is not just an activity carried out to comply with the regulatory requirements set out by the European Commission, but is a valuable programming tool which adds to the Structural Funds implementation and management processes. With timely, accurate and appropriate monitoring data, evaluation can be used to ensure Programmes are meeting their objectives.

2. Role of Monitoring and Evaluation

- 2.1. As stated in the EU Commission working documents², 'monitoring and evaluation are two closely related concepts'. It is important therefore to have clear definitions for them both. EVALSED³ provides the following definition of monitoring:

'An exhaustive and regular examination of the resources, outputs and

¹ European Commission, (2006): The New Programming Period 2007-13, Indicative Guidelines on Evaluation Methods: Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators, Working Document No. 2 and European Commission, (2006): The New Programming Period 2007-13: Indicative Guidelines on Evaluation Methods: Evaluation during the Programme Period, Working Document No. 5

² European Commission, (2006): The New Programming Period 2007-13, Indicative Guidelines on Evaluation Methods: Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators, Working Document No. 2

³ European Commission, (2006): EVALSED: the online and interactive resource for the evaluation of socio-economic development (published on the Internet at: www.evaled.com)

results of public interventions. Monitoring is based on a system of coherent information including reports, reviews, balance sheets, indicators, etc. Monitoring system information is obtained primarily from operators and is used essentially for steering public interventions.'

2.2. Monitoring is essentially the checking of outturns against expectations. Monitoring is generally straightforward if objectives and expectations are clear. The monitoring system for the EU Programmes consists of indicators which are used by the Managing Authority to assess the performance of a Programme.

2.3. The EU Commission defines an indicator as 'the measurement of an objective to be met, a resource mobilized, an effect obtained, a gauge of quality or a context variable'. There are three types of non-financial monitoring indicators – output, result and impact indicators. Output indicators are a measurement of initial directly-funded activity whereas result indicators are a measurement of the interim direct and immediate effects on direct beneficiaries. Impact indicators measure the longer-term effects arising from the funded actions, and these can either be directly linked to the action taken and the direct beneficiaries or be longer-term effects affecting the wider population.

2.4. The definition of evaluation provided by EVALSED⁴ is:

'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.'

⁴ European Commission, (2006): EVALSED: the online and interactive resource for the evaluation of socio-economic development (published on the Internet at: www.evaled.com)

- 2.5. Evaluation is an exercise that assesses the relevance, performance and success of on-going 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.
- 2.6. 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).
- 2.7. 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.
- 2.8. Evaluation must address a set of specific issues in order to adequately assess the delivery of a programme and fulfil the above requirements. Key issues identified by the Commission include:
- **Relevance:** How relevant are the programme'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 achieved its specific and global objectives?
- **Utility:** Did the programme 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 has been completed?
- **Added Value:** Would the intervention have happened without financial assistance?
- **Synergy:** Has the Programme complemented and enhanced in any way the effect of other related domestic policies?

2.9. Evaluation of the Structural Funds can be broken down into three phases: ex-ante, on-going and ex-post evaluation. For each phase, evaluations have to address a set of specific issues about the performance of the programmes. The following sections detail how the three phases of evaluation are being implemented in Peace III, with further sections covering on-going monitoring, as well as the monitoring of environment and equality within the Programme.

3. Ex-ante evaluation

3.1. An ex-ante evaluation is key to the development of a Programme. The purpose of an ex-ante evaluation is to optimise the allocation of resources and to improve the quality of programming. The main concerns should be the relevance of the Programme strategy, the likely effectiveness of the Programme and an assessment of the potential impact. The ex-ante evaluation should also comment on the proposed implementation systems and identify any potential risks. An ex-ante evaluation is required by the Commission and is the

responsibility of the Managing Authority (Article 48 of Regulation 1083/2006).

3.2. Ex-ante evaluators for Peace III were appointed at the beginning of the planning process and worked closely with the programme development team. The ex-ante was an iterative process and the evaluators provided feedback and guidance, both informally and through written reports.

