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Executive Summary

This study concerns the use of evaluation results in the European Commission. It responds to the following three questions:

1. Who are the users and what are the uses of the Commission’s evaluations?
2. Within the context of the elaboration of Commission acts/proposals, in the planning and budget cycle and in the management of ongoing activities, to what extent have the Commission’s evaluation activities actually contributed to different objectives that can be assigned to evaluation?
3. Are there certain factors that foster (or discourage) the use of evaluations? If so, what are these factors?

The study mainly focused on evaluations and their use within the Commission. It was based on an electronic survey conducted by DG BUDGET B5; on an analysis of the use of evaluation at the level of 10 different ABB Activities; and on a series of interviews with senior Commission staff.

Uses and users of evaluation

The study results show that the main users of the Commission’s evaluations are the services of the DGs commissioning the evaluations. More precisely, the main users appear to be the officials directly involved with the implementation of the interventions that are evaluated. The use of evaluation is most visible and explicit at an operational level, i.e. within and between different generations of expenditure programmes. Most of the use identified concerns adjusting the implementation of on-going programmes or policies and the preparation of their follow-up. Evaluation is less significantly used as an input to the setting of political priorities.

The study brought to the fore several other interesting uses and users, namely: for the management and operation of Commission agencies; in the formulation of regulations and directives; by other DGs and external stakeholders; in negotiations and in the preparation of agreements with third parties. Also, evaluation results are often used in other evaluations and studies such as impact assessment, mostly within a same DG.

Contribution of evaluation to different objectives

The study shows that evaluation is highly influential in the design and implementation of interventions. It also contributes greatly to raising awareness on interventions as well as to accountability.

The most common contribution of evaluation work lies in the improvement of implementation of interventions. However, there are policy instruments of the Commission where evaluation is not yet so common and the influence is also less evident, especially in the area of legislation.
Even though evaluations figure in proposals to Commission and Parliament, they are less influential in the setting of political priorities or choosing between different options *per se*. However, there are examples such as ex ante evaluation of Structural Fund programmes where political priorities have been influenced by evaluation at both the national and Commission level (Cohesion policy).

Finally, all evidence shows that overall allocation of EU resources is certainly *not* determined on efficiency grounds, but much more by political decision-making. The study shows especially that such decisions are generally very little informed by evaluation. Evaluation has however led to changes in resource allocation *within* interventions (especially expenditure programmes), in changes in eligibility criteria and incremental improvements in operational efficiency – the latter clearly resulting from evaluations exposing inefficiencies.

**Factors fostering the use of evaluation**

Crucial factors in fostering the use of evaluation are the timing and the purpose of the evaluation; support of the senior management; the quality of the evaluation process and the evaluation report; and the monitoring and follow-up of evaluation recommendations. Although still relatively important, the involvement of potential users; the human resources involved with evaluation (from the side of the Commission) and the dissemination of evaluation results appear to be less crucial.

**Recommendations**

The study identifies areas where improvements are needed and presents concrete options for each area. The general recommendations are the following:

Given their beneficial impact on the use of evaluations, the further development and enforcement of evaluation standards is recommended.

All evidence indicates that timing and planning of evaluation is crucial for evaluation use and that still this is not always managed to satisfaction. It is suggested that evaluation results can be made more useful by even better timing and anticipation.

The study clearly shows that the main use of evaluation is in the design and implementation of interventions and that this for the majority concerns continuation or renewal of interventions. It is therefore suggested that evaluation results can be better used in programming and planning of Commission activities.

The evidence provided by the study shows that Impact Assessment and ex ante evaluation are in practice very complementary. It is therefore recommended to increasingly combine the two approaches and to develop combined guidance.

The study shows that the use of evaluation information is limited in the legislative process, with several legislative financial statements failing to provide evaluative information. Therefore, the services involved in preparing legislative proposals should make an effort to use existing evaluation results in the legislative financial
statements to better support legislative proposals. An increased co-operation between the operational units, the financial services and the evaluation functions could be a first step in this direction.

The study shows that evaluation only weakly contributes to the efficient allocation of resources. In order to further enhance the Commission’s capability to maximise the utility of evaluation in the budgetary process, the role of evaluation in the various parts of the SPP and budgetary cycles (e.g. APS, PDB, AAR) could be strengthened by optimising the use of the available evaluation evidence in the respective reporting exercises. Also, evaluations should put more emphasis on cost-effectiveness and related issues.

The ABB Activity being the “unit of analysis” for the present study, as a by-result, the study clearly indicates that their internal coherence can in many cases still be further improved and the link with evaluation strengthened.
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Introduction

This is the final report of the study concerning the use of evaluation results in the European Commission. This study was carried out by the EPEC eeig on behalf of DG BUDGET, within the Lot 1 Framework Contract for ex-ante evaluation (reference BUDG-02-01-L1).

This report is set out in five further sections
- Rationale, scope and questions of this study
- Brief outline of methodology; an extended outline is given in different annexes
- Results
- Analysis
- Conclusions and recommendations

Annexes contain
- List of references
- Overall methodology
- Case study methodology
- Revision of initial success criteria
- List of interviewees

Case study reports are provided in a separate dossier.

1 Rationale, scope and questions of this study

1.1 Rationale and aims of the study
This study examines to what extent evaluations in the European Commission achieve their main purposes. It attempts to explain the reasons why certain evaluations have proven to be more (or less) useful and to identify factors and best practices that increase the utility of evaluations.

The aim is to improve the use of evaluation in the Commission. The study therefore includes recommendations on how evaluation results can be made more useful and how they can be better used in programming and implementation of Commission activities. A new Commission Communication on evaluation is envisaged for 2005 in order to consolidate and further develop the Commission’s evaluation framework. This study is intended to serve as an input to this Communication.

1.2 Scope of the study
The study examines the use of evaluations during the period of 2002 – 2004, meaning that evaluations covered by the exercise may date from earlier periods. The main focus is on the use of evaluation by the Commission, including an examination of processes in which evaluation results could potentially be used, with a view to identifying and increasing understanding of factors which encourage or discourage
their influence. However, it does not exclude other users such as the other European institutions or any other stakeholder.

The study focuses on the use of evaluations of EU funded programmes and policies. It covers all different types of evaluations: ex ante, intermediate, final and ex post. Project level evaluations, de-centralised evaluations and evaluations carried out by the Member States have, following the terms of reference, been of secondary concern in this study.

1.3 Questions to be resolved
The study covers the following three questions:

1  Who are the users and what are the uses of the Commission’s evaluations?
2  Within the context of the elaboration of Commission acts/proposals, in the planning and budget cycle and in the management of ongoing activities, to what extent have the Commission’s evaluation activities actually contributed to the following objectives?\(^1\)
   - provide input for setting political priorities and choose between different political priorities
   - support the design of interventions;
   - assist in an efficient allocation of resources;
   - improve the implementation of activities;
   - increase awareness on achievements
   - increase accountability on achievements.
3  Are there certain factors that foster (or discourage) the use of evaluations? If so, what are these factors?

2 Methodology
This section briefly discusses the methodology adopted. A full description of the overall methodology is given in Annex B and for the case studies in Annex C.

2.1 Overview
The study consisted of the following steps:

• Analysis of questionnaire responses from a survey administered by DG BUDGET (the contents of the questionnaire is further explained when the results will be discussed, see Chapter 3; the questionnaire is given in Annex F)
• Analysis of evaluation use as indicated in Council, Parliament and Commission legislative proposals, and the analysis of the use of evaluation-related information in Activity Statements and in the ABM/SPP cycle; this was based on reviews provided by DG BUDGET
• Ten case studies, revolving around the “ABB\(^2\) Activity” (see next section)

\(^1\) In the original Terms of reference for the study the first two and the last two points of the list were taken together. Since quite different issues are at stake (and the study confirms this) it was chosen to separate them to result in 6 different objectives to which evaluation can contribute.

\(^2\) Activity Based Budgeting. The starting point for the analysis of ABB Activities was the “Preliminary Draft General Budget of the European Commission for the Financial Year 2005” DG BUDGET May 2004.
This formed the heart of the study; case study reports are given in a separate dossier

- Interviews with persons with an interest in or an opinion on evaluation use, not necessarily linked to the case studies. Two types of persons were interviewed: either they have an interest in evaluation because of their hierarchical position (5 interviews) or they have an interest in evaluation results since they have a specific role within DG BUDGET in the policy cycle (3 interviews), in particular with regard to requests for budget or human resource.
- Analysis of the results of the different empirical items
- Formulation of conclusions and recommendations

A final workshop was held in order to further integrate and validate the conclusions and recommendations.

2.2 The unit of analysis (the ABB Activity) and the choice for cases

The unit of analysis that was chosen was inspired by the idea that, instead of examining individual evaluations and their use, more could be learned from instances where several evaluations would eventually contribute to a policy or a set of actions. Both formally (the introduction of ABM with a focus on activities and the extension of the Commission’s requirements on evaluation from expenditure programmes to all activities) and practically (a minimum level of coherence with each analysed entity for the present study), the “ABB activity” of the Commission seemed a good candidate and was chosen as the unit of analysis.

An ABB activity often covers several interventions – and in many cases different types of interventions – and can mobilise one or several evaluations and types of evaluation. It was thought that therefore studying ABB Activities would allow this study to account for the interplay between evaluations and interventions. Moreover, even if this is not the case for all ABB Activities, evaluation should be linked to the level of the ABB Activity, which is supposed to be a coherent entity, and therefore, the “ABB Activity Statements” should contain evaluation-related information.

---

4 For 2003 this was still fairly limited however, according to the previously cited study, p.3. Moreover evaluation-related information most of the time related to individual programmes or actions rather than to the ABB Activity as a whole.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Types of interventions within the ABB Activity</th>
<th>Number of evaluations identified relevant for this study</th>
<th>Evaluation types (ex ante, intermediate, final, ex-post, on-going) present in case study</th>
<th>Impact on the budget and/or external impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTR 02 02 (Encouraging entrepreneurship)</td>
<td>MAP &amp; IDA II programmes; MGS pilot(^5)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Low impact on the budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPL 04 03 (Work organisations and working conditions)</td>
<td>Transposition of a series of Health and Safety at Work Directives</td>
<td>4 (one of which, relating to series of 6 Directives was studied in detail)</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Low impact on the budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRI 05 04 01 or 02 (Rural development)</td>
<td>Structural Fund Interventions (devolved)</td>
<td>Numerous (on MS &amp; regional level)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREN 06 04 (Conventional &amp; renewable energies)</td>
<td>Expenditure Programmes in the area of Intelligent Energy</td>
<td>Several</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISH 11 03 (International Fisheries)</td>
<td>Fishery Agreement Protocols</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
<td>Final evaluations (all internal)</td>
<td>Low impact on the budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIO 13 03 (Regional development fund)</td>
<td>Structural Fund Interventions (devolved)</td>
<td>Numerous (on MS &amp; regional level)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC 15 03 (Vocational training-Leonardo)</td>
<td>1 Programme and two Agencies</td>
<td>More than 5</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANCO 17 04 (Food safety &amp; Novel Foods)</td>
<td>Two regulations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low impact on the budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAI 18 04 (citizenship &amp; fundamental rights)</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mid-term and final</td>
<td>Low impact on the budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO 23 02 (Humanitarian Aid)</td>
<td>Humanitarian Aid Operations; Partnerships; Themes / Thematic evaluations</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not the aim of this study to evaluate the coherence of the way in which different DGs organise their ABB Activities or of the ABB or ABM system as a whole. However, this Unit of Analysis does not represent a homogenous entity. An ABB Activity can associate different actions which are not necessarily part of one integrated whole. For instance, whereas “Vocational Training” (15 03) of DG EAC, associates only interventions strictly related to Vocational Training (i.e. the Leonardo programme and the two agencies ETF and Cedefop), in the case of Activity 02 02 (“Encouraging Entrepreneurship”) the IDA II and MAP programmes have no direct

---

\(^5\) Multiannual Programme for Enterprise and Entrepreneurship in particular for SMEs; networks between public administrations; Mutual Guarantee Schemes
relationship with each other and one can even question the relationship of the first with the general heading of the ABB Activity at stake.

