



LITHUANIAN STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION OF EU STRUCTURAL FUNDS

Financed by the European Social Fund under project “EU Structural Funds’ Evaluation Capacity Building in Lithuania 3” implemented within the framework of Technical Assistance Operational Programme.

Prepared by:



*the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Lithuania
in cooperation with*



VIEŠOSIOS POLITIKOS IR VADYBOS INSTITUTAS

Public Policy and Management Institute (PPMI),



Public Company Europos socialiniai, teisiniai ir ekonominiai projektai (ESTEP).

Translation: Ina Bachova

Design: Daiva Jackevičienė

Draft Standards for Evaluation of EU Structural Funds were discussed at the event “Quality of EU Structural Funds’ Evaluation and the Use of Results. Application of Evaluation Standards” held by the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Lithuania on 5 April 2013. The event was attended by representatives of organisations commissioning evaluation activities and service providers.

Edition of 70 copies

Published by UAB „S Logistika“

info@s-reklama.lt, www.s-reklama.lt

ISBN 978-609-95531-7-7

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	5
PURPOSE OF THE STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION OF EU STRUCTURAL FUNDS	6
1. EU STRUCTURAL FUNDS' EVALUATION SYSTEM AND EVALUATION PLANNING	8
1.1. Functions and regulation of evaluation of EU Structural Funds in Lithuania.....	8
1.2. Establishing an evaluation plan.....	9
1.3. Partnership in evaluation of EU Structural Funds.....	11
2. IMPLEMENTATION OF EVALUATION OF EU STRUCTURAL FUNDS	13
2.1. Preparing an evaluation project.....	13
2.2. Implementing an evaluation project.....	16
3. RESULTS OF EVALUATION OF EU STRUCTURAL FUNDS AND THEIR USE	23
3.1. Results of evaluation of EU Structural Funds.....	23
3.2. Using evaluation results.....	23
Annex 1. Sources related to evaluation standards	28

Evaluation of the EU Structural Funds is an important tool in achieving result-oriented management of Operational Programmes 2014–2020. It is therefore natural that increasing requirements are set to ensure the quality of evaluation as well as the credibility and benefits of its results.



Assuming that the quality of evaluation depends on the input of bodies commissioning evaluation activities and service providers and their cooperation with each other, the Ministry of Finance has been constantly initiating various activities to improve the quality of evaluation in Lithuania, including drafting evaluation guidance documents, convening international evaluation conferences, organising training for contracting authorities and services providers, holding other events for the evaluation community, carrying out thematic evaluations of the quality of evaluation and the use of evaluation results in Lithuania. All these activities encouraged to draw up general and clear evaluation standards, defining what a high-quality evaluation of the EU Structural Funds is in Lithuania.

These standards are based on the results of two thematic evaluations of the quality of evaluations and the use of evaluation results in Lithuania, European Commission's recommendations and relevant foreign experience. While drafting the standards, consultations were held with members of the Lithuanian evaluation community (contracting authorities, service providers, members of the academic community).

In the programming period 2014–2020, these standards outlining the overall vision of programme evaluation and specific implementation steps will help improve the quality of evaluation of the EU Structural Funds in Lithuania at all stages of implementation (planning, implementation and use of results) and ensure that it is based on both evaluation needs and capacities of bodies responsible for evaluation and service providers.

*Mrs Loreta Maskalioviė
Director, Department of EU Structural Assistance Management Department, Ministry of Finance*

Evaluation objectively determines the value of public interventions

Evaluation is an objective judgement of the value of a public intervention (public policy, programme, measure, project, etc.), based on its socio-economic needs, implementation process and impacts.

Evaluation of the EU Structural Funds (hereinafter – “evaluation”) is different from other evidence-based management tools (monitoring, audit, research, etc.):

- *the purpose of evaluation is to improve the preparation and implementation of operational programmes, and to account for the use of the EU Structural Funds;*
- *evaluation results are intended for decision-makers, responsible bodies and other groups of the general public;*
- *evaluations are carried out by experts that are functionally independent from the body responsible for the implementation of the operational programme in question;*
- *evaluation uses different evaluation approaches and methods for data collection and analysis;*
- *the evaluation process involves representatives of responsible bodies and other stakeholders;*
- *the final deliverable of evaluation is an evaluation report which, as a rule, presents the evaluation methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations.*

As laid down in regulations on the EU Structural Funds, 2014–2020 EU operational programmes must be subject to an ex-ante evaluation, evaluations during the programming period and ex-post evaluations. The EU Member States are responsible for the ex-ante evaluation and the evaluation during the programming period, while the ex-post evaluation is carried out by the European Commission in close cooperation with the EU Member States.

The purpose of evaluation standards is to improve evaluation planning, implementation and use of results

This paper presents minimum standards and guidelines on evaluation planning, implementation and use of results. It rests on the assumption that the quality of evaluation activities depends on the input of contracting authorities and service providers as well as on their cooperation with each other. In addition to these factors, a proper process at all stages of the evaluation cycle, including the involvement of stakeholders, also plays an important role. Even though high-quality evaluation reports allow for a better application of evaluation results, the implementation of evaluation recommendations also depends on the effective dissemination and monitoring strategy, as well as such external factors as political support or the need for evidence in the public management system.

The Standards for Evaluation of EU Structural Funds build on the strengths and weaknesses in the provision of evaluation services, evaluation reports and the use of evaluation findings in Lithuania, which were identified by the Evaluations of the Quality of Evaluations of EU Structural Funds and the Use of Evaluation Findings in 2008–2012. They supplement other guidance documents on the launch and performance of evaluations in Lithuania, including Methodological Guidelines on Evaluation of the EU Structural Funds and Style Guide for EU Structural Funds’ Evaluation Reports. For more information on guidance documents visit <http://www.esparama.lt/es-paramos->

vertinimas. All evaluation reports referred to in these standards are available at <http://www.esparama.lt/vertinimo-ataskaitos>.

These standards should be used by contracting authorities and service providers in order to improve the evaluation process, increase the quality of evaluation services and enhance the use of evaluation results. Ministries and state institutions responsible for evaluation of the EU Structural Funds must establish basic standards on evaluation planning, implementation and use, as well as lay them down in Lithuanian legislation and other documents. To make sure that service providers follow the evaluation standards when they are preparing proposals and providing evaluation services, contracting authorities must include a reference to these standards in the Terms of Reference and evaluation service contracts. Appropriate provisions of these evaluation standards may also be used in the national evaluation system, namely, for the evaluation of budget programmes.