3.3. *Include short paragraph on the main conclusions and recommendations from the ex-ante*

3.4. The final version of the ex-ante evaluation has been included in the final version of the PEACE III OP.

4. On-going evaluation

4.1. In the 2000-06 Programming period there was a requirement for each Programme to carry out a formal mid-term evaluation (MTE). This evaluation examined the initial results of the assistance provided, their relevance and the extent to which the targets had been attained. It also assessed the use of the financial resources and the operation of monitoring and implementation. The MTE had to be carried out by an independent assessor and submitted to the Commission no later than 31 December 2003. A further requirement of the regulations was to produce an update of the MTE by 31 December 2005.

4.2. Given the delayed start to Peace II (mid 2002), the MTE was required very early in the implementation of the Programme. As a result, the focus of the evaluation was on process rather than impact.

4.3. The mid-term update of Peace III provided an update on the implementation of the recommendations made by the mid-term evaluation and assessed the impact and added value of the

Programme.

- 4.4. In the 2007-13 Programmes, there is no longer a need for a mid-term evaluation or mid-term evaluation update. They have been replaced with on-going evaluation, creating a shift from regulation-based to more pragmatic and concrete needs-based evaluation (Article 48[3] of Regulation 1083/2006).
- 4.5. The Commission⁵ defines on-going evaluation as a process that takes the form of a series of evaluation exercises. Its purpose is to track the implementation and delivery of the OPs on an on-going basis and highlight any changes due to external factors that may impact on the deliverables (results, targets) of the OPs. It should also react to these changes by taking corrective action if necessary. It is also expected to complement monitoring activity and aid decision making.
- 4.6. Although the Commission recommends on-going evaluation it also asks for a flexible approach to evaluation. Evaluation will be undertaken and designed in accordance with the needs of each Member State. But Member States must be proactive in identifying real or potential difficulties which could lead to evaluation. The demand may come from policy (strategic) issues or more specific operational issues.
- 4.7. However, the Commission identified two specific cases when evaluation must be carried out:
- i. where the monitoring of operational programmes reveals a significant departure from the initial annual goals/targets set:

‘During the programming period, Member States shall carry out evaluations linked to the monitoring of operational programmes

⁵ European Commission, (2006): The New Programming Period 2007-13: Indicative Guidelines on Evaluation Methods: Evaluation during the Programme Period, Working Document No. 5

in particular where that monitoring reveals a significant departure from the goals initially set or where proposals are made for the revision of operational programmes, as referred to in Article 33. The results shall be sent to the monitoring committee for the operational programme and to the Commission'⁶.

ii. when operational programme revisions are proposed:

'At the initiative of the Member State or the Commission in agreement with the Member State concerned, Operational Programmes may be re-examined and, if necessary, the remainder of the programme revised, in one or more of the following cases:

- a) following significant socio-economic changes;
- b) in order to take greater or different account of major changes in Community, national or regional priorities;
- c) in the light of the evaluation referred to in Article 48[3]; or
- d) following implementation difficulties'⁷.

4.8. Monitoring and evaluating the previous EU Programmes for Peace and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland and Ireland has not been straightforward. The PEACE Programmes are unique amongst EU Structural Fund Programmes in their aims and objectives, and as a result do not easily lend themselves to the type of measurement and quantification that can be applied to more conventional economic and social development programmes. This is particularly true when it comes to assessing the impacts of the interventions.

4.9. These difficulties were recognised in recent evaluations such as the Mid-Term Update Evaluation for PEACE II and the Ex-Ante Evaluation for PEACE III. Despite this, significant efforts were made throughout

⁶ Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006, Article 48[3]

⁷ Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006, Article 33[1]

the implementation of the PEACE II Programme to obtain more information, both quantitative and qualitative, on the impacts of the assistance. It was recognised, however, that further steps should be taken to develop an appropriate monitoring and evaluation plan that is integrated with the implementation of the PEACE III Programme from the outset.