As already shown by the previous example, there are also significant differences between the ABB Activities, caused simply by the fact that the Commission is implementing a very heterogeneous set of different types of interventions, at many different levels and directed toward many different actors and types of stakeholders. For example, taking the sample presented in the Exhibit above, the “Structural Fund” ABB Activities of DG REGIO and DG AGRI amount to billions of Euros, and are incomparable in scale and scope to the more regulation-oriented ABB Activities (DG SANCO, DG EMPL) which have hardly any direct implications for the budget (but have socio-economic impacts “on the outside world”). The difference in types of intervention and the way in which they are implemented (on centralised basis by the Commission, by shared management with Member States or decentralised management in third countries or by joint management with international organisations) has consequences for the way in which evaluation is set up and its results can be used.

Finally there is heterogeneity in the extent to which an individual ABB Activity represents the different parts of the work of an individual DG. Again for DG EAC, the different ABB Activities correspond to the different “themes” covered by this DG (Vocational Training, Youth, etc.); in the case of ECHO, the ABB Activity studied here represents all the interventions performed by this DG since there is no other substantial ABB Activity alongside the one studied, in the case of EMPL the ABB Activity chosen is only one of the many types of activities this DG undertakes and cannot necessarily be taken as representative of all activities of this DG. For the Structural Fund ABB Activities, DG REGIO and DG AGRI also implement a substantial range of ABB Activities in addition to the ones selected for the present study.

As a consequence of these differences in ABB Activities, evaluation practice, logistics and use differ greatly from one ABB Activity to another. It was exactly the purpose of the study to better understand the different evaluation uses within the heterogeneity of activities so common to the European Commission and therefore a varied set of ABB Activities was selected. To increase the representativity of the sample, the activities were selected with considerations to the size of the budget, the types of interventions, number of evaluations and types of evaluations carried out. Moreover, the case studies represent DGs with different evaluation culture and experience.

---

6 Financial Regulation, article 53
7 A study performed by DG BUDGET (DG BUDGET, Analysis of Evaluation-related Information in the ABB Activity Statements (PDB 2004), November 2003) aimed to establish to what extent evaluation-related information was included in the Activity Statements presented within the context of PDB 2004 following the request (cf circular BUDG/A1/EW/D(2003) 11007) to include in the Activity Statements a Chapter 6 (Evaluation and Follow-Up) giving “whenever possible, a brief review of recent evaluation findings concerning the Activity, including Court of Auditors reports, stating clearly recommendations made in these reports.” The study refers to the first year of the new ABB-system and concludes that the number of Activity Statements comprising evaluation-related information was relatively limited and that there were only three Activity Statements with a presentation of evaluation related information clearly linked to the Activity as a whole.
3 Results

This section contains the analysis of the questionnaire survey, discusses briefly the results of one of the studies provided by DG BUDGET, and gives the results of the interviews and the cases studies. Full case study reports are provided in a separate Dossier.

3.1 Survey

3.1.1 Implementation of the questionnaire and response

A questionnaire was designed by DG BUDGET B5 and sent electronically as Word form to persons (Heads of Unit) responsible for the interventions evaluated (they had the freedom to forward the questionnaire to persons they would find more suited to respond). The questionnaires were sent for all evaluations completed in 2002 and 2003, except for cross-cutting evaluations managed by DG BUDGET or the Secretariat General, i.e. 186 individual evaluations (though to fewer respondents). 155 questionnaires were completed and returned to DG BUDGET (83%). Just over one-third (59) of the evaluations for which questionnaires were completed related to expenditure programmes, the others related to a wide range of other types of interventions such as Organisations (centres, foundations, agencies…), Regulation or Directives, Actions, Action Plans and Strategies (e.g. Country Strategies).

The questionnaire contained three questions. The first question asked “how useful this evaluation [was] in general for the Commission.” Respondents could reply “very,” “quite,” “somewhat” and “not” useful. The second question asked how the evaluation had been used. The possible uses that could be indicated in the replies are listed in Exhibit 2.

Exhibit 2 Items of the questionnaire: different types of evaluation use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A - To support the design of interventions and/or provide input for setting political priorities by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 - supporting proposals to Council or Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 - supporting the design of interventions at the level of the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 - supporting the annual planning cycle (e.g. were used in the APS / CLWP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B - To assist in an efficient allocation of resources by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1 - supporting the establishment of the Financial Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 - determining the appropriate level of funding within Commission proposals for Council and/or Parliament acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 - determining the appropriate level of funding in Commission acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 - underpinning financial decisions at management level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 - underpinning budget allocations within the budgetary (e.g. PDB/AMP) processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C – To improve the implementation of activities by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 - supporting management decisions on operational level spending/activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 - underpinning the Commission's own administration / internal procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D – To increase accountability and/or awareness of activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| E – If the evaluation had been used in any other way, it should be specified |

The third question asked who the users of the evaluation were. Apart from question 3 relating to the users of the evaluation, for which DG BUDGET provided the results

---

8 Regarding evaluation use as indicated in legislative proposals.
directly, responses were statistically analysed by EPEC. They were also used to support the selection and analysis of case studies.

### 3.1.2 Analysis of statistical results

According to the analysis provided by DG BUDGET, nearly 95% of respondents state that the user of an evaluation is the commissioning DG. “Other DG, DGs or Services within the Commission,” “Other EU Institutions or agencies” and “Member states” account for slightly over 20% whereas “Relevant stakeholders” are users in around 30% of the cases.

Concerning the usefulness of the evaluations, 3 of the 155 responses said to “not know” about its usefulness and one respondent did not indicate it. For the remaining 151 responses, the distribution is as follows:

- Not useful: 9 (6%)
- Somewhat: 25 (16%)
- Quite: 70 (45%)
- Very: 47 (30%)

#### 3.1.2.1 Use per type of intervention

About one-third of the types of intervention for which the evaluation was seen as “quite” and “very” useful are expenditure programmes (24 and 13 respectively – not shown in a graph), just a little under their relative weight in the sample (i.e. 38%). There is no significant difference with the usefulness of other types of interventions. There is a significant difference in distribution however when the answers “not useful” are inspected: out of 10 of such opinions, only 2 were related to expenditure programmes, the others to evaluations of different other types of intervention. This would indicate that evaluations of expenditure programmes are seen as generally more useful than evaluations of other types of interventions – the number of negative responses is too small however to generalise this statement. It is true that in the Commission and elsewhere, programme evaluation benefits from a much longer historical track record which could explain that its evaluations are better embedded in policy processes – and this traditionally is also the case at the European Commission.

#### 3.1.2.2 Use per type of evaluation

The distribution of different types of evaluation in the sample was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex ante</th>
<th>Interim</th>
<th>Ex post</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

9 This is explained by shifts in posts.
10 In the remainder of this report, unless indicated otherwise, the word “programme” will refer to “expenditure programme.”
11 See previous evaluation use report.
12 Including IA
13 Intermediate and ex post evaluations combined.
It was analysed whether certain types of evaluations (ex ante, etc.) were viewed as more useful than other ones. The result shows that there is no significant difference between ex ante, interim and ex post evaluations.

3.1.2.3 Different types of use of evaluations

The further analysis of survey results is given below. Exhibit 3 shows first of all that no single item is seen unanimously as being the principal “consumer” of evaluations, i.e. items receiving the three highest scores are only indicated as such by just over half of the respondents.

Exhibit 3  The different types of use of evaluations

The use for management decisions, accountability and awareness receive the highest scores and items corresponding to “Category B” generally receive the lowest scores. In other words the contribution of evaluation is to a great extent relating to substance, rather than to how the budget for a specific activity is set.

3.1.3 Other types of uses, not pre-identified by the questionnaire

Exhibit 3 shows that the “other” category was ticked fairly often (3rd rank out of 12). It is therefore necessary to better understand this category – there was a possibility to explain this in the questionnaire (question 2e). Below follows the transcription of survey comments, in order of frequency with which they appeared:

- “contribution to external e.g. Member States’ or local authorities’ learning (cited four times) (*)
- “to serve in negotiations” (cited several times although not always clear whether exactly the same thing was meant each time, e.g. “to back up our position in negotiations”)
- “contributing to analysis” / “contributing to preparatory work” / “giving insight” (*)
- “contributing to internal learning or to internal debate” (cited three times) (*)
- “external confirmation of weaknesses” / “confirming our own assessment”
- “close a programme” (cited twice)
- “to increase coordination between EC and other organisation working in the same area”

The responses given do not indicate that a specific category of use contexts would have been forgotten in the survey design: the “other” category is quite heterogeneous,
although some issues seem to be repeated several times. It does bring out some typical cases of non-instrumental uses\textsuperscript{14} of evaluation, marked with an asterisk.

3.1.4 Specific analysis of “free text” comments

There was also a possibility to give free text comments in the survey questionnaire which was used by several respondents. Their reading shows that these mostly were not directly related to the evaluations analysed in the survey but rather to the opinions and experiences of the respondents. The different ideas and suggestions proposed by the respondents can be summarised as follows:

- The use of evaluation within the framework of expenditure programmes is very often limited to the DG, even if indirectly results may well go beyond it (see also previous section for some non-instrumental uses of evaluation)
- In the case of regulation, directives, policies, strategies, etc., Impact Assessment and Ex Ante Evaluation become important tools and users go far beyond the DG or the Commission and comprise Council, Parliament, Stakeholder groups in wider society, etc.
- Especially “devolved” evaluation (Structural Funds) needs an effort of centralisation and capitalisation in order for its results to feed back into the decision making processes of the Commission itself
- Several times it is suggested that in order to be useful, the scope of an evaluation should be in-depth and narrow, rather than broad
- Related to the previous point, several respondents mention problems with evaluators as the latter do not always have sufficient expertise or in-depth knowledge to perform an evaluation in a manner satisfactory to the evaluation client

3.2 Evaluation use as indicated in the Council, Parliament and Commission legislative proposals

DG BUDGET provided an analysis of the Council/Parliament level acts and Commission level acts sent to Inter-service Consultations.\textsuperscript{15} The basis of this was a systematic sample used for an existing study of 113 proposals. The aim of this study, dating from October 2004, was to ascertain the influence of evaluation on programming and decision-making at all levels. The study shows that the use of evaluation information is limited in new proposals. The use is at the least highly unclear, since very often there are no references to evaluation results. More precisely, the following observations can be made:

- Information on follow-up measures stemming from both ex ante and ex post evaluations is relatively scarce. Many Legislative Financial Statements fail to provide any information at all on evaluation reports or exercises. (64% of the Legislative Financial Statements examined did not report on either an ex ante or an ex post evaluation). This may indicate that the preparation of new proposals often does not seem to be supported by a formal evaluation exercise.
- However, the study also found that for proposals involving important operational expenditure, ex ante evaluation had been carried out in 67 % of cases. This result indicates that ex ante evaluation tends to concentrate on bigger proposals for operational expenditure.

\textsuperscript{14} Whereby instrumental use of evaluation is defined as evaluation research feeding directly into decision making for policy and practice; see for instance Weiss, C. (1998) ‘Have we learned anything new about the use of evaluation?, American Journal of Evaluation, vol. 19, pp. 21–3.

\textsuperscript{15} DG BUDGET, Evaluation information provided in Financial Statements in the Inter-service consultations (final version October 2004).
• In cases where Legislative Financial Statements did include information on ex ante evaluation reports, the role and the extent to which ex ante evaluation effectively played a role in the design process for a programme or policy proposal was unclear. In most of these cases the Legislative Financial Statement usually simply stated that a detailed ex ante evaluation has been carried out, but no information was provided whether and to what extent its findings and recommendations had influenced the final proposal.

• As with the case of ex ante evaluation, the services fall short of providing information in the Legislative Financial Statements on whether and to what extent the results of past intermediate, final or ex post evaluations have been used in preparing the proposal. Even if this item of the Legislative Financial Statement was filled in (in 14% of the cases examined), again only the overall results of recent evaluations were mentioned – in the proposals using other Financial Statements, i.e. for Commission level acts, even less information was provided on the follow-up measures of prior evaluations.

• For those Financial Statements that lack an explicit mention of evaluation, some “evaluative” exercises nevertheless seem to have been performed, since objectives stated are normally “SMART,” as required in the Financial Regulation (article 27), albeit not fully since information on the time scale over which objectives should be achieved is mostly missing. Also, an analysis of the need for Community intervention as well as of the outputs and costs has been performed fairly often.