The use of the evaluation standards will depend on their application in the evaluation society

New evaluation terms used in these evaluation standards are as follows:

- **Evaluations during the programming period** measure the effectiveness, efficiency and impacts of the programme being implemented. Also, at least once in a programming period it is required to assess the contribution of the EU Structural Funds to the implementation of objectives for each priority.
- **Impact evaluations** identify the changes brought by interventions, i.e. the outcomes of interventions and the extent to which they have contributed to the changes. The object of this type of evaluation is a strategy of the EU Structural Funds, an operational programme or any part of it (priority, measure, etc.), a group of operational programmes.
- **Implementation evaluations** are focused on the management of a programme, i.e. how effective the assistance administration process is and how issues faced by beneficiaries are addressed. The object of this type of evaluation is the EU Structural Funds' assistance administration system, its components and functions, the involvement of stakeholders in the implementation of an operational programme.
- **Participatory evaluations** are based on the partnership approach and the participation of evaluators as well as other stakeholders (socio-economic partners, beneficiaries, etc.) in the evaluation process from evaluation planning to the implementation of specific evaluation activities.
- **Rigorous evaluation approaches and methods** are experimental and non-experimental evaluation techniques that explain the causal relation among interventions, other factors and the changes observed. Counterfactual impact assessment, econometric modelling, theory-based evaluation and cost-benefit analysis are the main examples of this type of evaluation.

Other evaluation terms are defined in appropriate Lithuanian legislation and methodological documents on evaluation of the EU Structural Funds.

The first part of this paper presents standards concerning the evaluation system and evaluation planning. The second part deals with the preparation and execution of evaluation projects, and the third part elaborates on the use of evaluation results. The annex to the paper lists different sources of information on evaluation standards.

1. EU STRUCTURAL FUNDS' EVALUATION SYSTEM AND EVALUATION PLANNING

1.1. Functions and regulation of evaluation of EU Structural Funds in Lithuania

Functions and procedures of evaluation activities are properly defined if:

- *the managing authority effectively coordinates evaluation activities, i.e. draws up an evaluation plan, coordinates the performance of the Evaluation Coordination Group and monitoring of the implementation of evaluation recommendations.*
- *every body responsible for the implementation of evaluation activities assigns a responsible person whose functions are clearly defined and related to evaluation planning, implementation, dissemination and use of results (they could be combined with monitoring functions).*
- *every body responsible for the implementation of evaluation activities draws up and adopts internal evaluation procedures describing how evaluations are planned, executed and their results used.*

In the programming period 2007–2013, evaluation of the EU Structural Funds in Lithuania fell within the responsibility of the managing authority (the Ministry of Finance) and intermediate bodies (other ministries and state institutions). The Ministry of Finance coordinates evaluation activities, draws up evaluation plans and ensures the implementation of these plans; coordinates the performance of the Evaluation Coordination Group; organises horizontal evaluations that focus on issues cutting across all areas of management; organises evaluation capacity building activities. Ministries and other state institutions initiate and organise evaluations in their area of competence; participate in the Evaluation Coordination Group; cooperate with implementing bodies that collect and submit data on the implementation of projects funded by the EU Structural Funds. The Evaluation Coordination Group promotes inter-institutional cooperation and performs functions related to discussing evaluation plans, Terms of Reference and the evaluation results implemented, as well as offering proposals to the Ministry of Finance and other bodies responsible for evaluation activities.

Planning human resources

In the new programming period, the EU Member States will have to allocate resources necessary to evaluation and put appropriate evaluation procedures in place. Each ministry or state institution responsible for evaluation assigns a person whose functions are clearly defined and related to evaluation planning, implementation, dissemination and use of results (they could be combined with monitoring functions). As recommended by the Commission, members of the staff of institutions responsible for evaluation, who perform internal evaluations, should not be involved in the preparation or implementation of programmes, i.e. the principle of independence should be observed.

A responsible person must be assigned for evaluation functions

An example of good practice: evaluation units in Lithuanian bodies responsible for evaluation

As recommended by the Commission, some Lithuanian institutions have established individual units for the performance of evaluation functions (the Evaluation Unit at the Ministry of Finance, EU and National Programme Evaluation Unit at the Ministry of Agriculture, Budget Programme Evaluation Unit at the Ministry of Transport and Communications). These units have their areas of responsibility clearly defined by appropriate procedural documents. In early 2013, respective units of each three institutions employed four persons who performed all evaluation-related functions (from evaluation planning to the dissemination of evaluation results). Allocating the responsibility for evaluations to concrete persons ensures institutional memory and learning processes, improves the quality of evaluations as well as accountability for the use of evaluation results.

Establishing evaluation procedures

In the new programming period, the managing authority should draft and adopt a general evaluation procedure to be applied by all institutions participating in the evaluation system. Following this procedure, responsible bodies must establish and adopt internal evaluation procedures. The main responsibility for the performance of all evaluation-related functions lies with a responsible person or the evaluation unit (if established). Procedural documents should describe three basic stages of the evaluation process: evaluation planning, implementation and use of results.

General and specific evaluation procedures must be in place

Evaluation planning procedures set out procedures related to justifying the need for evaluation, drafting the Terms of Reference, planning the evaluation budget. They should put an emphasis on the importance of cooperation among a person or a unit responsible for evaluation activities, other units of the relevant body (related by competence) and the Evaluation Unit of the Ministry of Finance. The procedure for executing evaluations mainly focuses on the monitoring of the evaluation process and quality control, the institution's role in data collection, the interactive aspect of the evaluation process (presentation of evaluation reports, commenting, meetings to discuss conclusions and recommendations). Procedures for using evaluation results should deal with monitoring the implementation of recommendations, delegating this function to a person responsible for evaluation activities. Moreover, publicity measures for evaluation reports, organisation of presentation events and other measures of dissemination of evaluation results should be in place.

1.2. Establishing an evaluation plan

Evaluation activities are being planned properly if:

- *an evaluation plan is drawn up in consultation with all stakeholders, observing the principle of proportionality and with regard to the cycle of interventions, evaluation needs and general requirements for evaluation activities.*
- *evaluation activities provided for in an evaluation plan ensure that the effectiveness, efficiency and impacts of an operational programme (or any part of it) are systematically assessed.*

- *evaluation activities have been allocated adequate financial and human resources with regard to the type and scope of evaluation, the complexity of the methodology to be applied, data collection techniques.*
- *an adequate timetable is set for evaluation activities, thus ensuring the feed of evaluation results into the decision-making process (drafting or amending programmes, initiating or suspending the implementation of measures).*

Evaluation plan is the key planning document

Operational programmes for 2014–2020 must be systemically evaluated, emphasising the results of the Cohesion policy and the principle of proportionality, i.e. the number of individual programme or priority evaluations to be carried out and the financial resources allocated for this purpose must be in proportion to the financial amounts planned for a respective operational programme or measures. The relevance of evaluations and their input in refining the implementation of programmes is ensured through the proper identification of the need for evaluation. Evaluation activities should be planned after implementation issues have been identified, there is a need for meeting accountability requirements (e.g. to collect the missing data, draft annual reports) or for improving the implementation of programmes, priorities or measures.