- 4.10. In an effort to inform this issue, the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group of the PEACE II Monitoring Committee commissioned consultants PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) to develop a monitoring and evaluation framework for peace building. The report⁸ from this exercise together with lessons learned from current and previous experience, and the findings of the ex-ante evaluation for PEACE III, have all informed the development of this plan for monitoring and evaluating PEACE III.
- 4.11. The PwC report assesses a range of different internationally used approaches for monitoring and evaluating peace building outcomes, which can be applied at different levels (project, programme or strategic) and stages of the programme cycle (planning, implementation or monitoring and evaluation). The approaches assessed include Theories of Change, Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA), Conflict Sensitivity Analysis and The Aid for Peace Approach. While discussing the differences between these methodologies, the report recognises that there is operational overlap between them.
- 4.12. PwC conclude that five of the approaches are potentially applicable to the Northern Ireland/Ireland context. However, the principal recommendation was that the Aid for Peace Approach to evaluation should be adopted. This technique is known as third generation PCIA.

⁸ PriceWaterhouseCoopers LLP, 2007, A monitoring and evaluation framework for peace building, Final Report

- 4.13. PCIA is a methodology first developed by Kenneth Bush in 1996⁹. It is a means of anticipating, monitoring and evaluating the ways in which an intervention may affect or has affected the dynamics of peace or conflict in a region. PCIA can help to identify and understand the impact of an initiative on peace or conflict. It is a process which must be integrated into every stage of the project cycle – design, implementation and evaluation.
- 4.14. The Third Generation PCIA: Aid for Peace Approach, developed by Thania Paffenholz¹⁰, builds on PCIA, as well as other evaluation methodologies. It focuses on assessing the needs for peace building in a given country or area and then tailoring the intervention's objectives and activities to these needs by identifying their peace building relevance and developing appropriate indicators. There are four key stages:
- Peace building needs analysis
 - Peace building relevance assessment
 - Conflict risk assessment
 - Peace and conflict effects assessment
- 4.15. The Aid for Peace Approach shaped the development of Peace III at the programme level. It is now imperative to ensure that this is carried through to the implementation of the programme at the theme and project levels. To this end, it is intended that these stages will be applied at these lower micro levels as and where appropriate. Therefore, prior to the issue of a letter of offer, each lead partner of a project or operation will be taken through these four key stages of Aid for Peace by a facilitator. Namely, the lead partner will be asked to identify their current understanding of the conflict in their area and the peace building needs the project is seeking to address; assess how the project is relevant to these needs; identify any risks for the project

⁹ Bush, K. (1996) *Good Practices for the PCIA of Development Projects*, CIDA Discussion Paper, OECD DAC Taskforce on Conflict, Peace, and Development Cooperation, Paris, 16-17 September

¹⁰ Paffenholz, T. (2005) *Third Generation PCIA: Introducing the Aid for Peace Approach*, <http://www.berghot-handbook.net>

and to evaluate the conflict and peace building effects of the project including identifying appropriate indicators. Each operation will have a minimum of three evaluative reports – one at the initial stages of the operation, one at the mid-point of implementation and one at operation completion.

- 4.16. The 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 PEACE III Programme.
- 4.17. Although a formal mid-term evaluation is no longer required by the Commission, the Managing Authority are committed to conducting an evaluation of the Programme during its life-cycle. The timing of this evaluation must be balanced between having sufficient progress within the Programme for an assessment of its performance to be carried out while also allowing time for amendments for the Programme to be made as a result of recommendations. The Managing Authority will take advice from the MEWG on this timing, although it would be expected that it will be late 2010/early 2011.
- 4.18. The Managing Authority plan to conduct an evaluation of the locally-led projects funded under Priority 1, Theme 1. These projects will be multi-annual plans, with the first plans covering 2007-2010. An evaluation of these projects will be carried out towards the end of 2010 to assess the overall impact of these projects, to make an assessment of continuing need for funding and whether this method of funding is the most appropriate for the second half of the Programme.
- 4.19. It may be necessary to undertake ad-hoc evaluations at a programme level or priority level. The necessity for these would be dictated by a range of factors resulting from, for example, the annual review process or under-performance of a priority. It is essential to retain flexibility in

how and when these evaluations are undertaken in order for specific programme and priority issues to be addressed and to maintain efficiency and effectiveness. Therefore the methodology for the ad-hoc evaluations cannot be prescriptive at this stage, particularly with regard to qualitative data which can provide useful additional information. However, it is recognized that these evaluations must cover minimum basic standards in relation to quality. This is discussed in a further section.