3.3 Results from interviews

On top of the case studies, interviews were conducted with 8 different officials who, without being directly involved with managing evaluations themselves, would have an interest in evaluation. As a matter of fact, two groups of interviews are distinguished under this heading:

• with officials within DG Budget, who may encounter evaluation results within the framework of the budgetary cycle in requests for either human or financial resource allocations

• with officials “from the senior management” in different DGs; these interviews, which were relatively brief, aimed at discussing preliminary findings of the study. They have in particular focused on the three interrelated issues of (1) how and to what extent evaluation results filter up to senior management; (2) the conditions for the use of evaluation results on a more operational and implementation level versus a more strategic use; (3) also the relation between ex ante evaluation and impact assessment was discussed

The main observations to be drawn from first group of interviews, i.e. with the officials managing the approval of (financial and human) resource allocations at DG BUDGET are the following:

16 Specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timed objectives; note that in the evaluation literature the A stands normally for Accepted and the R for realistic which could simply be interpreted as an inversion of the A & R of the Financial Regulation.
• Evaluation results are not visibly or directly encountered by the interviewees, i.e. they do not consult themselves evaluation reports or other results directly; these either come within the requests from the DGs or in the “meta” analyses provided by BUDG B5

• Evaluation results are especially used when requesting for resources to increase, or eventually when resource reallocations are being requested. There was no evidence of evaluations used to support a decrease in resources to the central services in DG Budget. However, evaluations may be used to decrease resources within certain activities since they are used to support reallocations within DGs.

• Evaluations have a function as a tool for the management and implementation of interventions, but overall still play a very minor role in budget allocations, which remain a highly political process rather than one in which evidence stemming from evaluation has a significant input.

As concerns the second type of interviews there appeared to be as many different views as interviews, not only on how evaluation is used but also on how it should be used. Whereas one interviewee regrets that evaluation is limited very much to the operational level (in the case of this interviewee more specifically to the definition and redefinition of programmes) another interviewee thinks that this is exactly what evaluation is meant for and that other mechanisms, such as impact assessment, exist for more political issues, regulation and interventions that may have a limited budgetary impact, but a wide societal scope. This latter point-of-view is contradicted by a third high level official who says not to really understand why ex ante evaluation and impact assessment are – in his idea artificially – separated whilst conceptually so close. A fourth interviewee asserts that he is already using evaluation to define and redefine, not expenditure programmes, but policies.

3.4 Overall case study results

Each of the 10 case studies is the subject of a case study report which is presented in a separate Dossier. Each case study covers the following issues:

1 Evaluation use: main points to be learned from the case studied
   ➔ This is a summary, in bullet point format, of “striking features” interesting for the aim of this study

2 Description of the activity
   ➔ Starting point for this was for each case the description of the ABB activity as in the Activity Statements (May 2004), eventually completed with other relevant documents (e.g. to describe the different constituents of the activity more in detail).

3 How evaluations and other “information sources” structure the activity
   ➔ This describes the evaluations within the ABB Activity studied, as well as other support that would be of importance (impact assessment, consultation…).

4 How evaluation is used within this activity
   ➔ This discusses for each ABB Activity or, if applicable, for each individual evaluation:
   4.1 Who are the users and what the uses are of the evaluations within this activity?
   4.2 To extent to which evaluations within this activity have contributed to …
      – Providing input for setting political priorities
      – Supporting the design of interventions
- Assisting in an efficient allocation of resources
- Improving the implementation of activities
- Increasing accountability on achievements
- Increasing awareness on achievements

Exhibit 4 (next page) contains overall results only. Detailed results and in-depth analysis can be found in Dossier 2 which contains the individual case studies. Case study results are abundantly cited in the analytical section hence they are not developed in full at this stage in the report.
### Exhibit 4  Overview of cases studied, evaluations identified and brief summary of their uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Evaluation-intervention couples identified</th>
<th>Main use of the evaluation results</th>
<th>Evaluation types (ex ante, intermediate, final, ex-post, on-going) present in case study</th>
<th>Different evaluation types</th>
<th>Intervention-types</th>
<th>Evaluation: legal obligation?</th>
<th>Centralised, decentralised or devolved</th>
<th>Evaluation: internal, external?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTR 02 02 (Encouraging entrepreneurship)</td>
<td>Intermediate (2002-03) and final (2004-05) evaluation of MAP Intermediate (2002) and final (2004) evaluation of IDA programme Evaluation of MGS pilot</td>
<td>Implementation improvement The MGS pilot action is stopped after the evaluation</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Mid-term and final evaluations</td>
<td>Programmes Pilot action</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Decentralised</td>
<td>MAP mid-term internal, others external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPL 04 03 (work organisations and working conditions)</td>
<td>Evaluation of the practical implementation of national legislation transposing health and safety directives</td>
<td>To account for achievements in the light of the EU member states implementing the relevant Directives</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Ex post</td>
<td>Transposition of directives</td>
<td>There is legal requirement but it is arguably to monitor progress rather than evaluate</td>
<td>Decentralised</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRI 05 04 01 &amp; 02 (Rural development)</td>
<td>Leader – Several evaluations Objective 5a &amp; 5b and accompanying measures. Different regulations</td>
<td>Policy making</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Ex post Mid-term Impact Assessment</td>
<td>Expenditure programmes Policies Regulation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Decentralised, devolved</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREN 06 04 (Conventional &amp; renewable energies)</td>
<td>Mid-term evaluation of Energy framework programme which consists of SAVE, internal coherence;</td>
<td>Implementation of current programme, internal coherence;</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Ex post, mid-term, Ex ante</td>
<td>Expenditure programmes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Decentralised</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Evaluation-intervention couples identified</td>
<td>Main use of the evaluation results</td>
<td>Evaluation types (ex ante, intermediate, final, ex-post, on-going) present in case study</td>
<td>Different evaluation types</td>
<td>Intervention-types</td>
<td>Evaluation: legal obligation?</td>
<td>Centralised, decentralised or devolved</td>
<td>Evaluation: internal, external?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTENER, SYNERGY, CARNOT, SURE and ETAP</td>
<td>future of the programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISH 11 03 (International Fisheries)</td>
<td>Evaluation of fishery agreements between Europe en third countries</td>
<td>Renewal of fishery agreements</td>
<td>Final evaluations</td>
<td>“Final”</td>
<td>Agreements with third countries</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Decentralised</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIO 13 03 (Regional development fund)</td>
<td>Mid-term evaluation of structural funds</td>
<td>Implementation Decisions on performance reserve Capitalisation within the DG</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Mid-term</td>
<td>Structural funds (programmes)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Devolved</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC 15 03 (Vocational training-Leonardo)</td>
<td>Mid-term evaluation of Leonardo II programme Periodical evaluations of Cedefop and European Training Foundation</td>
<td>Continued implementation of a programme Input to ex ante evaluation and preparation of a new programme Establishment of action plan of agency</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Mid-term “On-going” / periodical evaluation of agencies</td>
<td>Expenditure programme Agencies</td>
<td>Yes, in all cases</td>
<td>Decentralised</td>
<td>External (but the ex ante evaluation making use of the Leonardo evaluation was done internally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANCO 17 04 (Food safety etc)</td>
<td>- Evaluation of the Food Labelling legislation - Evaluation of Legislation Regulation</td>
<td>“On-going”</td>
<td>Legislation and Regulation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Decentralised</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Evaluation-intervention couples identified</td>
<td>Main use of the evaluation results</td>
<td>Evaluation types (ex ante, intermediate, final, ex-post, on-going) present in case study</td>
<td>Different evaluation types</td>
<td>Intervention-types</td>
<td>Evaluation: legal obligation?</td>
<td>Centralised, decentralised or devolved</td>
<td>Evaluation: internal, external?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg 258/97 concerning Novel Foods and Novel Foods Ingredients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAI (JLS) 18 04 (citizenship &amp; fundamental rights)</td>
<td>Mid-term and final evaluations of Daphne programme</td>
<td>Implementation of on-going programme Preparation of new programme</td>
<td>Mid-term and final</td>
<td>Mid-term and final</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Decentralised</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO 23 02 (Humanitarian Aid)</td>
<td>Evaluation of humanitarian aid interventions</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Periodical evaluation</td>
<td>Programme / External funding</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Decentralised</td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE TO THE READER:** for reasons of readability the remainder of this report will mostly refer to the cases *by the acronym* of the corresponding DG plus eventually the ABB number (the “FISH” case, the “JLS” case etc.), and not to the whole denomination of the ABB Activity.
4 Analysis

The analysis of the different results of the study which were individually discussed in the previous section is organised in three main parts reflecting the three questions that were posed in the terms of reference (see section 1.3):

- The users and uses of the Commission’s evaluations
- Contribution of evaluation to different objectives
- Factors that foster (or discourage) the use of evaluations

4.1 The users and the uses of the Commission’s evaluations

All empirical material converges to say that the main users of the Commission’s evaluations analysed for this report are, in the first place and most often, the DGs who commission the evaluations. More precisely, the users appear to be the officials directly involved with the implementation of the interventions that are evaluated. The use of evaluations is most visible and explicit at an operational level, i.e. within and between different generations of expenditure programmes. Most of the use identified relates to supporting the implementation of on-going programmes or policies and the preparation of their follow-up. The design of new interventions and setting of political priorities is less influenced by evaluation.

This is confirmed by the questionnaire survey, for which nearly 95% of respondents state that the users are the services of the DG commissioning the evaluation. “Other DG, DGs or Services within the Commission,” “Other EU Institutions or agencies” and “Member states” all account for slightly over 20% whereas “Relevant stakeholders” would be users in around 30% of the cases.

Exhibit 5 shows the different users and uses of the evaluations performed under the ABB Activities that were examined.

**Exhibit 5 Users of the evaluations within the ABB Activities studied**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTR 02 02 (Encouraging entrepreneurship)</td>
<td>The prime users of the mid-term evaluations (of IDA and MAP) that took place under this ABB activity were the Commission / DG ENTR itself, and use related mainly to implementation. The main user of the MGS Pilot action also was the Commission; it led to not continuing its action on Mutual Guarantee Schemes. The IDA II mid-term evaluation also served to prepare an amendment to the programme, the follow-up of IDA II i.e. the IDABC programme, which was approved by Council and Parliament in 2003 (and finally adopted on 21 April 2004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPL 04 03 (work organisations and working conditions)</td>
<td>Unit D/4 for Health, safety and hygiene at work is the only unit dealing with health and safety at work within DG EMPL and was therefore the principal user of the results within the DG. The external evaluation results have been fully exploited by the Operational Unit, both with regard to the direct results of the evaluation, which provided an input for a Communication, and the evaluation process. The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
role of the OU, which was fully responsible for drafting the ToR and overseeing the evaluation process can be considered highly relevant for this. It meant that the OU, including the Head of Unit, had the possibility to assess progress, ensure that the external contractors were performing and that all issues they wanted to evaluate were covered. It also meant that the unit was able to use the available preliminary results when drafting the Health and Safety Strategy 2002-2006, even though this document preceded the Communication on the practical implementation of Health and Safety Directives. Furthermore, the lessons learnt from drafting the ToR and overseeing the evaluation process are very useful as the unit is launching a similar evaluation of other Directives.

| AGRI 05 04 01 or 02 (Rural development) | Evaluations within DG AGRI are often used at the policy development level rather than by operational units. To design the policy 2007-2013, the evaluations for the period 1994-1999 of Objectives 5a and 5b, and LEADER II were used, as well as the LEADER mainstreaming study. Operational units use evaluations to assess draft programming documents or proposals for their modification as submitted by Member States/regions. The extended impact assessment was performed internally, supported by an inter-service working group gathering together 14 DGs. It used evaluations of Objectives 5a and 5b, LEADER II, plus internal analysis on the implementation of the current policy. |
| TREN 06 04 (Conventional & renewable energies) | The use of evaluation under this activity is mainly by programme managers, in order to implement programme activities, change programme design and reallocate budgets. Evaluations are used by the Commission services in drafting new proposals. The mid-term evaluation of the Energy Framework Programme conducted in 2002 was used as input to the ex ante evaluation for the new programming period 2007-2013 that took place in 2004. |
| FISH 11 03 (International Fisheries) | For DG FISH, the establishment of a strategy for negotiations is based for an important part on evaluation results. Evaluation results are also used in the financial “fiche” that accompanies the Commission decision to sign a fishery agreement. This case is also one of the few for which other DGs could be very explicitly identified as users, especially DG ENV and DG DEV (see case study for details) |
| REGIO 13 03 (Regional development fund) | The users of the evaluations of DG REGIO are situated at different political levels mirroring the organisational structure of the Structural Interventions themselves: from the regional level to the level of the definition of Cohesion policy as a whole. There is evidence that the evaluations are used at the whole range of levels lying between these extremes. The prime users of the individual Structural Fund evaluations are the actors at local level, who are in charge of managing an individual structural intervention and its evaluation. Recommendations in evaluations (except ex post evaluation which is commissioned by the Commission directly) address this group directly, not the Commission. The Commission however also uses the (large quantities of) reports of Structural Interventions evaluations for its own purposes. We identified two major types of uses at Commission level: methodological (synthesising reports and feeding them back in to the DG’s own evaluation system), and at policy level (contribution to the improvement of Cohesion policy). The first type of use is quite explicit (DG REGIO for instance makes analyses of... |

sets of evaluations, e.g. of the last mid-term evaluations, and publishes these); the second is sometimes less evident to identify. There is nevertheless quite some evidence that the results of the evaluations (combined with many other inputs, see below) also contribute to Cohesion Policy:

- The DG organises cross-cutting studies on the “contribution of structural interventions to…” [this or that policy, for instance Information Society] which contribute to the formulation of Cohesion policy, more visibly than the individual evaluations. These studies rely much on information coming from evaluation reports.
- Examples of high level use are Commissioner’s presentations which refer implicitly to evaluation.
- Cohesion policy is currently being debated in Parliament, and a recently published study on the subject relies heavily on information from past evaluations.\(^{18}\)
- Different recent “Cohesion policy events” (see case study for details) referred directly or indirectly to evaluation(s)
- The annual cohesion report refers directly to results from evaluations

Apart from these uses at political level, there is also a “community” of Structural Fund scholars or practitioners consisting of a mix of evaluators-consultants and academics (some playing both roles), and eventually representatives of local administrations. The indirect effect of the “evaluation industry” that has been set in train by DG REGIO is the building of evaluation capacity by local and regional authorities.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAC 15 03 (Vocational training)</th>
<th>Leonardo da Vinci II Interim evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The LdV evaluation was first of all used for internal programme purposes: the modification and improvement of the implementation of the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other important users of the evaluation are the Council and the European Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The evaluation was an input to the ex ante evaluation/extended impact assessment which, in turn, was an input to a Commission Communication on the 2007-2013 integrated programme for Lifelong Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The report was formally presented to Member States and Leonardo agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The external evaluation of Cedefop was followed up by a Commission Communication, and, in response to this, Cedefop established an action plan. This indicates that the main direct users of the evaluation results are, subsequently, the Commission and Cedefop itself.

The evaluation has also been used by the Commission for purely informational purposes (“learning about the functioning of Cedefop”, after a change in post of the person in charge) and therefore also contributed to the “organisational memory” of the DG

User of the ETF evaluations are EP, Council, ESC, DG EAC, DG RELEX, DG ELARG, DG AIDCO, DG EMPL, ETF management, ETF Governing Board, Member States, Partner Countries, international organisations (ILO, EU,...).

\(^{18}\) Adaptation Of Cohesion Policy To The Enlarged Europe And The Lisbon And Gothenburg Objectives, Study, Provisional version, European Parliament, Directorate-General for Internal Policies Structural and Cohesion Policy Unit REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT, IP/B/REGI/ST/2004-008, January 2005
All the evidence gathered in this study shows that in the European Commission evaluation has become highly integrated into programme management, with results being routinely used by programme managers. Furthermore, several other interesting uses and users have been identified, suggesting that evaluation has an increasing role to play for interventions other than programmes. These other instances of evaluation use are the following.

The EAC case shows that evaluation is a good means to analyse the functioning of Commission agencies. In a legally quite precisely defined procedure (periodic external evaluation – Communication by the Commission – Response of the agency in the form of a concrete action plan) the agencies are externally evaluated at regular intervals, held accountable for their achievements and asked for concrete actions in response to the evaluation. Published, evaluation results are transparent for all direct and indirect stakeholders involved.

Several ABB Activities studied testify to the importance and use of evaluation in the formulation of regulations and directives. This is the case for the EMPL and SANCO cases, being the ABB Activities covering the evaluation of regulation and legislation or (in the case of EMPL) the transposition of a series of related directives.

---

19 For a more extended account of evaluations of other agencies see the Meta-Evaluation on the Community Agency System. DG BUDGET, September 2003. EP has requested the Commission in 2003 to evaluate agencies every three years.

20 For the importance of timing for evaluation use, see §4.3.1.

---

| SANCO 17 04 (Food safety etc) | The main result of the evaluation is the updating of the Labelling legislation and the simplification of the Novel Food legislation. There will be a communication from the Commission regarding the labelling evaluation – this is a statutory obligation.
Labelling is a large area and therefore many potential users can be identified: the SANCO Direction, other DGs like AGRI, FISH or ENTR for example; industry and consumer organisations also used the evaluation results. The situation is slightly different regarding Novel Food which has mainly been used internally within DG SANCO and only sporadically by other DGs.
Other indirect uses were the increased awareness of other DGs on the potential effects of the Unit Food law and biotechnology as well as within DG SANCO. Evaluations also increased the contacts with other DGs and within SANCO, because of the necessity of consultation – one interviewee even saw this as the most important use he has made of the evaluation i.e. to consolidate the relationships with DG SANCO.

| JAI (JLS) 18 04 (citizenship & fundamental rights) | The main users were officials designing the follow up of the Daphne Programme and those involved in its implementation. There is evidence that some of the products of the evaluation such as the “project fiche” also directly added value to the programme.

| ECHO 23 02 (Humanitarian Aid) | Two main types of evaluation use can be distinguished with different types of users. First, there is the level of the operations or partnerships, with evaluations aimed at improving these for themselves. Second there is “evaluation for learning” at the level of ECHO as a Directorate that funds the activities of the previous type. This type of evaluation can again be divided into evaluations to support policy and strategy making, and those aiming at the development of more general methodologies, tools, guidelines, etc., which can feed back into the operations.
into national legislation. Here the user group of evaluation goes typically beyond the DG directly responsible for drafting a legislative text since the consequences of the evaluation have a less well-defined perimeter than in the case of a programme. It is also in this case that one encounters generally more involvement of other DGs during an evaluation and in the uptake of evaluation results (examples: EMPL 04 03, SANCO 17 04) – up to a point where one of the representatives of such an other DG stated that “…the consolidated relations with [the DG concerned] are the only use I made of this evaluation …,” which could be considered as a positive side-effect of the evaluation process.

A very specific type of evaluation and evaluation use could be found at DG FISH. This case shows the utility of in-depth evaluation studies for the preparation of agreements with third countries. The development of a culture of evaluation at this DG is quite recent, yet the number of evaluations of this kind has grown to such an extent as to lead to the saturation of the evaluation framework contract the DG has established for this type of exercise.

Evaluation use for agreements and policies concerning third countries, confirms some of the comments in the survey questionnaire pointing at the role of evaluation results in negotiations with external parties more in general. In such cases the overlapping nature of (ex ante) evaluation and impact assessment becomes very evident. The evaluation reports concerning the international fishery protocols are confidential since they contain strategic material for the Commission with regard to third parties.

The last type of evaluation use is the use of evaluation results in other evaluations or other studies such as impact assessment – mostly within the same DG (examples: TREN 06 04, EAC 15 03…). Some examples of an integration or combination of both types of exercises are appearing (Impact Assessment and ex ante evaluation). More generally, in all cases which involve expenditure programmes, the different subsequent evaluations very much relate to each other and often update earlier evaluation results.

4.2 Contribution of evaluation to given objectives

This section takes up the specific contribution that evaluation can have to 6 given objectives as defined in the study Terms of Reference, i.e.:

- Providing input for setting political priorities and choosing between different policy options
- Supporting the design of interventions
- Assisting in an efficient allocation of resources
- Improving the implementation of activities
- Increasing accountability on achievements
- Increasing awareness on achievements

It should be noted that the Terms of reference drew the first two points together under one heading as well as the last two points. It was chosen in the inception phase of this study to separate them in order to be able to better distinguish different types of use of evaluation.
An explanation of the judgement criteria and the indicators used in this chapter is given in Annexe D.

4.2.1 Providing input for setting political priorities and choosing between different policy options

Do evaluations give support for setting political priorities and choosing between different policy options? First of all, the survey results indicate that in 39% of the cases, the evaluation results gave “support for proposals to Council and Parliament,” and this type of use therewith occupies the fifth rank of the different types of uses that were proposed to the respondents. The senior officials interviewed however do not view evaluations to be directly supportive of political decision making, or in a similar vein (cf the interviews with DG BUDGET) find that political decision making does not rely enough on the evidence provided by evaluation results.

The case studies (see Exhibit 6) show few instances of evaluation used for setting political priorities and choosing between different policy options. The only case examined where evaluation results are explicitly used in the policy process is for ABB 05 04 Rural development. In this case, according to the interviews, evaluations were used at the policy development level to elaborate rural development policies. The “Impact assessment of rural development programmes in view of post 2006 rural development policy” was partly based on a review of 30 Mid Term Evaluation reports submitted by Member States and selected by DG Agriculture. The evaluations for the period 1994-1999 of Objectives 5a and 5b, and LEADER II were also used.

Exhibit 6 Input for setting political priorities and choosing between policy options to policy: evidence from the case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation results are used to elaborate/support proposals to Council and Parliament (e.g., reform communications, framework regulations, other regulations/directives) Evaluation results are used in internal process (which can be an ex ante evaluation or impact assessment) that leads to new proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples of indicators</td>
<td>- Referred to in Communications or their annexes &lt;br&gt;- Referred to in the adoption process in Council or Parliament &lt;br&gt;- Use in the APS / CLWP &lt;br&gt;- Use in internal preparation process for new proposals &lt;br&gt;- Use of evaluations within Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Evidence of this type of use of evaluation found in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

21 After, in decreasing order, C1 Management decisions, D Accountability and Awareness, A2 Support design and E Other.
22 This table only contains brief references to the different documents providing evidence for use. More information is provided in the individual case study reports. If an ABB Activity that was studied is not mentioned in the table, it means that no clear evidence of this type of evaluation use was found for that activity.
23 For evaluation use in (legislative) financial statements see section 3.2.
24 See individual case studies for a fuller description.
The evidence shows that evaluations are quite systematically referred to in Communications (or their annexes). Reference can be implicit but nevertheless obvious (i.e. by referring to evaluation findings without making an explicit reference to it – cf IDABC). Use of evaluations is also visible and explicit in the internal preparation process for new proposals, and, related to that, within Impact
Assessments and other preparatory studies. Evaluation information is less visibly or directly referred to in the adoption process in Council or Parliament,\textsuperscript{25} although some good examples exist. For instance, for the case REGIO 13 03 (Regional development fund), there is direct use of evaluation evidence in the Commission’s “Cohesion reports” and EP has recently been submitted a study on the contribution of Cohesion policy to the Lisbon and Gothenburg Objectives, which relies very much on evaluation evidence.

Little evidence was found of the evaluations cited in the case studies being explicitly used in the APS,\textsuperscript{26} the AAR,\textsuperscript{27} or the CLWP. More generally, these documents make only sporadic reference to evaluation (the CLWP refers most to evaluations).\textsuperscript{28}

The evidence from the case studies shows that evaluations do intervene in the policy process. Many of the evaluations studied under the different ABB Activities reported on to Parliament and Council, often because they were legal obligations. It is however much more difficult to find direct evidence that Parliament or Council have subsequently used the evaluation outcomes. A major exception within the case studies is REGIO where a study for Parliament relies heavily on a synthesis on Structural Interventions’ evaluations.

A second observation is that the contribution of evaluations to the setting of political priorities, if it exists, is likely to take place in an incremental manner. The evaluations studied under the case study programme concerned existing interventions and – with one exception (MGS) – their continuation. Evaluations have not been used to define new political priorities overall, but they may have eventually caused incremental shifts in the orientation of an intervention or its design, which will be discussed in the next paragraph.

The conclusion is that evaluation results are definitely and systematically used in the policy process, and that there is visible evidence of that. Ex ante evaluations increasingly draw on prior evaluations as an input, while being a tool to support programme design and aid policy making (examples from the cases: EAC, TREN). However, while evaluation is especially important for continuation or renewal of existing programmes, it does not seem to influence policy priorities to the same extent. Even if evaluations may influence political priorities, any such causal effects are difficult to trace and this study has not come across any clear evidence in this respect. Evaluation is not a strong priority setting tool, its effect being often limited to inducing incremental changes.