The managing authority must draw up an evaluation plan for 2014–2020 and submit it to the Monitoring Committee. The plan should include the following basic elements: an indicative list of (implementation and impact) evaluations to be undertaken; methods to be used for the individual evaluations and their data requirements; provisions that data (general and specific programme indicators) required for certain evaluations will be collected; a timetable; a strategy to ensure use and communication of evaluations; human resources involved; the indicative budget for implementation of the plan; a training plan. Where needed, the evaluation plan may be revised every year.

Evaluation activities require adequate financial resources

Given the requirements to apply more rigorous evaluation approaches or methods (theory-based evaluation, counterfactual analysis, econometric modelling, etc.) in 2014–2010 and their costs, evaluation activities must have adequate financial resources. Financial resources needed for a particular evaluation are determined by the type, scope and depth of the evaluation to be carried out as well as the complexity of the methodology to be applied. Information on how to set a budget for an evaluation activity is available in the Methodological Guidelines for Evaluation of the EU Structural Funds.

At the planning stage, a timetable for evaluation activities is made with regard to the type of evaluation. Setting a proper timetable is one of the prerequisites for ensuring the integration of evaluation results in the decision-making process. Implementation evaluations should be carried out when the programmes have been launched and the main problems have been identified, i.e. early in the programming period. Also, the outset of the programming period should be used to measure the impact of interventions from the previous programming period, in particular if they are likely to be continued in the new programming period. Other impact evaluations should be planned later in the implementation stage, i.e. the second half of the programming period, depending on the progress of the implementation of operational programmes. As required by regulations of the EU Structural Funds, at least once in a programming period an evaluation should assess how the EU Structural Funds have contributed to the objectives for each priority.

An example of good practice: interim evaluations of the implementation of operational programmes for 2007–2013

The evaluation plan 2010 provided for evaluations examining how much the EU Structural Funds contributed to the achievement of targets and objectives established in the operational programmes for 2007–2013. For instance, the Evaluation of the Implementation of Priority 4 of the Operational Programme for Human Resources analysed 14 measures and how they contributed to the implementation of the objectives of the priority aimed at strengthening administrative capacities and the effectiveness of public administration (improvement of human resource management, improvement of performance management, better regulation of economic activities, etc.). The input of measures funded by the European Social Fund to the increase in employment and implementation of the objectives of Priority 1 of the Operational Programme for Human Resources was scrutinised in the Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Implementation of ESF-Funded Employment Measures. The Interim Evaluation of the Implementation of Priorities of Operational Programmes 2007–2013 Administered by the Ministry of Education and Science and Programmes Implementing these Priorities looked at the progress in the implementation of priorities assigned to the competence of the Ministry of Education and Science.

1.3. Partnership in evaluation of EU Structural Funds

The principle of partnership is properly observed if:

- partners are selected on the basis of clear criteria, taking the theme and specifics of the evaluation activity into consideration.*
- partners are effectively engaged through effective forms of cooperation – institutionalised or ad hoc.*
- the feedback on partnership is promoted and its results properly communicated (e.g. by carrying out participatory evaluations).*

The contracting authority, when planning an evaluation activity, must decide whether to include partners. A possibility of different partners (competent regional, local, city or other state authorities; socio-economic partners; non-governmental organisations) in evaluation activities depends on a particular evaluation. The contracting authority should also decide at which stages and how partners will be able to contribute. Partners may be engaged through institutionalised forms of partnership (e.g. committees, commissions, working groups, thematic networks) or on an ad hoc basis through the use of information and consultation procedures. A particular form of partnership is chosen by institutions responsible for launching evaluation activities. The Commission recommends including partners into the whole evaluation process and proposes to monitor the effectiveness of the principle of partnership in the implementation of operational programmes 2014–2020.

The involvement of partners plays a crucial role in the evaluation planning process, i.e. when the managing authority is drawing up an evaluation plan and an indicative list of evaluations to be carried out, exploring possibilities to collect data necessary for

Partners may prove to be most useful in evaluation planning, data collection and consideration of results

evaluations. At this stage, partners should be engaged through institutionalised forms of cooperation, i.e. the Monitoring Committee or the Evaluation Coordination Group. Moreover, consultations (even by electronic means) should take place so that partners could be able to propose relevant evaluation topics. Partners should also be involved in the implementation of particular evaluation projects. They may prove to be most useful in evaluation planning, data collection and consideration of results (especially preliminary conclusions and recommendations).

At the evaluation project planning stage, partners could be engaged through institutionalised forms and by setting up an evaluation project steering/monitoring committee responsible for defining objectives and the object, drafting the Terms of Reference and, at a later stage, for supervising the implementation of the evaluation activity. Partners should be involved in data collection activities on an ad hoc basis, namely by organising interviews and surveys to learn their opinion on the intervention or object being evaluated. When discussing interim evaluation results, partners could be invited to meetings where evaluation conclusions and recommendations are considered. This information could also be sent electronically, thus giving them the opportunity to provide their remarks and comments. More about the scope and forms of the involvement of partners in the evaluation process, see methodological documents (e.g. Guidelines for the Application of the Principle of Partnership in Evaluation of the EU Structural Funds).

Participatory evaluations allow for a full involvement of partners

One of the ways to involve partners in the evaluation process is the so-called participatory evaluations. The main idea behind this type of evaluation is to apply the principle of partnership, meaning that the responsibility for the implementation of an evaluation activity is shared, i.e. certain evaluation stages involve and some activities are performed by stakeholders (socio-economic partners, beneficiaries, members of local communities, etc.) rather than professional evaluators and external experts. Organising this type of evaluation requires more time and more coordination costs, but it may help improve measures that are implemented through the “bottom-up” approach.

An example of good practice: Evaluation of the Cooperation between Lithuanian Science and Business

Participatory evaluation activities were performed in the framework of the Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Cooperation between Lithuanian Science and Business and Coordination of Financing Opportunities (2011), i.e. the services were provided and some of the evaluation activities were carried out by an economic partner Association Žinių ekonomikos forumas, acting on the basis of a consortium agreement.