- 4.20. In addition to specific activity-focused evaluation, thematic evaluation may also be undertaken to cover the horizontal themes of the Programme (cross-border co-operation; equality of opportunity; sustainable development; impact on poverty and partnership) as well as vertical issues targeted by each of the priorities in respect of the over-arching programme aims.

5. Ex-post evaluation

- 5.1. The aim of the ex-post evaluation is to compare the expected objectives with those actually achieved by looking at the impact and utilisation of resources to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the assistance. The evaluation will cover the factors which contributed to the overall success or failure of implementation and the achievements and results, including their sustainability. This evaluation must be carried out by an independent evaluator within three years of the end of the programming period. The Commission has primary responsibility for the ex-post evaluation in collaboration with the Managing Authority (Article 49 of Regulation 1083/2006).

6. On-going monitoring

- 6.1. Alongside the development of the programme, and the ex-ante evaluation, work was carried out to produce a suite of indicators at priority and sub-priority level which could be used for the on-going monitoring of the programme. These indicators, and their targets, were informed by a number of pieces of research and a range of processes. Namely, experience gained in monitoring PEACE I and PEACE II; a Logical Framework exercise carried out as part of the development of the PEACE III OP; various commissioned consultant and academic reports¹¹; the Ex-Ante Evaluation for PEACE III, and consultation responses to the draft PEACE III OP which included comments from existing PEACE II implementing bodies.
- 6.2. The result of this work is a comprehensive list of monitoring indicators at theme level, within priorities (Annex A). In addition, a more detailed paper has been produced (Annex B) providing a definition for each indicator, as well as detailing how the information for each indicator should be collected, by whom, how often and where the information should be recorded. *Annex B is to be added and will include short sections on the applications and monitoring database, Equality Monitoring Forms, Attitudinal Survey.*
- 6.3. The letter of offer process will be used to agree relevant monitoring indicators and targets with each operation. These will be clearly informed by the implementation of the Aid for Peace approach at this level. Operation leaders will be expected to provide updated information on their indicators on a six-monthly basis. This will allow an assessment to be made of how the project is progressing towards targets and highlight any particular areas of concern where action may be required.
- 6.4. The PEACE III OP acknowledges that other changes, in addition to those implemented through the PEACE Programme, need to occur as

¹¹ Including PWC's Monitoring and Evaluation Framework; and PEACE III Guidelines and Assessment Framework, C
Knox University of Ulster.

part of the process towards building a peaceful and stable society. Similarly, the PEACE III programme operates within a broad context, much of which is outside the control of the programme. In order to provide contextual information for the environment within which the programme is being implemented a series of context indicators has been established. It is important to note that these are not designed to be measures of the success or otherwise of the PEACE III interventions, but can provide useful information on the wider picture in the region.

- 6.5. Progress reports, based on data collated from the monitoring system, will be produced for each monitoring committee meeting. These will describe, for each theme and priority, the progress that has been made as well as analysis of where progress is either notably good or below expectation.
- 6.6. Annual monitoring information will be used to complete the Annual Implementation Reports (AIRs), which must include the progress made in implementing the OP in relation to the specific, verifiable targets, using the indicators at priority level¹². Again, the process of on-going evaluation through the implementation of Aid for Peace at the operational level will be summarized and reported here also.

7. Environmental monitoring

- 7.1. Sustainable development cuts across the objectives of all of the EU Structural Fund Programmes including Peace III. It is important to monitor the effect of the programme on this cross-cutting issue and to identify the extent to which sustainability is mainstreamed into the outworkings of the programme. In developing the programme, a Strategic Environmental Assessment was conducted. This highlighted

¹² Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006, Article 67[2]

the need to monitor a selected number of environmentally focused indicators.

- 7.2. In addition to the above monitoring, the Environmental Working Group of the 2000-2006 NI Community Support Framework recommended that the use of Development Path Analysis (DPA), as a technique for monitoring environmental impacts of programmes, should be continued in the monitoring of the 2007-2013 programmes in Northern Ireland.
- 7.3. DPA is a tool that helps to transform patterns of economic and social development. In the past, it was often the case that development was pursued at the expense of the natural environment. Many now realise that, if it is to be sustainable, development must go hand in hand with environmental protection. Within the Northern Ireland Structural Funds programmes, both in the 2000-2006 period and in the current 2007-2013 timeframe, DPA is the primary tool to be used to help guide the region toward a more environmentally sustainable path of development. It is also the main tool for monitoring the extent to which this transformation is taking place.
- 7.4. DPA is based on an assumption that certain patterns of development, or “development paths,” are more environmentally sustainable than others and that regions have choices about which path to pursue. The tool recognises six development paths.