\textsuperscript{25} It was part of the case studies to scan relevant documents available (cf http://www.europarl.eu.int/home/default_en.htm, http://ue.eu.int/showPage.ASP?lang=en) for evaluation information used by EP and Council.


\textsuperscript{27} For example, COM(2004) 418 final (Brussels, 9.6.2004) Communication from the Commission Synthesis of Annual Activity Reports 2003 of DGs and Services { SEC(2004) 732 } does not cite evaluation one single time. Individual AAR (AARs for 2003 were studied) do systematically cite evaluation but from the perspective of the implementation of the evaluation plan/programme rather than from the perspective of evaluation use per se.

\textsuperscript{28} The Roadmaps Commission Work Programme 2005 does refer to the evaluations found under the EAC, TREN and JLS cases.
This conclusion is not surprising since it has not been the aim of evaluation as a tool to set political priorities, but it can provide the information needed to make better policy decisions. Other management tools and procedures have been developed to support the choice between different policy options, i.e. Impact Assessment. However, not many conceptual differences exist between Impact Assessment and Ex Ante Evaluation. According to the existing guidelines, both tools should be used to present different options. However the observation from the case studies is that, currently, Impact Assessment is used to select options and ex ante evaluation is used to further work out a preferred option. Increasingly, for reasons of efficiency – i.e. not conducting two similar or complementary exercises separately – the two approaches are drawn together into one single exercise, whereas for a case such as DG FISH, the boundaries between evaluation and impact assessments (in this case of fisheries agreements) are in fact blurred and it does, in our view, not really make sense to be dogmatic about these issues. The interviews with senior staff confirm that the two exercises are complementary and that it would be more efficient to integrate them where possible.

4.2.2 Support to the design of interventions

Well over one-third of the respondents to the questionnaire survey answered that evaluation supports the design of interventions – this item therewith ranking fourth (after “Support to management decisions,” “Increase accountability and/or awareness of activities” and “Other”). This is confirmed by the interviews, which show that support to the design of interventions is seen as a major contribution of evaluation. Most of the case studies examined evaluations of existing programmes in the context of their possible continuation (either at mid-term or for a new generation of interventions) and therefore mostly focused on design (this section) and implementation (next section) issues.

Exhibit 7 gives evidence from the case studies.

---


30 Following the White Paper on European Governance: “Proposals must be prepared on the basis of an effective analysis of whether it is appropriate to intervene at EU level and whether regulatory intervention is needed. If so, the analysis must also assess the potential economic, social and environmental impact, as well as the costs and benefits of that particular approach. A key element in such an assessment is ensuring that the objectives of any proposal are clearly defined”, Impact Assessment would take charge of the analysis to see whether an intervention is appropriate, ex ante evaluation would aim at performing the detailed assessment.

31 E.g. by DG EAC – see their item list “EIA report integrating ex ante evaluation requirements” which formed the methodological basis for the new proposal for the Integrated programme for Lifelong Learning 2007-2013. It is interesting to note that this checklist initially designed by DG EAC to do the combined exercise, is annexed (Annexe H) to the most recent ex ante evaluation guide of DG BUDGET as checklist for ex ante evaluation. Inversely, p.8 of the IA Guidelines indicate: “…where a proposal has been selected for an extended impact assessment but will also incur budgetary expenditure, the ex ante evaluation requirements of the Financial Regulation will be integrated into Impact Assessment.”
Exhibit 7: Support to the design of interventions: evidence from the case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation results are used to describe the implementation of an intervention to Council and Parliament</td>
<td>DECISION 2004/387/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 21 April 2004 on interoperable delivery of pan-European eGovernment services to public administrations, businesses and citizens (IDABC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation results are taken account of when designing interventions at the level of the Commission</td>
<td>COM(2004) 62 final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation results support the annual planning cycle</td>
<td>Draft report on promoting health and safety at the workplace presented by the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs (Provisional (2004/2205(INI) of 9.11.2004, PE 349.899v01-00 by Jiri Mastalka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM(2002) 118 final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IEE II ex ante evaluation of IEE II provided input to the design of the new programme 2007-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM(2002) 162 final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From one generation of structural fund interventions to the next, evaluations (especially mid-term) have been used for the adaptation of the design of the structural interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The overall design of the programme cannot be changed without changing the legal base (this is an interim evaluation) however there were recommendations on “internal” changes, eg with regard to “innovation” and “valorisation” of the projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Labelling foodstuffs evaluation is currently being used in a proposal updating the legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Novel food evaluation is currently in the process leading to the establishment of a proposal to amend the legislation, possibly simplifying the legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Daphne II programme visibly included recommendations on design of the programme from previous evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Following one of the evaluations studied for the case study, a new organisation regarding the nutrition aspects of health has been set up in the field, in cooperation with the other associations active locally and the nutritional composition of a food basket was modified following the evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32 This table only contains brief references to the different documents providing evidence for use. More information is provided in the individual case study reports. If an ABB Activity that was studied is not mentioned in the table, it means that no clear evidence of this type of evaluation use was found for that activity.

33 For evaluation use in Use in (legislative) financial statements and explanatory memoranda section [on financial statement analysis] is referred to.

34 See individual case studies for a fuller description.
For reasons of completeness it is recalled (see previous section) that little evidence was found of the evaluations cited in the case studies being explicitly used in the APS, the AAR, or the CLWP.

Also the case studies show that evaluation supports the (re)design of interventions. No cases were found where evaluation has led to a *radically altered* design of a programme, regulation or other type of intervention and most of the time slight changes or reformulations were the result. There may be two reasons for this:  
• first, none of the evaluations within the activities studied referred to the design, from scratch, of an entirely new intervention – in all cases, whether it were programmes or other types of intervention, the case material describes situations of either intermediate evaluation whereby the focus was mainly on implementation issues or continuation or renewal of the same intervention;  
• second, a radical change in design of an existing intervention (as for instance suggested by a mid-term evaluation) may necessitate to change the legal base.

The evidence shows that evaluation *will* positively contribute to the design of an intervention only if it comes at a moment when inputs for making new design are needed. This is in itself not a great surprise, but it is important to mention since it emphasises two important issues relating to whether it is possible to change the design of the intervention and to what extent, which in turn is related to:  
• the opportunities offered by the legal base\(^{35}\)  
• whether the evaluation itself comes in a timely fashion to be used (which is not always the case). The issue of timing is discussed below (see § 4.3.1)

**4.2.3 Support to the efficient allocation of resources**

The survey results (§ 3.1.2) show that evaluation is used in a relatively limited way to support budgetary and financial decisions. Of the different uses of evaluation with regard to allocation of resources,\(^{36}\) the use of evaluation for underpinning financial decisions at *management level* is seen as most important.

The analysis of the evaluation use as indicated in legislative proposals (cf § 3.2) does not readily identify explicit and direct evaluation use in the Financial Statements over the period studied.

Also the cases studies (Exhibit 8) yield very little evidence that evaluations contribute to the efficient allocation of resources, even though in some cases evaluations have certainly played an important role in doing so and in other cases evaluations proposed organisational modifications in view of increasing efficiency. It lies beyond the scope

---

\(^{35}\) During an interview for one of the case studies a (rare) example of an attempt to change the legal base in the course of a programme was mentioned, however this took about as long as the remainder of the programme and the desired changes in design could therefore not be implemented.

\(^{36}\) I.e. “Supporting the establishment of the Financial Perspectives,” “Determining the appropriate level of funding within Commission proposals for Council and/or Parliament acts,” “Determining the appropriate level of funding in Commission acts,” “Underpinning financial decisions at management level” and “Underpinning budget allocations within the budgetary (e.g. PDB/AMP) processes.”
of the present study to analyse whether these organisational changes effectively lead to more efficiency.

Case examples are given below.

**Exhibit 8 Use of evaluation in the efficient allocation of resources: evidence from the case studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>− Evaluation results support establishment of Financial Perspectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Evaluation results are instrumental in determining the appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level of funding within concrete Commission proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Evaluation results are instrumental in determining the appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level of funding in Commission acts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Evaluation results underpin financial decisions at management level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Evaluation results underpin budget allocation choices within the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budgetary and ABM/SPP processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of indicators</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>− Use in (Legislative) Financial Statements and explanatory memoranda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see § 3.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Use in financing acts/decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Referred to in the adoption process in Council or Parliament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Use in Activity statements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Use in APS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Use in operational decisions with financial implications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Evidence of this type of use of evaluation68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTR02 02</td>
<td>− There is no explicit evidence that the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evaluation has influenced the efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allocation of resources, but the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pointed at the need for a better focus of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the programme and clearer objectives, which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>may indirectly have led to a more efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spending of resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREN 06 04</td>
<td>− The Intelligent Energy for Europe Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>followed the recommendations of the mid-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evaluation report of the Energy Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme with regard to its structure and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>division of the budget over its sub-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC 15 03</td>
<td>− The expectation, based on previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evaluations, is explicitly expressed in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposal for the new programme Lifelong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning 2007-2013, that the integration of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the formerly separate programmes in one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>single integrated programme should lead to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>efficiency gains both at Commission level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and in Member States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>− better complementarity with relevant other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>initiatives will be sought as follow-up to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the recommendations of the evaluation and this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is expected to lead to overall efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAI (JLS) 18 04</td>
<td>− Through the influence on the design of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subsequent Daphne programme resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allocation decisions were better informed by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the evaluation work. There is no explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evidence that the evaluation influenced the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>overall scale of resource allocation viz the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programme and other interventions that share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>similar objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO 23 02</td>
<td>− It is a major objective of the so-called</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“geographical” evaluations performed by DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECHO to determine allocation of resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 This table only contains brief references to the different documents providing evidence for use. More information is provided in the individual case study reports. If an ABB Activity that was studied is not mentioned in the table, it means that no clear evidence of this type of evaluation use was found for that activity.

38 See individual case studies for a fuller description.
Overall, it has been proven difficult to find evidence for the use of evaluation for more efficient allocation of resources.

The interviews with representatives of DG BUDGET confirm the survey and case study results and indicate that the influence of evaluations is indeed marginal in budget requests. This seems to be especially so for internal policies and programmes: according to one of the interviews, one of the largest internal expenditure programmes of the Union “does still not manage to demonstrate its effective impact,” even though this same programme requests substantial increases in budget. In the case of budget allocations within the framework of external policies, the role of evaluation is (traditionally) more important. It should be mentioned that evaluation is used when increases are requested (the doubling of the budget for the Daphne programme in ABB 18 04 is a typical example of such evaluation use); it has never occurred, according to the interviews, that they were used by a DG to decrease budget or the number of posts at the DG level, even though reallocation is definitely justified by evaluations very often.

An example of evaluation use for the purpose of supporting the establishment of the financial perspectives is the “Evaluation Highlights” prepared by DG Budget and presented to the Council’s Financial Perspectives ad hoc Working Group and to the Parliament’s Temporary Committee on policy challenges and budgetary means of the enlarged Union 2007-2013.

4.2.4 Support to implementation of interventions

As already indicated in § 4.1, the main contribution of evaluation lies in the improvement of the implementation of activities. In all case studies but two (both relating to regulation, one of the transposition of regulation into MS’ legislation (DG EMPL), the second to design of follow-up regulation (DG SANCO)) evaluations were first and foremost used to improve the implementation of the intervention. It goes without saying that this was especially the case with intermediate evaluations of expenditure programmes, however also uses of evaluation within the implementation of agreements with third countries (DG FISH), of agency organisation (DG EAC), humanitarian aid projects (DG ECHO) or devolved (Structural Fund) programmes were encountered.

This result is confirmed by the survey results which give “implementation” and in particular evaluation use in “supporting management decisions on operational level spending/activities” by far the highest score (two-thirds of the respondents; above “design” and “awareness-accountability”).