2. IMPLEMENTATION OF EVALUATION OF EU STRUCTURAL FUNDS

2.1. Preparing an evaluation project

An evaluation project is properly designed if:

- *the evaluation meets decision-making or reporting needs, is important and relevant for decision-makers, other stakeholders and the general public.*
- *the Terms of Reference are of high quality (with clear objectives and tasks, specific evaluation questions, proper evaluation methods, etc.) and drafted with effective cooperation in place.*
- *evaluation services are purchased in due time, in accordance with public procurement requirements and with regard to the good practice.*

Specifying the need for evaluation and elaborating objectives

The planning of an individual evaluation starts by revising the strategic need for an evaluation identified in the evaluation plan 2014–2020 and the elaboration of evaluation aims. Where required, additional evaluations that are not included in the evaluation plan 2014–2020 may be initiated based on new and specific evaluation needs. As a rule, the need for evaluation is related to the necessity to improve interventions and accountability, while the object, aims and objectives of a specific evaluation depend on the progress in the implementation of operational programmes, the need to change them, monitoring results, external factors, the need to provide information to the Commission or Lithuanian state authorities. Each evaluation must also have a gap in empirical evidence to be eliminated by evaluation services. The evaluation results expected should not duplicate the results of previous evaluations or other evidence-based management measures (monitoring, audit or research). Whether it is an impact evaluation or an implementation evaluation depends on the object, aims and objectives of the evaluation to be carried out during the programming period. Usually, each evaluation is assigned to one type of evaluation. However, mixed evaluations that have features of both an impact evaluation and an implementation evaluation can be planned, too.

Evaluation projects are planned in accordance with the evaluation plan 2014–2020 and additional needs

Opinion of contracting authorities about evaluations of the EU Structural Funds 2007–2013:

“Most of the evaluations were launched to improve the use of EU support: to get the opinion of independent evaluation experts on certain issues related to the use of EU support and gain new and relevant knowledge. [...] Another important factor is the need to account to the Ministry of Finance and/or the European Commission for the use of support.”

Subject to the need for evaluation and the type of evaluation, an evaluation project must have a well-defined object, aims, objectives, benefits (outputs, results and impacts), budget and any other relevant information. It must be logically structured, i.e. all elements must be coordinated with each other: evaluation aims and objectives must correspond to the result and the output; the budget must be consistent with the aims

and objectives, etc. The evaluation project may be drawn up using a logical framework approach that allows relating the vertical logic of a project (aims, objectives, etc.) with objectively measurable (output, result and impact) indicators and external factors (assumptions and risks). Later on, this information is used when the Terms of Reference for an evaluation activity are drafted.

Drafting and structuring the Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference is the key evaluation document

The Terms of Reference define the object, the objective and tasks of an evaluation activity, evaluation questions, evaluation methods and sources of information to be used, the evaluation results expected, a timetable for the provision of services, other rights and duties of all the actors involved. The Terms of Reference are drawn up not only for external assistance, but for an internal evaluation as well. The document consists of such basic elements as justification of the need for evaluation, the scope of evaluation services and the organisation of evaluation.

The Terms of Reference are drafted by ministries and state institutions that carry out planned evaluations of the EU Structural Funds. Each institution assigns a person responsible for drafting the Terms of Reference. If required, an evaluation steering/monitoring committee may be set up for this purpose. Responsible bodies, when drafting the Terms of Reference, may consult with the Evaluation Unit of the Ministry of Finance, partners and other stakeholders or independent experts as well as discuss the draft Terms of Reference with the Evaluation Coordination Group.

Formulating evaluation aims, objectives, criteria and object

The Terms of Reference must set out well-defined aims, objectives and evaluation questions

The Terms of Reference must communicate a well-defined aim or several aims of the evaluation, clearly showing the object and purpose of the evaluation. They define evaluation objectives, reflecting the main evaluation stages or interrelated groups of evaluation questions. Contracting authorities may also indicate the result they expect – how they intend to use evaluation results (e.g. for drafting a piece of legislation or a strategic document, account for the implementation of a strategy or a programme).

The Terms of Reference must formulate evaluation questions that are clearly related to evaluation objectives. Evaluation questions may be grouped by evaluation criterion (e.g. relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, utility, sustainability). The number of evaluation criteria and their respective distribution in the Terms of Reference are subject to the need for evaluation, its type and object (e.g. impact evaluations examine the results and benefits of the use of the EU Structural Funds, the contribution of interventions to them).

The Terms of Reference must contain a well-defined and balanced (neither too wide nor too narrow) evaluation object, meaning that they must indicate which programmes/priorities/objectives or other parts of programmes and/or systems/processes/documents or any part of them must be covered (and which must fall outside the scope of evaluation). Contracting authorities may indicate which significant external or other factors may affect the evaluation object.

Evidence from the Thematic Evaluation of the Quality of Evaluations on the good practice in the Terms of Reference

The results of meta-analysis reveal that evaluation aims, objectives, questions and objects are the best formulated in evaluation projects launched by the Ministry of Finance, such as “The Evaluation of the Implementation of SPD Measures 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10 and the Impact of the Implementation of these Measures on the Lithuanian Fishery Sector”, “The Evaluation of Information and Publicity of the EU Structural Funds” and “The Evaluation of the Quality, Effectiveness and Sustainability of Research and Studies Funded by the EU Structural Funds 2007–2013”. Moreover, according to the service providers surveyed, “the Ministry of Finance draws up high-quality Terms of Reference with well-defined evaluation criteria, questions and scope. And only in rare cases the evaluation object is too wide.”

Making a list of methods

The Terms of Reference provide a list of key methods that depends on evaluation aims, objectives, evaluation questions and object. The Terms of Reference for impact evaluations provide for rigorous evaluation approaches (e.g. counterfactual analysis or theory-based evaluation) and, as is often the case, quantitative methods (e.g. analysis of monitoring or statistical data, surveys, econometric methods). The Terms of Reference for implementation evaluations, on the other hand, may prefer qualitative methods and the participatory approach. The contracting authority assesses all the possibilities to apply these approaches and methods (availability of monitoring and administrative data, the possibility to perform an experiment and quantify benefits of the EU Structural Funds, the possibility to involve stakeholders, etc.). Evaluation methods are set out in detail and a specific list of these methods is provided in proposals submitted by service providers.

The type of evaluation determines the evaluation methods to be used

Examples of good practice: applying rigorous evaluation approaches and methods

Among evaluation reports on the EU Structural Funds 2008–2012, it is worth mentioning evaluations that used rigorous evaluation approaches and methods that allowed evaluators to provide more robust evidence of the use of the EU Structural Funds according to certain criteria. The Evaluation of the Situation, Needs and Effectiveness of Social Integration Services for Socially Vulnerable and Social Risk Groups (commissioned by the Ministry of Social Security and Labour) employed a counterfactual analysis that helped precisely measure the impact of certain measures. The Evaluation of Changes in the Condition of Economic Sectors Assigned to the Competence of the Ministry of Economy and Co-Funded by the EU Structural Funds used econometric modelling. The Evaluation of the Implementation of Priority 4 of the Operational Programme for the Development of Human Resources (commissioned by the Ministry of Finance) presented the theory of change that covered the intervention logic of the priority and its relation with the programme background.