Path A: Actions that promote activities that simply meet environmental regulations.

Path B: Actions that clean up the mess from past activities or actions that promote physical regeneration.

Path C: Actions that put in place environmental infrastructure to reduce the negative environmental impact of development activities.

- Path D: Actions that help organisations to meet increasing environmental standards.
- Path E: Actions that improve the resource efficiency (“eco-efficiency”) of existing activities.
- Path F: Actions that support, as well as encourage, new types of activity or behaviour using fewer environmental resources, or producing less pollution, than existing activities in the area.

7.5. The objective of the tool is to help shift activity away from Path A and toward activity under Path F. Path A is activity that simply meets minimum environmental regulations and, therefore, makes a minimal contribution to environmental sustainability. Path F makes a significant contribution; it is activity that pursues environmental protection at the same time as it pursues economic and social development. The paths in between are paths that mitigate the impact of existing activity in some way.

7.6. As part of the selection process, each project approved by PEACE III will be assigned to a development path. The budgets of the projects will then be added together to give a profile of the amount of funding committed under each path. This will be monitored on a regular basis and reported to the programme monitoring committee.

8. Equality Monitoring

8.1. Similarly to environment, the protection and promotion of gender equality cuts across each of the EU structural fund programmes. In addition in Northern Ireland, Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998 requires that all public authorities shall, in carrying out its functions relating to Northern Ireland, have due regard to the need to promote equality of opportunity:

- between persons of different religious belief, political opinion, racial group, age, marital status or sexual orientation;
 - between men and women generally;
 - between persons with a disability and persons without; and
 - between persons with dependants and persons without.
- 8.2. Section 75 also requires public authorities to “have regard to the desirability of promoting good relations between persons of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group.”
- 8.3. In Ireland, the Equal Status Act (2000), as amended by the Equality Act (2004) also applies.
- 8.4. As noted above, balanced participation by men and women, and accessibility for disabled persons, are central requirements of the EU Structural Funds Regulations. In addition, Article 16 of General Regulation No 1083/2006 states that “the Member States and the Commission shall take appropriate steps to prevent any discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation during the various stages of implementation of the Funds, and, in particular, in the access to them”.
- 8.5. In order to ensure that the principle of equality of opportunity is embedded within every aspect of programme implementation, equality is one of the cross-cutting themes of PEACE III. For the impact of equality of opportunity to be assessed, monitoring data must be gathered and reported on to the Programme Monitoring Committees.
- 8.6. Where projects clearly have individual beneficiaries monitoring data will be collected using a short, anonymised questionnaire designed to reflect Equality Commission best practice. The questionnaires will be returned in a Freepost envelope to the Northern Ireland Statistics and

Research Agency (NISRA), who will analyse the returns.

- 8.7. However, individual beneficiaries may be less clear for projects that aim to benefit a larger population on an ongoing basis, e.g. infrastructure projects may benefit large numbers of people who cannot be meaningfully surveyed. In such instances, the Managing Authorities, in conjunction with NISRA, will provide advice on how an assessment of equality of opportunity can be made.

9. Quality

- 9.1. Assessing the quality of monitoring and evaluation is an integral and fundamental part of this process. Systems or evaluations that do not meet minimum quality standards could mislead decision-makers and programme managers. However, to assess evaluation quality is a complex and difficult process. The evaluations performed in the context of socio-economic development programmes and policies are too different from each other to allow the existence of few simple rules that can guarantee the quality across the board. However, the quality of the evaluation as a whole is conditional upon the presence of three distinct but interrelated aspects:

- the quality of the planning and design phase, including the commissioning of the evaluation;
- the quality of the implementation of the evaluation itself;
- the quality of the monitoring system and of the available data.