Exhibit 9 gives evidence from the case studies for the role of evaluation in the support of the implementation of interventions.39

---

39 The fact that, contrary to some of the other items discussed in this chapter, evidence could easily be found for most of the 10 cases is in itself an indicator of use of evaluation in implementation.
Exhibit 9  Support to improve the implementation of on-going activities: evidence from the case studies

| Criteria | – Evaluation results support management decisions on operational level spending/activities
| Examples of indicators | – Use in individual AMPS
| | – Use in designing / modifying internal procedures
| | – Referred to in Commission responses or fiche contradictoire to (external) evaluation
| | – Check/control by evaluation units of follow-up of recommendations

| Case | Evidence of this type of use of evaluation found in

| ENTR02 02 | – Annual implementation reports of the MAP programme
| | – The MAP extension until end 2005 (and probably even to end 2006
| | – Amendment of the IDA II programme and implementation of the on-going programme
| EMPL 04 03 | – Management decisions on operational level.
| AGRI 05 04 02 | – Evaluations are used by operational units to improve implementation of programmes in the Member States
| TREN 06 04 | – Establishment of the Executive Agency (which started end 2004)
| FISH 11 03 | – Fishery Protocol Agreement negotiations
| | – A tool to follow up the use of recommendations in negotiations is in development
| REGIO 13 03 | – On the regional level (the prime users of the individual evaluations) evaluation serves the improvement of the implementation of on-going activities (at these levels).
| | – The implementation of Cohesion policy (see section on political use of evaluation)
| EAC 15 03 | – AMP
| | – Second half of programme: selection methods for projects will be adapted following the evaluation report and the approval of the Leonardo Committee
| | – Follow-up of recommendations is monitored by the evaluation unit through the “service document” and “action plan” which is checked by the Evaluation Function at 6-month intervals
| | – Cedefop Action Plan following on from the evaluation
| | – Cedefop’s workplan for 2002
| | – ETF Action Plan following on from the evaluation
| JLS 18 04 | – Implementation of the second part of the programme
| ECHO 23 02 | – Individual contract renewal

---

40 This table only contains brief references to the different documents providing evidence for use. More information is provided in the individual case study reports. If an ABB Activity that was studied is not mentioned in the table, it means that no clear evidence of this type of evaluation use was found for that activity.

41 See individual case studies for a fuller description.
Evidence of the use of evaluation for implementation of on-going activities is found, first of all, in the way in which the activity takes into account the recommendations made by the evaluation of concern. To a lesser extent (though examples (e.g. EAC case) exist) explicit such evidence is found in individual AMPs.

It is an increasing practice to monitor the follow-up of recommendations from evaluations; and also the issue of timing is crucial. These two factors will be discussed in the second part of this chapter, under sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.4, respectively.

### 4.2.5 Support of evaluation to increasing awareness and accountability on achievements

Following the survey the use of evaluation to increase awareness and accountability on achievements is, today, after the operational use of evaluation described in the previous section, the second most important use of evaluation, as testified by the case studies and the survey results. In all but one case (the evaluations of Fishery Protocol Agreements of DG FISH) evaluations are published.

#### Exhibit 10 Use of evaluations for accountability: evidence from the case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Evidence of this type of use of evaluation found in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>− Evaluation results are used to account for achievements in the context</td>
<td>ENTR02 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of decision making processes</td>
<td>− Staff working paper on the MAP prolongation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Evaluation results are referred to in dealings with the Council and</td>
<td>EMPL 04 03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>− Draft report on promoting health and safety at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>workplace presented by the Committee on Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Social Affairs (Provisional (2004/2205(INI) of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.11.2004, PE 349.899v01-00 by Jiri Mastalka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>− COM(2002) 118 final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGRI 05 04 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>− Discharge 2002: EP calls for comprehensive evaluation of support to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>less favoured areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>− Justification of DG AGRI policy and choices in front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Council and Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Use in AAR and related processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− References in Communications Commission working documents, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Referred to in discharge documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Referred to by ECA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Referred to in replies to Parliamentary Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Referred to in other Council or Parliament documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

42 This table only contains brief references to the different documents providing evidence for use. More information is provided in the individual case study reports. If an ABB Activity that was studied is not mentioned in the table, it means that no clear evidence of this type of evaluation use was found for that activity.

43 See individual case studies for a fuller description.
The use of evaluations in view of accountability is readily identifiable from the different documents. They are especially to be found in Commission Communications, but far less in other types of documents such as discharge documents, replies to parliamentary questions, etc.

Moreover, through publication of evaluation results, the evaluation process has, even though it is not the primal aim, increased awareness as a side-effect.

**Exhibit 11** Use of evaluations to improve awareness: evidence from the case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation results are referred to in dealings with stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Examples of indicators | - Dissemination and ways of dissemination of information on evaluation results  
- Discussion of evaluation results by relevant stakeholder groups |
| Case | Evidence of this type of use of evaluation found in |
| ENTR02 02 | - The MAP intermediate and final evaluation reports were published on internet  
- The MAP Final evaluation report has been on the agenda of the relevant business organisations  
- The IDA II Mid-term evaluation was discussed in the management |

---

44 On a cross-cutting level, in the Discharge for 2003, European Parliament requested the Commission to periodically repeat a previous meta-evaluation on agencies (example of EP appreciating evaluation synthesis). It also emphasis the importance it attaches to punctual publication of evaluation reports.

45 This table only contains brief references to the different documents providing evidence for use. More information is provided in the individual case study reports. If an ABB Activity that was studied is not mentioned in the table, it means that no clear evidence of this type of evaluation use was found for that activity.

46 See individual case studies for a fuller description.
The Communication issued following the evaluation is available on the Internet and has been on the agenda of relevant organisations (trade unions, employers organisations, policy groups, etc) and EP. The complete external evaluation report was not published but its results were communicated to a wider audience through the DG EMPL website, where the executive summary and a short version of the report have been published.

AGRI 05 04 02  
Evaluation reports are published on internet

TREN 06 04  
Evaluation reports are published on internet

FISH 11 03  
The evaluation reports are not published for strategic reasons

REGIO 13 03  
All reports are published, but awareness is not the main goal of the evaluations

EAC 15 03 LdV Interim  
The Leonardo II interim evaluation report is made widely available through Internet and was discussed in the Leonardo Committee and in the Advisory Committee for Vocational Training  
The Leonardo II interim evaluation report contributed to organisational memory  
The Cedefop and ETF evaluations and subsequent action plan were published on Internet

SANCO 17 04  
The Labelling foodstuffs evaluation closely involved many stakeholders in the process who took note of the report  
A stakeholder meeting in 2005 will seek reactions on the updated legislation proposal  
The Novel food evaluation’ steering group comprised only people from the Commission (DGs SANCO, ENTR, TRADE…) and an EFSA (European Food Safety Agency) representative

JLS 18 04  
The final evaluation was published on Daphne website

ECHO 23 02  
Evaluation reports are published on internet  
Evaluation results are presented to the Member States at the Humanitarian Aid Committee

The table shows that in some cases a quite active strategy of communication is developed among stakeholders whereas in other cases this is limited to simply making available the report on the internet.

As a special case of awareness, one should mention **inter-DG communication** that can take place around evaluations (by sitting on each others’ Steering Groups for instance). This is a practice (since it is a necessity) in the case, often, of evaluations of regulation (cases SANCO, EMPL) and/or programmes which have a strong political character and their corresponding evaluation (AGRI), of agreements (FISH) and of agencies which have “multiples tutelles” (e.g. ETF / EAC). It is far less an established practice in the case of the evaluation of programmes (EAC, ECHO, TREN, REGIO, JLS) although exceptions exist (MAP final evaluation involving ECFIN representatives – DG ENTR).

### 4.2.6 Conclusion

The following table summarises the different uses of evaluations of the previous table in order to obtain a synthetic picture.
### Exhibit 12  Most evident uses identified in the different case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Support to policy process and setting of political priorities</th>
<th>Design of the intervention</th>
<th>Allocation of resources</th>
<th>Implementation of the intervention</th>
<th>Awareness and accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTR02 02</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPL 04 03</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRI 05 04 02</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREN 06 04</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISH 11 03</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIO 13 03</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC 15 03</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANCO 17 04</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLS 18 04</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO 23 02</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analyses of the previous sections show that evaluations are most used in the implementation and the design of interventions. Their contribution to accountability and awareness is also important. Evaluation intervenes in the policy process, and clear evidence is found of evaluations being used in Communications, and for some cases even in documents discussed in Parliament. Evaluation contributes however to incremental changes and certainly not to radical new changes in policy or to the choice of policy options. Finally, all evidence shows that evaluation does not significantly contribute to the efficient allocation of resources.

### 4.3 Factors that foster or discourage the use of evaluations at the level of individual evaluations

One of the aims of the study was to analyse which factors play a role in fostering the use of evaluations, either at the level of individual evaluations (this section) or at the organisational level (chapter 4.3.9). For this analysis, he following factors were to be taken into account:

- Evaluation planning and timing
- Reason to evaluate
- Purpose of the evaluation
- Human resources
- Financial resources
- Focus of the evaluation (in-depth vs broad)
- Role of internal vs external evaluation
- Knowledge generation, data gathering and reliability
- Support of senior management
- Involvement of potential users
- Quality of report and evaluator
- Dissemination of evaluation results
- Monitoring the follow-up of evaluation recommendations
- Relation with the different phase of the evaluation project

---

47 But not necessarily to the setting of political priorities, see § 4.2.1.
48 Also at devolved level.
For each of these, it was analysed in the case studies whether they are important and, if applicable, in what phase of an evaluation project they eventually play a role. Moreover, it was studied whether there are differences in regard to the type of intervention. The following sections give examples of cases encountered, and eventual solutions and good practices that have been proposed by the different DGs.

These “factors” were not a part of the questionnaire survey and therefore results of this section rely mostly on the case studies and additional documentary analysis.

It should be noted that the analyses show that all factors have an importance for the use of evaluation. Some factors seem however more important than others, and some turn out to be quite crucial. This is especially so for the timing and the purpose of the evaluation; the quality of the evaluation process and evaluation report; and the monitoring and follow-up of evaluation recommendations. Therefore the different factors will not be discussed in the order given above but in the order of what can be viewed as their “relative importance.” It is also a result of the study that some factors seem to go together rather than being disconnected. The order adopted is the following:

- Evaluation planning and timing; purpose of the evaluation
- Support of senior management
- Quality of the evaluation, comprising the issues of the quality of the report and evaluator; the issue of knowledge generation, data gathering and reliability; and the focus of the evaluation (in-depth vs broad)
- Monitoring the follow-up of evaluation recommendations
- Involvement of potential users
- Human resources
- Dissemination of evaluation results

Some factors appear less important or “commonsensical”, these are:

- Reason to evaluate
- Role of internal vs external evaluation
- Financial resources

The section will finish with a brief analysis that relates the different factors to the different stages in the evaluation project.

### 4.3.1 Evaluation planning and timing; purpose of the evaluation

All case studies show without exception that evaluation planning and its timing within the policy cycle is crucial. It is especially important for the renewal and follow-up of programmes and agreements, but less for more overarching policies (comprising different interventions or instruments) or regulation (directives). For the latter two types of intervention, often other inputs are used in parallel to evaluation results. Also, due to their intrinsically political character these two types of interventions are more much more difficult to plan than programmes and their follow-up.

The purpose of the evaluation is intimately linked – not to say an equivalent factor – to the timeliness of the evaluation, since evaluations generally are meant to provide
input to a (set of) decision(s) and that decision is necessarily situated in time. The two should therefore be discussed at the same time.