Public procurement of evaluation services

Evaluations are usually carried out through the procurement of services

Public procurement should ensure the acquisition of high-quality evaluation services according to legal procurement procedures. Evaluation services should be procured in due time so that evaluation results could be used in the decision-making on the improvement of interventions or accountability for the use of the EU Structural Funds. Qualification requirements for service providers and evaluation experts must meet methodological recommendations for public procurement and the need to ensure high-quality services, depending on the object, aims and objectives of each evaluation. Proposals submitted by service providers must be assessed by the principle of cost efficiency. Service providers, when submitting proposals, must estimate costs that are required for the provision of high-quality evaluation services. To receive feedback on competitive strengths and weaknesses of the proposals submitted, service providers have the right to request more detailed results of the procurement procedure (evaluation of proposals). More information about the procurement of evaluation services is available in the Methodological Guidelines for Evaluation of the EU Structural Funds and other documents.

2.2. Implementing an evaluation project

An evaluation project is being properly implemented if:

- *the evaluation is well-structured (operationalised evaluation questions, consistent evaluation methodology) at the inception stage.*
- *evaluation information received from data collection and analysis is reliable, proper and sufficient to answer evaluation questions; it serves as a basis for evaluation results and conclusions.*
- *internal and external quality control measures are applied, risk management is in place, contracting authorities and service providers effectively cooperate with each other.*
- *contracting authorities and service providers observe evaluation ethics.*

Evaluation of the EU Structural Funds consists of the following three stages: evaluation structuring, data collection, analysis and interpretation.

Structuring an evaluation

Structuring an evaluation covers the operationalisation of evaluation questions and the design of final evaluation approach and methodology

Evaluation must be structured before the end of the inception stage. The aim of the structuring process is to operationalise evaluation questions, to make a detail list of sources of information that may be useful for data collection and analysis, to set out evaluation methods, to revise the work plan. Structuring an evaluation is based on the Terms of Reference that provide for evaluation aims, objectives and questions, evaluation methods and sources of information. An inception report elaborates evaluation questions by providing specific evaluation questions, information judgement criteria (indicators), evaluation methods and/or sources information for each evaluation question. The final report presents information on the evaluation structuring in a separate part or annex of the report.

In case of an impact evaluation, the structuring stage includes establishing an intervention logic for a programme, priority, objective or actions (or groups of actions). The intervention logic must be clear and logical, mapping the most important links among resources, activities, outputs and outcomes, identifying preconditions or assumptions/risks (external factors) for the achievement of outputs and outcomes. If it is an implementation evaluation, the structuring stage includes an analysis of the system being evaluated and its components or stakeholder analysis.

Each evaluation must be built on a consistent evaluation methodology. The methods chosen based on a certain methodological approach (e.g. quantitative or qualitative evaluation; experimental approach; theory-based evaluation; statistical analysis; comparative analysis/case studies; participatory evaluation) must produce an integrated set of methods. Every methodological choice must be justified. If possible, the evaluation methodology should ensure data triangulation that ensures the credibility of results.

The structuring process during the inception stage may involve desk research or meetings with contracting authorities or other stakeholders. However, no field research is usually carried out during the inception stage, i.e. information should not be collected from external sources (surveys, interviews, participant observation, focused groups, etc.).

Examples of good practice: operationalising evaluation questions

Some examples of good operationalisation of evaluation questions may be found in horizontal and administrative evaluations of the EU Structural Funds (e.g. “Evaluation of Information and Publicity of the EU Structural Funds” and “Evaluation of the Quality, Effectiveness and Sustainability of Research and Studies Funded by the EU Structural Funds 2007–2013” or “Evaluation of the Relevance and Effectiveness of Monitoring Indicators for the Implementation of Priorities of Measures of the Operational Programme for the Promotion of Cohesion Administered by the Ministry of Health”) and evaluations of the use of the EU Structural Funds in different fields of management (e.g. “Evaluation of the Situation, Needs and Effectiveness of Social Integration Services for Socially Vulnerable and Social Risk Groups” or “Evaluation of the Implementation of SPD Measures 4.8, 4.9 and 4.10 and the Impact of the Implementation of these Measures on the Lithuanian Fishery Sector”). These reports are available at <http://www.esparama.lt/vertinimo-ataskaitos>.

Data collection, analysis and interpretation

Data collection serves as a means to gather data necessary for answering evaluation questions. Data are collected by quantitative and/or qualitative methods described in the Methodological Guidelines for Evaluation of the EU Structural Funds, other research and evaluation guides. The data collected during the evaluation are provided in annexes to evaluation reports, and their files (e.g. files of surveys, interviews and administrative data) are handed over to the contracting authority.

The purpose of data collection is to answer evaluation questions in accordance with the evaluation methodology

Responsible ministries and other public bodies must ensure that the monitoring

data necessary for evaluation activities are collected, especially data for measuring common and specific monitoring indicators. If the necessary administrative data are of a confidential nature or cover personal data, the contracting authority must cooperate with data managers and find ways how to depersonalise such data and hand them over to evaluators.

Most common evaluation methods in Lithuania

The meta-analysis data reveal that all planned evaluations of the EU Structural Funds conducted in 2008–2012 included desk research. Another common method was interviews, followed by analysis of primary sources and surveys. Focus groups or expert panels, comparative analysis or benchmarking, as well as case studies were slightly less common. Econometric modelling and counterfactual analysis—the most complex rigorous methods recommended for measuring impacts in 2014–2020—were used only for several evaluations in Lithuania.

Data analysis and interpretation must enable evaluators to answer evaluation questions

The purpose of data analysis and interpretation is to analyse the evaluation data collected and interpret them against the criteria set to answer evaluation questions. The data are analysed and interpreted using methods of analysis appropriate for the rationale for evaluation and operationalised evaluation questions.

The thoroughness of evaluation data must be adequate to the scope of evaluation and operationalisation of evaluation questions. The service provider must provide information of adequate quality (proper, sufficient and reliable) information that enables evaluators to answer evaluation questions. Following the data analysis, evaluation reports present evaluation results for each evaluation question and evaluation conclusions according to each evaluation criterion. Evaluation results and conclusions must be presented as required by Style Guide for EU Structural Funds' Evaluation Reports. The text of an evaluation report must be clear, simple and concise.