- 9.2. The following table¹³ presents both quality control and quality assurance criteria to bear in mind when carrying out or managing an

¹³ European Commission, (2006): EVALSED: the online and interactive resource for the evaluation of socio-economic development (published on the Internet at: www.evaled.com)

evaluation. Further detail on each of the issues is provided by EVALSED.

Quality Control: Output Criteria	Quality Assurance: Process Criteria
Meeting needs as laid out in ToR	Coherent and evaluable objectives
Relevant scope and coverage	Well drawn terms of reference
Defensible design and methods	Sound tender selection process
Reliable data used	Effective dialogue and feedback throughout evaluation process
Sound analysis	Adequate information resources available
Credible results that relate to analysis and data	Good management and co-ordination by evaluation team
Impartial conclusions showing no bias and demonstrating sound judgement	Effective dissemination of reports/outputs to Steering Committee and policy/programme managers
Clear report with executive summaries and annexed supportive data	Effective dissemination to stakeholders

- 9.3. The existence of an Evaluation Steering Group (ESG) is an important part of the evaluation process. The principle role of the ESG is to ensure a high quality and useful evaluation. This will involve facilitating the work of the evaluators through for example, providing access to information and contacts, and elaborating evaluating questions and key issues that they feel should be informed. The ESG should not attempt to influence the evaluators to omit certain evidence or to come to conclusions they would prefer to hear that are not substantiated by the evaluation evidence.

- 9.4. Evaluation Steering Groups will be established for all major evaluations carried out under this plan. Membership for these steering groups will be drawn from the programme's Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group.

10. Dissemination

- 10.1. All major evaluation reports, at programme or priority level or a thematic evaluation, will be presented to the programme monitoring committee (PMC). These presentations will be accompanied by a response from the managing authority (MA) on each recommendation presented within the report, detailing whether the recommendation has been accepted and how it is being taken forward. When requested by the PMC, the MA will provide further updates on these recommendations.
- 10.2. In the interest of transparency and in order to stimulate public debate on evaluation findings, all evaluation reports will be published. This will involve broader circulation of evaluation documents and also examples of good practice. The most effective method for this is to use the SEUPB website supplemented with presentations. This will aim to promote interest in evaluation and strengthen its credibility. Information sharing will be particularly useful when undertaking thematic evaluations. It will be important, however, to ensure that evaluation reports are presented in an accessible format with summaries, interpretation and sign posting.

11. Resources

- 11.1. In accordance with the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality (Article 13 of Regulation 1083/2006), Member States are responsible for monitoring their OPs, for carrying out on-going evaluations and for taking corrective measures when problems arise. In accordance with

the principle of independence, evaluations shall be carried out by experts or bodies (internal or external) that are functionally independent of the certifying and audit authorities (Article 47[3] of Regulation 1083/2006). The independence of evaluation can also be enhanced by the presence of steering groups in which various stakeholders are represented.

- 11.2. As stated in the Regulations, evaluations shall be funded from the budget for technical assistance (Article 47[4] of Regulation 1083/2006).

DRAFT

ANNEX A: MONITORING INDICATORS FOR PEACE III

Table A.1: Targets and indicators, Priority 1: Building positive relations at the local level

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
Output	30 programmes developed and implemented Of which: 13 will be local authority led	0	Reporting by project promoters and verification/checking by funding body	Six monthly
	60 events that address sectarianism and racism or deal with conflict resolution	0 [240 projects in PEACE II focused on reconciliation ¹⁴]	Reporting by project promoters and verification/checking by funding body	Six monthly
	3,000 participants attending above events	0 [38,000 participants in PEACE II projects]	Reporting by project promoters and verification/checking by funding body	Six monthly
	Community balance of participation in events	n/a	Equality forms completed by all participants at events	Six monthly
	5% of participants from ethnic minority groups	n/a [Proportion of population from ethnic minority groups: NI 1%, ROI approx 3%]	Equality forms completed by all participants at events	Six monthly

¹⁴ These projects were funded under Measure 2.1 of PEACE II. It is expected that there will be a smaller number of more focused events under this Priority in PEACE III, given both the more strategic focus of the Programme and the level of funding available.