Exhibit 13  Selected examples showing importance of timing, and relation between timing and purpose of an evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Relation with timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTR 02 02</td>
<td>IDA II mid-term served to amend IDA II programme and define IDABC. IDA II end-term was not used in design of new programme (because it came after the decision) but may be used in its implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRI 05 04 02</td>
<td>The Commission proposition on the policy 2007-2013 has been voted in July 2004; the “light synthesis of the mid term evaluations” (a screening of 30 evaluations at Member State/ regional level) came too late to be useful for the proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREN 06 04</td>
<td>Both major evaluations under this ABB Activity (mid-term of EFP and ex ante of IEE II) seem to be not optimally timed to be able to take into account relevant results from other evaluations or studies or to be themselves optimally useful. In the case of the EFP mid term evaluation the results of the intermediate report had to be used to prepare the relevant communication. For the ex ante evaluation it would have been better, according to the evaluators, if some evaluations of specific programmes under the EIE would have been finalised in order to use them for the ex ante evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISH 11 03</td>
<td>The evaluations serve as input to the FPA negotiations and therefore must come in time to assist FPA negotiations. This has been problematic in the past but today the evaluations are performed in a timely manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIO 13 03</td>
<td>There is a very strict timing of the different evaluations the results of which serve both updating of evaluations and the different stages of the DG REGIO policy cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC 15 03</td>
<td>The timing of the LdV II external interim evaluation was advanced with 6 months in order for the evaluation results to be taken up in the ex ante evaluation / EIA of the Lifelong Learning Integrated programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANCO 17 04</td>
<td>For the Novel food legislation there existed a legal obligation to review the legislation 5 years after it came into force. The evaluation of the Labelling Foodstuff legislation was not linked to the timing within the policy cycle and was nevertheless extensively used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO 23 02</td>
<td>Evaluations are an input to decisions on contracting with partners in the field and more broadly on the definition of the strategies of desks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Good timing of evaluations to make them useful within the overall management of the decision process is often problematic. This is testified, for instance, by the Ex ante evaluation of a renewed multi-annual Community programme in the field of energy (2007-2013), published September 2004.\(^{49}\)

\[\ldots\], the amount of information available to carry out a comprehensive ex ante evaluation of EIE-II is limited. The most recent evaluation reports relate to the previous programme, the Energy Framework Programme (EFP, 1998-2002), for which a mid-term evaluation was carried out in 2002. An ex-post evaluation of the ALTENER component of the EFP is to be completed in 2004, but there are no ex post evaluations available yet for the other components of the programme (SAVE, SYNERGY). We are aware that there is a review of SAVE energy agencies underway, but no details are yet available. In addition, the current EIE programme (2003-2006) has started only recently, with the first call for proposals closing in April 2004. This means that no evaluation reports are available relating to the current EIE programme. Our methodology for this ex ante evaluation must

\(^{49}\) cf case study ABB 06 04
therefore adopt a pragmatic approach based on the information available and the information needs for the development of the proposed EIE-II programme.” (p2-3)

A second example where in the event the evaluation timing was – in the words of the evaluation function – “too much of a straightjacket” was the IDA final evaluation (DG ENTR), as co-decision meant that the decision had to be taken earlier than the timing for the final evaluation foreseen in the legal base. Therefore the final evaluation could only have a very minimal effect with regard to a decision that had already been taken.

Many programmes – and often also other interventions – today have built the exact timing of evaluations into their legal bases. However, a certain flexibility should be allowed in order to optimise use. In the EAC case for instance, the interim evaluation of the Leonardo da Vinci programme was advanced with 6 months in order to be useful for the ex ante evaluation / impact assessment of the new generation of programmes 2007-2013, which took place at the end of 2003. In other cases, interim evaluations fixed in the legal base were seen as coming too early to be useful to analyse first effects of the intervention (example: REGIO case). In such cases evaluations focused on implementation rather than effects. Also EAC had experienced this problem and in the new planning period made the timing of interim evaluations more flexible in the legal base. The few cases of the evaluation of agencies encountered in the case studies also put question marks to a very prescriptive timing of evaluations, not always synchronised with important planning processes at the agencies or in their environment.

Since timing of the availability of results is an important factor, the duration of the evaluation project also is important. In the AGRI-case evaluations had a longer duration than foreseen hampering the uptake of the results (i.e. input to new rural development policies). In the case of FISH evaluations were planned as a function of the termination of the existing agreements and the foreseen start of new fishery agreements with third countries.

Good practices and solutions identified were

- to advance evaluations in time if needed (the possibility to do so depends on the flexibility built into the legal base)
- to establish framework contracts allowing to shorten the length of evaluation projects especially with regard to tender procedures
- to plan evaluations in accordance with the decision making needs and constraints (e.g. the type of legislative procedure)

Finally the co-ordinating role of the evaluation function should be emphasised since it is often the only entity that clearly oversees the entire set of evaluations and evaluation processes within a DG in relation to the overall decision making process and therewith can propose to operational units to set an evaluation project in train in timely fashion.50

---

50 At least for the case studies examined for legally obligatory evaluations the operational units themselves have often initiated the evaluation.
4.3.2 Support of the senior management

The interviews conducted for the case studies show clearly that the support of the senior management for the use of evaluation results is viewed as being important by those who manage evaluations. Explicit support for evaluations, or evaluation use, is nevertheless often absent or at best highly difficult to find good evidence for.

Especially in the case of intermediate “routinised” and legally obligatory expenditure programme evaluation, there is only “silent support” most of the time, that is, an explicit great interest in evaluation of senior management is absent. It is clear for senior management however that these evaluations simply need to be done, so the necessary support is there – even more so now that evaluation is formally planned and budgeted in the AMP. The case studies and interviews with senior staff show that as a consequence however, the explicit use of evaluation results takes place very much at an operational level – even if there are counter-examples, such as the case in which evaluation results are very explicitly used by a high-level official, as follows:

On each in-depth discussion regarding a sector at the level of the DG, I consult the corresponding evaluations to better apprehend the sector and be aware of the criticisms expressed in the reports

(interview with senior staff member)

This case notwithstanding, evaluation results have difficulties to “filter up” to the higher levels of senior management, at least in their original form. How in such cases evaluation statements are translated within the more political documents or internal notes (to Directors-General or Cabinets) could not be analysed thoroughly within the framework of this study. Directors-General normally receive copies of important evaluation reports, but the direct use they make of them remains unclear. Interviews with officials who work or have worked in Cabinets indicate that evaluation results seldom reach the Cabinets, which does not exclude their use “in disguise” but this is difficult to track. Therefore, the more general case however seems to be the following

All directors formally buy in but we are guilty of not using [evaluations]

(interview with senior staff member)

Interviews at DG BUDGET indicate that evaluation results are taken up and used by senior management in particular if they support budget increases and eventually reallocations. The survey has shown however that use of evaluations is not primarily seen as being important for budgetary or financial decisions other than at operational level.

One case was encountered where at the suggestion of the senior management a feasibility study in view of launching an evaluation framework contract was initiated (FISH Case).

For ex ante evaluation, support from the senior management to take evaluation results seriously and integrate them into Communications of new legislative proposals appears necessary for the results to be taken up in the decision making process (design of new programmes, policies, regulations or agreements).

Finally it should be noted that in the cases studied, evaluations results mainly relate to expenditure programmes. Often the financial and intellectual investment in evaluation
is (following the proportionality principle) related to the size of the intervention in terms of impact on Commission expenditure and not necessarily on impact on society at large. Therefore policies or legislative proposals which may have great impact on society but low direct cost for the Commission seem to be “under-evaluated,” whilst it is exactly in these that the senior management may be interested.\(^{51}\)

An increased support of senior management can foster the use of evaluation, which seems particularly important to consider at the planning stage and when the evaluation results become available. To involve senior management at these two stages can make a difference, in particular to improve the strategic use of evaluations.

4.3.3 Quality of the evaluation

The evidence shows that the overall quality of an evaluation is probably the second most important issue for evaluation results to be used. This comprises what were originally two different factors in the Terms of reference:\(^{52}\)

- The quality of the report and of the evaluator
- The focus of the evaluation (in-depth vs broad)

These two issues are discussed in turn below. It is an important finding from the case studies that the evaluation functions play an important role in the quality assurance of the evaluation project and its results.

Inversely, it is not because an evaluation is methodologically and empirically sound that it will necessarily lead to its recommendations being followed up – political factors can still be much more important than the results of the evaluation.\(^{53}\) Following the interviews with senior staff, major political decisions can still be taken after a bad quality evaluation or even in the absence of evaluation.

However, the case studies support the idea that, within a system where evaluation is taken seriously and effectively planned to be used (which is increasingly the case), it is a condition sine qua non to have evaluation effectively produce knowledge on the subject under scrutiny, with reliable data gathering procedures and reliable evaluation outcomes. In the end, this increases the use of evaluations.

4.3.3.1 Quality of report and evaluator

The quality of the report and, related to this, the evaluator, is crucial, especially in a system whereby evaluation is starting to be routinely used within the decision making process. Once evaluation is taken seriously as a management tool by the services, there is an increased demand on the quality of the evaluation, its deliverables and its recommendations, not only by the evaluation function for professional or formal reasons but very much by operational units themselves which see the need to be able

\(^{51}\) Even though ex ante evaluation in its initial conception also was to cover this, this role has been taken over by Impact Assessment, launched in 2002 by the Secretariat General.

\(^{52}\) A third factor initially proposed by the terms of reference related to “knowledge generated on the intervention by the evaluation and the reliability of data.” Being part of the overall quality assessment of evaluation reports, it was not taken up in the main text of this report. The individual case studies do refer to this heading however.

\(^{53}\) In this context, Impact Assessment is a tool for providing a more rationally derived, empirically based and transparent input (alongside others) into the policy-making process.
to follow up the report – not the least because they invest quite some time in participating in or managing the evaluation process.

Exhibit 14  Examples concerning the quality of the evaluation report and the evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABB Activity</th>
<th>Comments on quality of evaluation reports and evaluators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTR 02 02</td>
<td>Applying independently to 3 different external evaluations the evaluators were said to need “much help” from the side of the Commission to better understand the subject matter of the interventions evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRI 05 04 02</td>
<td>Especially for the early evaluations linked to this ABB Activity evaluators were more often methodological specialists than experts in rural development. Evaluation reports should however contain substance in order to be relevant and used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREN 06 04</td>
<td>The evaluation team of the EFP mid-term evaluation comprised apart from generalist consultants, reputed energy experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISH 11 03</td>
<td>The quality of the report (understanding of the needs of the Unit, datagathering and analysis…) is crucial as it is a tool to assess what the partner country affirms during negotiation of new FPAs. The framework contract (through learning by doing), and certainly the knowledge in international fisheries from the contractor, have improved the quality of the reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIO 13 03</td>
<td>A remark made in the analysis, performed by DG REGIO, of mid-term evaluations is that the supply of evaluators (since all evaluations are taking place during the same period) makes evaluators stretched (in some countries one evaluator doing up to six different evaluations!) and this has a strong impact on the quality of the reports and therewith on the potential use of these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC 15 03</td>
<td>In the case of the Leonardo II interim evaluation doubts were expressed on the sampling techniques and on the sample of the survey (comparability between countries) used by the contractor. Also in the final phases of the evaluation close cooperation with the contractor was needed to arrive at a useful result. The evaluation function sits in at all meetings with the contractor and has to formally approve the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANCO 17 04</td>
<td>Interviewees linked very much the quality of the report to the competences/knowledge of the evaluator in the field of food safety. In the case of Labelling foodstuffs, the evaluation was performed by an external consultant only expert in evaluation. The evaluation on Novel food has been performed by the evaluation function on the basis of the report of an external expert with competences in food legislations. The quality of the report of the second was found to be significantly better (and usability therefore higher) precisely because of the expertise needed for these highly technical subjects (see case study report for more details).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO 23 02</td>
<td>It is important to identify consultants who understand humanitarian aid very well, so as to involve more actively, through confidence building from the earliest stage, the geographical desks and the ECHO field based technical assistants. The use of consultants inexperienced in humanitarian aid has on occasion caused frustration on the part of ECHO officials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both shown by the survey and by the case studies, the quality of the evaluator and of the final evaluation report is of great concern to Commission officials involved with evaluation. In many interviews conducted for this study mention was made of the fact that the trajectory between draft final report and the final report of an evaluation was the subject of many iterations between the (external) evaluator and the

---

54 The final evaluations of IDA, MAP, MGS.
55 And, we have the impression, even more explicitly an issue than during the previous evaluation use study.
person responsible for leading the evaluation at the side of the Commission (and eventually the Steering Group):

We had hands-on contact with the evaluator. In order to make findings relevant for us we had to invest a lot and had weekly contact with the evaluator.

(OU leading an evaluation)

In the case of devolved evaluation (Structural Funds, cf REGIO case) the evaluation process is not managed directly by the Commission and that makes thinking about the control of quality even more relevant since more difficult to put in place and to apply. It is a major concern, but the process to obtain quality reports is necessarily more complicated: the Commission has to work together with local authorities (who concretely are the evaluation client) to prepare Terms of reference (which are fairly standardised across Europe), work with the Steering Group and interact with the Steering Group and the evaluators on the draft report.  

In this respect the following citation from a representative of an evaluation unit in a DG which performs a lot of evaluations, echoes well how from another perspective, namely increasing the relevance of the report (and not the methodological quality per se) can be improved

Use of evaluation is linked to quality of the evaluation – so there is a role to be played not only in dissemination of reports, but in analysing evaluation reports in relation to the policies of the DG. The role of evaluation units could be more powerful if they analyse the results of previous evaluations in this respect.