Applying quality control measures and project risk management

Evaluation services must be subject to internal and external quality control measures

The quality of evaluation services is ensured through external and internal quality control measures. The external quality control of evaluation services lies within the responsibility of a person assigned by the contracting authority. External quality control may include members of the evaluation steering/monitoring committee. Both the person responsible for evaluation and the steering committee (if established) must be active in commenting on evaluation reports and discussing them with the service provider, demand that all quality-related defects are eliminated from evaluation reports and, where required, propose amendments to the contract and take any other actions to ensure the quality of evaluation. All this must be done with regard to the problems and risks related to the provision of evaluation services. Before approving the final evaluation report, the contracting authority must check its quality against the pre-defined quality assessment form. Such a systematic check not only helps eliminate defects of evaluation reports, but also to monitor changes in the quality of evaluation services.

An example of good practice: the Steering Committee

The Steering Committee was set up to coordinate and control the Renovation and Development of Water Supply and Waste Water Treatment Systems commissioned by the Ministry of the Environment. The committee approved by the order of the Minister of the Environment consisted of representatives from the Ministry of the Environment, the Ministry of Finance, the Environmental Project Management Agency and socio-economic partners (representatives of the Association of Local Authorities in Lithuania, the National Control Commission for Prices and Energy, the National Association of Water Suppliers). Experts of the European Investment Bank had the right to attend committee meetings as observers. The Steering Committee was responsible for the quality control of evaluation services, commenting and approving evaluation reports.

The internal quality of services falls within the responsibility of the evaluation project manager or a competent quality expert. To ensure the quality of evaluation services, the service provider must allocate adequate financial resources and competent evaluation experts for implementing the evaluation project. It is important that services are provided by the evaluation experts listed in the proposal for evaluation services. When executing an evaluation project, the service provider may use a wide range of internal quality assurance measures: following general quality management standards or special requirements for the quality of evaluation of the EU Structural Funds, applying manuals or guidelines regulating different evaluation approaches or methods (e.g. Guidelines for Counterfactual Impact Assessment Methods), performing internal reviews of evaluation reports and working documents, monitoring clients' satisfaction, measuring the quality of evaluation services, etc.

Risk management plays a significant role in carrying out an evaluation project and its activities. It is essential that the Terms of Reference, proposals and inception reports identify risks related to the contracting authority, the service provider, etc. Where needed, the relevance and impact of such risks may also be examined. Another important task is to observe risks and, where necessary, take appropriate corrective actions. The most frequent risks which have the most substantial negative effect on evaluation results are related to the insufficient availability of monitoring and other data that are needed for evaluation. Other risks that should be taken into account include the turnover of persons responsible for evaluation or evaluators, their limited involvement in the evaluation process, delayed public procurement, execution of evaluation activities and delivery of reports, incompleteness of evaluation reports.

Cooperation between the contracting authority and the service provider during the implementation of evaluation projects

The contracting authority and the service provider must cooperate with each other throughout the entire evaluation project period. For this purpose, they can use electronic means of communication and hold meetings to discuss the progress. It may be beneficial to include into the evaluation process not only persons responsible for evaluation, but also specialists responsible for the object (content) of evaluation, beneficiaries, stakeholders, socio-economic partners.

Risk management is a crucial element of evaluation

The contracting authority and the service provider must effectively cooperate throughout the evaluation process

At the stage of structuring an evaluation, when the contract is signed, the contracting authority and the service provider should hold a kick-off meeting to discuss the evaluation progress. Both sides of evaluation should cooperate in specifying the rationale for evaluation, methods, sources of information, etc.

At the data collection stage, the contracting authority should allow evaluators to get familiar with the available relevant information, provide monitoring data that may be useful for evaluation, help the service provider to find the missing or publicly unavailable information from public and municipal institutions or beneficiaries of the EU Structural Funds. Also, representatives of the contracting authority should be engaged in interviews, surveys, focus groups and other evaluation activities.

An example of good practice: cooperation between the contracting authority and the service provider during the data collection stage

The counterfactual analysis carried out for the Evaluation of the Situation, Needs and Effectiveness of Social Integration Services for Socially Vulnerable and Social Risk Groups to Use the EU Structural Funds 2007–2013 More Effectively used data from databases of the Lithuanian Labour Exchange and the State Social Insurance Fund Board (Sodra) on project participants (the target group) and a group of persons selected for comparison (the control group). The possibility to get and use the data for evaluation purposes was made possible by a constructive cooperation between the Lithuanian Labour Exchange and Sodra, with a help of active mediation by the contracting authority, i.e. the Ministry of Social Security and Labour. Following a written request by the Ministry, the Lithuanian Labour Exchange identified, according to the characteristics received, a group of relevant persons and forwarded a list to Sodra which, in turn, gathered information on those persons from its database. The Ministry submitted depersonalised data to the evaluators.

Cooperation between the contracting authority and the service provider is of utmost importance in drawing up conclusions and recommendations. The usual practice is to hold a meeting where the contracting authority and evaluators are able to present and discuss preliminary conclusions and recommendations. It is essential to ensure that managers of the contracting authority are involved in the consideration of recommendations as often as possible. The management of institutions could be informed through executive summaries or by presenting summarised recommendations to internal divisions or decision-making arrangements (e.g. committees, commission and working groups). Cooperation at this stage helps ensure that responsible institutions are competent to implement the solutions proposed and they have the necessary human and financial resources.

An example of good practice: cooperation between the contracting authority and the service provider in formulating recommendations

In order to present the results of the Evaluation of the Implementation of Priority 4 of the Operational Programme for the Development of Human Resources, a special event was organised whose programme included not only the introduction

of draft evaluation conclusions and recommendations, but also voting on each recommendation (there were 27 participants in total) and a discussion of the voting results (focusing on recommendations that received weaker support). The voting allowed engaging representatives of interested parties and making a more precise list of recommendations in the final evaluation report. Moreover, draft recommendations were additionally presented in a meeting for civil servants of the Ministry of the Interior and the subordinate institutions. The meeting was chaired by the Vice-Minister of the Interior.

Evaluation ethics

Evaluation ethics is defined as a system of values and beliefs, affecting the choices made during evaluations. Contracting authorities and service providers must observe international and national standards of evaluation ethics.

Contracting
authorities and
service providers
must observe
evaluation ethics

Contracting authorities must follow the principle of objectivity in the procurement process and the evaluation of proposals. Once the implementation of the evaluation project starts, the contracting authority should remain impartial and refrain from any influence on the service provider in order to ensure that evaluation reports contain only favourable conclusions or omit recommendations that are appropriate but not acceptable to the contracting authority.

To ensure the protection of persons participating in evaluation activities, service providers must observe the principles of confidentiality and anonymity, avoid pressuring target groups that are not willing to take part in the evaluation, refrain from raising unrealistic expectations related to the evaluation in question (e.g. that the evaluation will help effectively solve specific problems relevant to the target group), ensure the informed content, i.e. guarantee that persons involved in the evaluation are provided sufficient information on the evaluation in question, not pose any threat to the integrity of organisations members of which consented to participate in the evaluation. Evaluators must also follow the principle of mutuality and allow persons who have taken part in the evaluation to get familiar with the evaluation results.