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
	40% of participants are young people (under 25 years of age)	n/a [Proportion of population aged under 25: NI 35%, Border Region 38%]	Equality forms completed by all participants at events	Six monthly
Result	Changes in attitudes towards cross-community and cross-border activities [Target will be set when baseline information becomes available]	Not yet available - included in 2007 questionnaire	Attitudinal Survey	2007, 2010 and 2013
	Increase in the proportion of beneficiaries who have contacts/recognized friends in the other community [Target will be set when baseline information becomes available]	Not yet available - included in 2007 questionnaire	Attitudinal Survey	2007, 2010 and 2013
	Improved levels of trust and tolerance among Programme beneficiaries, decreased levels of prejudice [Target will be set when baseline information becomes available]	Not yet available - included in 2007 questionnaire	Attitudinal Survey	2007, 2010 and 2013
Impact (Global)	Increase in the percentage of adults who think relations between Protestants and Catholics are better than they were five years ago	52% (2005)	NI Life and Times Survey	Annual

Table A.2: Targets and indicators, Priority 1: Acknowledging and dealing with the past

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
Output	1,000 people in receipt of Trauma Counselling/Service	0 [3,400 participants were involved in PEACE II projects with trauma counselling as a key element, some may have received assistance other than trauma counselling ¹⁵]	Reporting by project promoters and verification/checking by funding body	Six monthly
	50 events assisting victims and survivors	0 [211 PEACE II projects were involved in reintegration activities with victims and survivors ¹⁶]	Reporting by project promoters and verification/checking by funding body	Six monthly
	2,000 participants at events assisting victims and survivors	0 [8,700 participants involved in PEACE II projects]	Reporting by project promoters and verification/checking by funding body	Six monthly

¹⁵ The 3,400 participants of PEACE II were involved in projects where trauma counselling was a key element, however, there were other services offered within these projects and it is likely that some participants received assistance other than trauma counselling. In addition, less funding is available for PEACE III.

¹⁶ Measure 2.4b of PEACE II had a particular emphasis on assisting victims and survivors and there were 211 projects funded. Given the more strategic nature of PEACE III, it is expected that there will be a smaller number of focused events.

PEACE III Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

	20 conflict resolution workshops	0	Reporting by project promoters and verification/checking by funding body	Six monthly
	200 participants attending conflict resolution workshops	0	Reporting by project promoters and verification/checking by funding body	Six monthly
Result	75% of recipients of trauma counselling feel they are better able to cope	0	Reporting by project promoters and verification/checking by funding body	Six monthly
	75% of participants of events believe they are more able to describe what it is like for the other community	0	Reporting by project promoters and verification/checking by funding body	Six monthly
	Change in perception amongst Programme beneficiaries that violence is not a legitimate or effective means of resolving conflict	Not yet available	Survey or focus groups of participants before and following events	Ongoing
Impact	Changes in awareness of the past and or roles in the conflict among Programme beneficiaries	Not yet available	Survey or focus groups of participants before and following events	Ongoing

Table A.3: Targets and indicators, Priority 2: Creating shared public spaces

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
Output	10 shared public environments created or improved through cross-community regeneration projects	0	Reporting by project promoters and verification/checking by funding body	Six monthly
Result	Increased usage of the shared public environments [Target will be set when baseline is known]	Baseline will be presented when projects are identified	Surveys of local communities	Ex-ante Ex-post
	Economic indicators will be developed following identification of projects	Not yet available	Reporting by project promoters and verification/checking by funding body	Six monthly
Impact (Direct)	Environments supported are perceived as being useful shared spaces	Baseline will be presented when projects are identified	Surveys of local communities	Ex-ante Ex-post
Impact (Global)	Increase in the percentage of people who think there are less Loyalist murals and flags on display these days than there were 5 years ago	17% (2005)	NI Life and Times Survey	Annual

	Increase in the percentage of people who think there are less Republican murals and flags on display these days than there were 5 years ago	23% (2005)	NI Life and Times Survey	Annual
	Percentage of people who think the neighbourhood where they live is a 'neutral space'	71% always 17% sometimes (2005)	NI Life and Times Survey	Annual

DRAFT

Table A.4: Targets and indicators, Priority 2: Key institutional capacities are developed for a shared society

