



Monitoring and Evaluation of the ESF post-2013

Antonella Schulte-Braucks
Head of Evaluation and Impact Assessment Unit
DG EMPL

INCREASING FOCUS ON PERFORMANCE

Vilnius, 3-4 March 2011

Background

- Increasing political call for focus on results
- Europe 2020 strategy: a clear set of common priorities, and a clear framework for identification of funding priorities.
- Lessons from the ESF ex post evaluation 2000-2006 and experience with current programming period

Lessons from ex-post: 1 - Monitoring

- Uneven quality of data and data collection methods
- No information about intensity of the support
- Missing data

2 – Indicators

- Interpretation of indicators not always consistent within a MS
- Indicators do not always cover all programme priorities to the same extent
- Indicators cannot be aggregated at EU level

3 – Evaluation

- Quality, frequency, methodology and scope of evaluation vary substantially between Member States
- Limited knowledge of Member States' evaluation at EU level – except for MTE/update MTE

Improvements in current programming period

1- Monitoring

- SFC2007 includes data on participants.

But:

- Data quality remains uneven
- Data collection methods vary greatly
- No information about intensity of support of individuals

Improvements in current programming period

2 - Indicators

- Common output indicators (Annex XXIII) which can be aggregated

But

- More than 7000 programme indicators
- Result indicators often capture only immediate effects

Improvements in current programming period

3 - Evaluation

On-going evaluation in MS

But:

- Evaluation plan only in convergence regions
- Substantial variations between MS in quality, frequency, methodology and scope of evaluations
- Limited knowledge of MS evaluations at EU level

Increasing focus on performance: ideas for the future

- Effectiveness as a principle of the Structural Funds
- OPs programme logic: to establish a clear link between Europe 2020 priorities, NRP and JAF assessment, priorities and funds allocation

Monitoring

- Limited number of Fund-specific common indicators for all OPs
 - Output (based on simplified Annex XXIII)
 - Result indicators capturing direct effects
 - Entry and stock reporting
 - Common definitions
 - Reporting in AIR part of admissibility check
 - + OP specific indicators – as to date
- Micro-data collection

Evaluation structure

- Ex ante evaluation MS
 - On-going evaluation MS, Commission
 - Ex post evaluation Commission, MS
-
- Evaluation plan for each OP
 - Commission guidance on evaluation
 - For each OP synthesis evaluation towards the end of the period

Ex ante evaluation

It shall appreciate:

- justification for the thematic priorities selected
- relevance and clarity of the proposed indicators
- plausibility of the targets for the indicators and for explanation concerning the contribution of the outputs and direct results to the longer term results
- consistency between the allocated financial resources and needs assessment based on the NRP
- quality of the monitoring and data collection systems, including for gathering the necessary data to carry out evaluations.

On-going evaluation

- To support programme implementation and to refine strategies
- To capture longer term effects of interventions
 - Counterfactual methods
 - Integration of counterfactual and qualitative methods

Ex post evaluation

- Synthesis evaluation for each OP: it shall summarize the relevant findings of all evaluation carried out during the programming period and provide a qualitative assessment of findings in the light of results of programme implementation
- Ex post evaluation by the Commission

GOALS

- Clear linkage to Europe 2020/NRP
- Clear objectives
- Unequivocal indicators
- Reliable monitoring
- Relevant evaluations

to answer the key question

What has been achieved?



Thank you for your attention