Service providers must be independent from political influence of the contracting authority and other stakeholders. They must meet integrity and impartiality requirements, avoid or declare any conflicts of interest. Evaluators must apply procedures of transparent communication with target groups. In cases where there is a substantial risk that an evaluation may be not objective, the method of checks and balances may be used, i.e. an independent expert who is related neither to the service provider nor to the contracting authority should be assigned to supervise the evaluation.

Any data collection techniques used for evaluation activities must be used correctly, avoiding any subjective data collection procedures where answers of different respondents are known a priori, ensuring the proper use of databases and the protection of information (e.g. database passwords, information of limited use), guaranteeing triangulation of sources of information, indicating all sources of information used for evaluation, meeting all requirements for the protection of intellectual property.

The sources of information employed for evaluation activities must be appropriately quoted, and any plagiarising of evaluation reports or other sources on the similar issues should be strictly avoided.

An example of good practice: Guiding Principles for Evaluators, the American Evaluation Association

A. Systematic Inquiry: evaluators conduct systematic, data-based inquiries about whatever is being evaluated.

B. Competence: evaluators provide competent performance to stakeholders.

C. Integrity/Honesty: evaluators ensure the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process.

D. Respect for people: evaluators respect the security, dignity and self-worth of the respondents, program participants, clients, and other stakeholders with whom they interact.

E. Responsibilities for general and public welfare: evaluators articulate and take into account the diversity of interests and values that may be related to the general and public welfare.

3. RESULTS OF EVALUATION OF EU STRUCTURAL FUNDS AND THEIR USE

3.1. Results of evaluation of EU Structural Funds

Evaluation results are of high quality if:

- *the evaluation report is clear, specific and easy to understand; it provides answers to all evaluation questions and formulates analysis-based conclusions.*
- *the evaluation report contains recommendations that meet quality standards (validity, clarity, timeliness, enforceability, effectiveness) and are formulated by the service provider in cooperation with all responsible bodies.*
- *the evaluation report is accompanied by an executive summary drafted as acceptable for decision-makers.*

Evaluation results

The main evaluation deliverable is an evaluation report, which must be clear, specific and easy to understand, produced in accordance with the Style Guide for EU Structural Funds' Evaluation Reports. The evaluation report is accompanied by an executive summary which sums up the initial information, the rationale and methodology, evaluation results, conclusions and recommendations. It must give a brief description of the methodological framework, indicate clear links between the evaluation findings and conclusions, present examples of good practice, give concrete answers to all evaluation questions, as well as formulate valid conclusions and recommendations.

The main deliverable of a high-quality evaluation is a clear, specific and easy to understand evaluation report

Recommendations produced in the evaluation report must meet quality standards, i.e. they must be clear, legitimate, timely, enforceable and effective. Evaluation recommendations must be formulated by evaluators in consultation with the contracting authority and other bodies responsible by competence. They should be designed for the contracting authority that further decides on the final recipient who, in accordance with its competence, will be able to implement them. Evaluation recommendations should be discussed in a meeting with the contracting authority and other stakeholders, and the service provider must take their written proposals into account and improve the recommendations accordingly.

3.2. Using evaluation results

Evaluation results are used effectively if:

- *evaluation results (e.g. evaluation results, designed methodologies, calculation models, etc.) are properly communicated to all target groups.*
- *the insights provided in evaluation reports, the statistical information collected and the results of the calculations made are used for improving programmes or reporting purposes.*
- *recommendations produced in evaluation reports are implemented and evaluation results are integrated into the decision-making process.*

The use of evaluation results depends on the quality of evaluations, motives of the

contracting authority and its determination to use the knowledge, insights and recommendations offered in evaluation reports. It also depends on the feeling of ownership which is invoked by active involvement of all stakeholders in the evaluation process, on the relevance and feasibility of recommendations.

There are three ways to exploit evaluation results:

A. Using the knowledge created in evaluations. Evaluations collect new information, systemise available data and make calculations, meaning that new knowledge is created and can be later used by contracting authorities, stakeholders, and the general public.

B. Using insights and proposals presented in evaluation for validating decisions to be made. The insights presented in evaluations and the conclusions made are used in the decision-making process to motivate the actions that have already been decided on.

C. Implementing recommendations produced in evaluations. Implementing recommendations provided in evaluations improves the use of financial resources. According to the evaluations carried out in 2008–2012, one evaluation report provides 13 recommendations on average, whose larger share (approx. 63%) end up being implemented.

Disseminating evaluation results

Active dissemination of evaluation results is a fundamental premise for their use

One of the important factors in using evaluation results is a proper dissemination strategy that meets the needs of target groups (e.g. policy-makers, administrators of operational programmes, socio-economic partners, and the general public). All interim and final evaluation results must be communicated to all stakeholders by holding special events, sending intermediate and final reports by e-mail. As recommended by the European Commission, all evaluation reports must be available to the general public (they are published on a special website for the EU Structural Funds at <http://www.esparama.lt/vertinimo-ataskaitos>).

Evaluation results are usually communicated in the following ways: an evaluation report is made available on the Internet, published as a paper or sent by e-mail; an executive report or a brief summary of results is communicated and distributed; evaluation results are presented in special events or meetings (presentation for target groups, event of a wider scope, meeting of the Monitoring Committee); a press release is produced on the basis of evaluation results; evaluation results are presented in a special publication.

An example of good practice: active dissemination of evaluation results

The main deliverables of the Evaluation of the Relevance and Effectiveness of Monitoring Indicators for the Implementation of Priorities of Measures of the Operational Programme for the Promotion of Cohesion Administered by the Ministry of Health (commissioned by the Ministry of Health) was an evaluation report and methodology how to create a system to monitor secondary indicators that are required for calculating monitoring indicators of the implementation of measures of

the Operational Programme for the Promotion of Cohesion. The evaluation results were presented in four special events where institutions collecting information for the calculation of monitoring indicators could get familiar with the key evaluation findings. All four events were differentiated by target group, theme and geographical location. The event in Vilnius was aimed at a general presentation of the results. The other three information events held in Kaunas, Klaipėda and Trakai were targeted at beneficiaries. The events in Kaunas and Klaipėda gave the opportunity not only to discuss the evaluation results, but also to talk about changes in monitoring the implementation of measures administered by the Ministry of Health. The discussion held in Trakai was attended by beneficiaries as well as decision-makers and members of the academic community. Planning and organising the events by region and theme ensured a wider dissemination of the evaluation results. It also helped ensure that the information provided meets the needs of target groups.