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
Output	10 pilot projects of cross-border co-operation between public sector bodies	0	Reporting by project promoters and verification/checking by funding body	Six monthly
	5 research reports disseminated	0	Reporting by project promoters and verification/checking by funding body	Six monthly
Result	Number of people benefiting from shared services [Target to be set when pilot projects have been identified]	0	Reporting by project promoters and verification/checking by funding body	Six monthly
	Number of public servants who can identify positive changes as a result of shared projects [Target to be set when pilot projects have been identified]			
Impact	50% of pilot projects go on to become mainstreamed		Reporting by project promoters and verification/checking by funding body	Ex-post

Table A.5: Targets and indicators, Priority 3: Programme information and publicity

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
Output	2 public launches of the Operational Programme	0	Managing Authority	Six monthly
	25 dissemination activities supported	0	Managing Authority	Six monthly
	100 press releases	0	Managing Authority	Six monthly
Result	Average of 60 hits per month on website	0	Managing Authority website information	
	200 publicity and information enquiries	0	Managing Authority	
Impact	Increased overall awareness of the Operational Programme	First survey will be conducted in Autumn 2007	Omnibus Survey	Annually
	Increased awareness of the role of the EU in the Operational Programme	First survey will be conducted in Autumn 2007	Omnibus Survey	Annually

Table A.6: Targets and indicators, Priority 3: Management, monitoring and evaluation of the Programme

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
Output	9 Technical Assistance projects funded	0 [58 implementation projects in PEACE II]	Programme monitoring by Managing Authority	Six monthly
Result	14 monitoring reports completed	0 [10 progress reports for PEACE II]	Programme monitoring by Managing Authority	Six monthly
	19 evaluation reports completed	0 [12 research studies in PEACE II]	Programme monitoring by Managing Authority	Six monthly
Impact	100% of reports submitted to the EU Commission comply with regulations	0	Programme monitoring by Managing Authority	Six monthly
	100% of recommendations from evaluation reports responded to by Managing Authority and implemented where appropriate	0	Programme monitoring by Managing Authority	Six monthly

Table A.7: Context Indicators

Indicator	Baseline	Year	Source
Number of sectarian incidents	1,701	2005/06	PSNI
Number of racist incidents	936	2005/06	PSNI
Number of attacks on symbolic premises: churches/chapels, GAA/AOH property, Orange Halls, schools	Churches/chapels 83 GAA/AOH property 1 Orange Halls 35 Schools 132	2005	PSNI
Percentage of people who think NI is a place free from displays of sectarian aggression	5% scored this question more than 5 (where 1 = Definitely not achieved and 10 = Definitely achieved)	2005	NI Life and Times Survey
Percentage of people who are prejudiced against people from a minority ethnic community	Very prejudiced 1% A little prejudiced 24%	2005	NI Life and Times Survey
Percentage of parades that are contentious	7%	2004/05	Parades Commission
Reduction in the number of peace walls	37	2006	Northern Ireland Office

ANNEX B: DEFINITIONS AND METHODS OF COLLECTION

TO BE ADDED

DRAFT

ANNEX C: Evaluation timetable

Evaluations	Scope	Key questions	Dissemination	Timetable	Who will evaluate (internal/external)	Structure of steering group (where known)	Cost £ (where known)
On-going micro level evaluation of the programme using Aid for Peace	Potentially the whole programme	What is the impact of these projects? How do these relate to the Programme-level aims and objectives?	Progress reports, AIRs, specific reports	Ongoing 2008-2013	External	n/a	
Evaluation of Priority 1, Theme 1	All locally-led projects in this Theme	What has been the overall impact of these projects? Is there a need for further funding in these areas? Is the locally-led consortium the most appropriate to manage this funding?	SEUPB website	Late 2009/ Early 2010	External	MEWG	
Evaluation of PEACE III	Entire programme	To produce a synthesis of the work carried out in the ongoing evaluations. To review monitoring data and performance indicators with the purpose of assessing progress towards the key objectives and to recommend corrective actions if there is under-performance. To support any	SEUPB website	Late 2010/ Early 2011	External	MEWG	

		proposed changes to the operational programme or reallocation of financial resources.					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

DRAFT