Using new knowledge created in evaluations

Most evaluations create new knowledge. They collect statistical data related to the object being evaluated, summarise information from secondary sources, gather information from primary sources (e.g. interviews, surveys), make calculations (e.g. to reveal the impact that support provided from the EU Structural Funds to different economic sectors has on the gross domestic product or individual target groups). New insights and findings may be used for progress reports or strategic documents, reporting to the European Commission or Lithuanian authorities, drafting conference papers for representatives of institutions, making public presentations, participating in discussions with EU Structural Funds' beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Evaluation is used as a source of new knowledge about the object of evaluation

Opinion of contracting authorities:

“Evaluation results are usually used for public presentations, also annual implementation reports. Evaluations provide new and in-depth insights and information. [...] The evaluation process as such and learning opportunities it brings are also very useful. The involvement of external experts into the use of EU support is an effective practice that is being used at the EU level.”

Using evaluation results for decision-making

Some evaluations are commissioned so that external experts could examine and deliver their independent opinion on issues to be addressed by institutions administering the EU Structural Funds. In this case, insights and conclusions presented in evaluations are used for confirming the actions to be or being taken by institutions, e.g. withdrawing unsuccessful measures or launching new relevant measures, confirming the need to reallocate funds among different measures or sectors, justifying the need for administrative actions being taken. External experts that carry out evaluations often confirm the problems or solutions that have already been considered by institutions.

Evaluation results are used to ground the actions taken

Examples of good practice: evaluation insights that confirmed the decisions taken by institutions

Evaluation “Calculation of Implementation Indicators of the Operational Programme for Economic Growth in the Transport Sector” recommended that in the period 2007–2013 more financial resources were allocated to counties with insufficiently developed road networks. In the light of it, EU funds for local roads were distributed according to the level of development of the transport infrastructure. After the Evaluation of the Quality and Effectiveness of ESF-Funded Training identified problems related to the implementation of Measure “Diversification of Rural Labour Force into Non-Agricultural Activities” administered by the Ministry of Social Security and Labour, the Ministry adopted a decision that had already been considered for some time, namely to withdraw the measure and reallocate its funds to other measures.

Implementing evaluation recommendations

The value added of evaluations lies in the practical implementation of recommendations they put forward

The direct use of evaluation results is related to the implementation of recommendations and their role in the decision-making process. Whether recommendations offered in a particular evaluation report should be implemented or not is decided by the contracting authority. The contracting authority draws up an action plan for the implementation of evaluation recommendations. This plan set out only the recommendations to be actually implemented, concrete actions to be taken, responsible persons and a timetable. The implementation of evaluation recommendations should be regularly monitored by a person responsible for evaluations. The main aim here is to see how the proposals are fed in the decision-making process. The responsible person must periodically report to the managing authority information collected on the actual progress in the implementation of recommendations for that particular institution.

An example of good practice: ensuring the implementation of recommendations

In 2009, a study was carried out on the decline in mortality from cardiovascular diseases in supported regions. A Project Management Group, set up for the supervision and implementation of the evaluation, was actively engaged in the whole evaluation process. Evaluation recommendations formulated by a service provider were discussed with representatives of the Evaluation Unit, Vice-Minister of Health, department director, representatives of other units and social partners. The final report was accepted by signing a statement of delivery and acceptance. The Ministry, having taken proposals made by the evaluators into consideration, chose how to implement recommendations. Implementation measures were clear and specific (e.g. to design a procedure for the provision of services to cardiovascular patients). An action plan for the implementation of recommendations was approved by the order of the Lithuanian Minister of Health, and the implementation control was assigned to the Vice-Minister in charge of the policy area. By the end of 2012, more than half (60%) of the evaluation recommendations were fully implemented. When surveyed, the contracting authority said that the evaluation allowed it to improve operational programmes 2007–2013 (priorities/measures), ensured better reporting to the European Commission and raised the competence of civil servants.

Annex 1. Sources related to evaluation standards

Evaluation standards and manuals

1. OECD, *Quality standards for development evaluation*, 2010. <<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/55/0/44798177.pdf>>
2. *Guidelines for Follow-Up to Evaluation Report Recommendations*, 2008. <<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001583/158399E.pdf>>
3. Communication to the Commission from Ms Grybauskaitė in Agreement with the President. *Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation*, Brussels, 21 February 2007, SEC(2007)213. <http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/information_society/evaluation/data/pdf/sec_2007_0213_en.pdf>
4. The World Bank Group. *Evaluation Ethics*, 2007.
5. American Evaluation Association. *Guiding Principles for Evaluators*, 2004. <<http://www.eval.org/publications/guidingprinciples.asp>>
6. European Evaluation Society. *Evaluation Standards of National and Regional Evaluation Societies*. <<http://www.europeanevaluation.org/library/evaluation-standards/national-and-regional-evaluation-societies.htm>>

Methodological guidelines and other recommendations

7. European Commission. *The Partnership Principle in the Implementation of the Common Strategic Framework Funds – Elements for a European Code of Conduct on Partnership*. Commission Staff Working Document, 2012.
8. VŠĮ Viešosios politikos ir vadybos institutas. *Kontrafaktinių poveikio vertinimo metodų gairės*, 2012.
9. LR finansų ministerija. *Partnerystės principo taikymo ES struktūrinės paramos procese gairės*, 2012.
10. European Commission. *The Programming Period 2014-2020. Monitoring and Evaluation of European Cohesion policy – European Regional Development Fund and Cohesion Fund – Concepts and Recommendations*. Guidance document, Draft, November 2011.
11. LR finansų ministerija, VŠĮ Viešosios politikos ir vadybos institutas, VŠĮ Europos socialiniai, teisiniai ir ekonominiai projektai. *ES struktūrinės paramos vertinimas: metodinės gairės*, 2010.
12. LR finansų ministerija. *ES struktūrinės paramos vertinimo viešinimo rekomendacijos*, 2009.
13. European Commission. *The New Programming Period 2007–2013. Indicative Guidelines on Evaluation Methods: Evaluation during the Programming Period*, Working Document No. 5, April 2007.
14. EVALSED. *An online resource providing guidance on the evaluation of socio-economic development*. <http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/evalsed/guide/index_en.htm>

Evaluation reports and studies

15. VŠĮ Viešosios politikos ir vadybos institutas. *ES struktūrinės paramos vertinimo ataskaitų kokybės vertinimas*, 2013.
16. VŠĮ Europos socialiniai, teisiniai ir ekonominiai projektai. *ES struktūrinės paramos vertinimų rezultatų panaudojimo vertinimas*, 2013.
17. VŠĮ Europos socialiniai, teisiniai ir ekonominiai projektai, VŠĮ Viešosios politikos ir vadybos institutas. *Europos Sąjungos struktūrinės paramos vertinimo galimybių stiprinimo galimybių studija*, 2009.