(representative of an evaluation unit)

The involvement of the evaluation function in preparing the Terms of reference, in selecting the contractor, in monitoring the evaluation project through participation in steering groups or managing itself the evaluation process appears in all cases crucial. In some rare cases, such as DG EAC and DG ENTR, evaluation functions can in theory “veto” final reports. In most cases the final decision is left to the Operational Unit managing or participating in the evaluation – and they generally appear critical enough to accept or not a report.

It should be mentioned that there may be a perverse effect (encountered several times in the case studies and sometimes openly avowed by the Commission staff) when the evaluation is managed directly by the operational unit responsible for the implementation of the evaluated intervention. These officials may be particularly unreceptive to negative conclusions leading to pressure being placed on evaluators to write reports that are accommodating to their viewpoint, thereby diluting the objectivity and independence of the evaluation. In such cases, the role of the Steering group, and in particular the evaluation function itself, is to ensure that the independence of the evaluator is protected. On the other hand, a strong interest by the

---

56 Although it lies strictly speaking beyond the scope of this study it is interesting to mention that the evaluations of the Structural Funds have over time induced an increased structuration of evaluation competence at regional levels in Europe, whereby regional authorities (often under the pressure of decreasing national budgets) increasingly reflect upon and organise themselves for evaluation – today also of non-European activities.

57 According to some interviews, that may be less the case for the analysis of Evaluation proposals by consultants, where Operational Units may not be critical enough on the precise deliverables to expect. In such a case, the advice of the Evaluation Function is useful.
operational unit has potentially positive impacts and may contribute to better underpin recommendations and improved take up of evaluation results.

This potential influence was confirmed by one of the interviewees: “I had an idea what had to come out of the evaluation” – a similar type of statement as the one encountered several times in the free comments of the survey “the evaluation confirmed what we already knew, [but we needed an external contractor to confirm it...]”

Such statements may be interpreted negatively. However they show that evaluation allows users go from making decisions based largely on intuition to making them on a more empirical basis. In a complementary vein, as another representative of an operational unit implementing an (external) evaluation said: “evaluation is a way for the programme to raise issues which cannot be raised otherwise.” In the first citation above, the “idea” on what was “wrong” with the programme was that it lacked strategy, and the person managing the evaluation from the side of the Commission wanted the external evaluation to say this.

4.3.3.2 Focus of the evaluation (in-depth vs broad)

There were four cases where the importance of the depth of an evaluation study has been explicitly brought up as an issue (ENTR Case – for all evaluations concerned, FISH, EAC (for Leonardo), ECHO). These without exception suggest that evaluations are more valuable when they have a narrow focus, are more precise and go into more detail, than when they remain broad, with the risk of being superficial and giving generic recommendations. The depth and precision of an evaluation influences the concreteness of recommendations and the ease with which these can be followed up. The evaluations under the cited ABB Activities should lead to very concrete and operational, on-the-ground recommendations.

Exhibit 15 Importance of focus of the evaluation for the use of evaluation results – examples from the case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMPL 04 03</td>
<td>The evaluation included in the case study is in-depth since it included visiting companies in all Member States to assess the effects of legislation on workers and employers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIO 13 03</td>
<td>The analysis DG REGIO has made of the Objective 1 and 2 evaluations (op.cit.) asserts that “some mid term evaluations contained extensive descriptive material rather than more synthetic analysis […] evaluations should be informed by the ‘on-the-ground’ reality of the implementation of the programme”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO 23 02</td>
<td>In the case of operations evaluations, the recommendations for follow-up of the operations are generally extremely precise; therefore the evaluations in ECHO’s case are expected to go in-depth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that although evidence is not abundant, it clearly points in the direction that an in-depth rather than broad evaluation focus is more relevant for the evaluation results being used. This is confirmed by the free comments of the questionnaire survey (see § 3.1.4).
4.3.4 Monitoring the follow-up of evaluation recommendations

It is an increasing though as yet not generalised practice of evaluation functions to monitor the follow-up of evaluation recommendations. Although no harmonised format exists across DGs, the main ingredients are generally as follows. At the end of an evaluation, all recommendations are listed in a spreadsheet and questions are asked to the relevant Operational Unit relating to (1) whether a recommendation will/can be followed up; (2) how it will be followed up and (3) by when. Next, at regular intervals the realisation of this plan is checked by the evaluation function. Although it involves the evaluation function playing a policing role, it is seen as a very important tool to make sure that recommendations of evaluations are eventually followed up.

This practice is today still essentially related to expenditure programmes (and, within that, most to intermediate evaluations) and could, as far as the case studies are concerned, be identified for the cases ENTR 02 02 (Encouraging entrepreneurship), AGRI 05 04 01 or 02 (Rural development), TREN 06 04 (Conventional & renewable energies), REGIO 13 03 (Regional development fund), EAC 15 03 (Vocational training-Leonardo) and ECHO 23 02 (Humanitarian Aid). To our knowledge, amongst the cases studied, such a system is not yet in place in FISH, JLS and EMPL.

4.3.5 Involvement of potential users

The involvement of potential users of evaluations is important for the uptake of evaluation results. The survey indicated that the most important user group of evaluations is constituted by the services of the DG itself (see § 4.1), and this is confirmed by the case studies.

4.3.5.1 Involving those who are responsible for the uptake of the evaluation results

The case studies show that there is often a major involvement, in the evaluation, of the official(s) responsible for the implementation of the evaluation results.

Exhibit 16 Involvement of (potential) users: examples from case studies

| ENTR 02 02 | Users of the MAP evaluation are the managers of this programme at the Commission; they were involved since they managed the evaluations. Results of the public consultation however also stress how important stakeholders find evaluation. |
| FISH 11 03 | Inside-Commission users (DEV, ENV...) are involved in the establishment of the ToR and in the subsequent evaluations which is important for the take-up, by these same users. There are no “outside Commission” users and evaluation reports remain unpublished and treated confidentially. |
| REGIO 13 03 | In the evaluation of Structural Fund Interventions (devolved) all relevant stakeholders are involved which leads to enormous Steering Groups. |
| EAC 15 03 | The users involved for the LdV II mid-term evaluation were those closely related with the programme at stake. For the ETF and Cedefop evaluations, there was involvement of wider stakeholder groups. |
| SANCO 17 04 | Involvement of (potential) users is seen as crucial. Such involvement constitutes (1) A driving force to start evaluations on legislations; (2) input for evaluating |

Note: this item was not in initial checklist but appears increasingly used, and useful. It can also be noted that although it is not very precise on how to do it, the Evaluation Standards suggest that Evaluation Functions “check on how the evaluation recommendations have been taken into account”.

Formerly this was only done by the “Hi-I” DGs (cf Williams et al., 2002).
legislations (e.g. use of research work done by consumer organisations while
writing ToRs; surveys, meetings, consultations…); (3) Quality assurance of
evaluations through for example participation in the steering group.
Potential users (stakeholders, other DGs) were much more involved in the
evaluation on Labelling foodstuffs

Officials involved in the Steering Group are in most of the cases also the lead users
of an evaluation and have a strong interest in the recommendations since they are
generally also the ones held accountable for their implementation. This practice
strengthens both the reflection of the feasibility of given recommendations during the
evaluation process, and their effective use after the end of the evaluation process.

Results from the Annual Evaluation Review 2003 (p.15) issued by DG BUDGET
show that recourse to Steering Groups for the management of the evaluations has
become a standard practice over the last 8 years. In 2003, around 82% of all
completed evaluation projects were conducted under the guidance of a steering group.
The number of evaluations without steering groups is continuously declining. In about
half of the internal steering groups, Commission officials from the different DGs are
represented. In the other half, they come from the same DG.

4.3.5.2 Broader user groups within the Commission or wider stakeholder groups
For some types of interventions (cf FISH, AGRI cases and EAC/ETF evaluation) it is
indeed common to have Steering Groups involving representatives of different DGs –
this is determined by the scope of the intervention that is evaluated and is important
for the uptake of results of the evaluation by these other DGs. One could also ask
whether stakeholders external to the Commission should be present in the Steering
Group. The opinions diverge and there is not much experience with this issue. It is
thought to lead to complications in the process even though it may be a success:

The Head of Unit put many different stakeholders in the steering committee [of the
evaluation of a Directive]. It was a very tough process but in the end they had great
buy in from the stakeholders! Risky, but it worked.

(A representative of an evaluation function)

An alternative approach is to have a “mirror group” with representatives of the civil
society, as testified by the following citation:

The evaluation [concerning a specific area] had a focus group every morning
preceding the Steering Group meetings. This involved European business
organisations (sometimes rival) in the area. But that worked well too. The advantage
was that the industry was always up to date with where the evaluation was going. In
the afternoon with members of the Steering Group we discussed more the details of
the reports and the process.

(A representative of an evaluation function)
According the Annual Evaluation Review 2003 (p.15), just over 15% of Steering Groups comprise stakeholders from outside the Commission, and whereas overall the number of evaluations with Steering Groups has increased over the past 8 years, the share of Steering Groups with external members has unsystematically fluctuated.

New ideas on how to involve users beyond the “internal Commission users” better in the evaluation process are currently emerging within the framework especially of Impact Assessment in which stakeholder consultation is a standard component of the exercise. Similarly, within evaluation the practice of involving stakeholder groups is rapidly and positively emerging. Within the framework of its ex ante evaluation process, DG EAC had set up a series of public consultations; more recently DG INFSO (not among the case studies), had set up a wide stakeholder consultation around the publication of the intermediate report (summer 2004) of the Five Year Assessment Panel of the Information Society Technologies Priority. This process involved representatives of Member States but also the beneficiaries of the programme which through an Internet consultation were given (and effectively took) the opportunity to react upon a first draft of recommendations. This helped to finalise the final report of the Expert Panel carrying out this evaluation and helped disseminate the results of the evaluation to the relevant communities.

4.3.6 Human resources

It lies beyond the scope of the present study to quantitatively measure the involvement, in terms of time consumption, of persons involved in specific evaluations since European Commission officials are not obliged to keep timesheets. All evidence points however at the need for a thorough investment from the side of officials in order to guarantee an optimal quality of the evaluation, the quality – as will be shown later on – being an important factor for evaluation use in a system in which evaluation is generally adopted as a management tool. At the same time, time investment was not mentioned as being a particular problem, and evaluations were not said to be a burden in this respect, even if they were generally found to be “time consuming.”
The case studies show that the following activities consume human resources (only human resources on the side of the Commission are considered):

- The “secretariat” of the evaluation project, i.e. the official(s) who from the beginning to the end follow the evaluation process, are in closest contact with the evaluator (in the case of an external evaluator), etc. Estimates in interviews range from “20% of my time” to peak periods of “nearly full time” especially in the beginning of the evaluation project (ToR, kick-off meeting, inception report, inception meeting…) and in the period of drafting the final versions of the final report.
- Specific contribution of the evaluation function (drafting Terms of reference, contribution to Steering Group meetings…)
- The Steering Group, the members of which consume time for meeting, reading documents and eventually writing comments on documents; this should be multiplied by the number of people on the steering group. In the cases analysed, formal Steering Groups are used for external evaluations only (the exception being DG ENTR for the internally conducted MAP mid-term evaluation)
- The administration with regard to the formal procedures of the evaluation project, again especially important in the case of external contractors (hence in external evaluation) or in internal evaluation with external components (e.g. external facilitation of workshop within an internal ex ante evaluation)
- In the case of an internal evaluation project, performing the different steps of the conduct of the evaluation project internally.

The time invested by the officials(s) who directly monitor the evaluation project, and of the members of the Steering Group of the evaluation appear to be especially important for the success of an evaluation and therewith enhancing the chances for the uptake of its results.

4.3.7 Dissemination of evaluation results
Dissemination to a wider audience forms an important part of the involvement of potential users of the evaluation and of the evaluated intervention (see also §0). Relevant users within the Commission and relevant stakeholder groups outside the Commission need to be actively made aware of the results of an evaluation before any uptake can take place.

Different groups need to be distinguished in the dissemination process:
- Those responsible for the implementation of the intervention, normally already directly involved in the evaluation
- Senior management within the DG
- Other DGs involved in the intervention (or being amongst its target groups – cf DG FISH procedures)
- DG BUDGET where B5 is an active component of the dissemination process through the annual evaluation review and other activities which analyse and summarise the evaluation activity within the Commission
- Wider stakeholder groups and beneficiaries

In principle, again no difference in intervention type can be made with regard to the importance of dissemination, although for expenditure programmes, agreements and
partnerships, dissemination target groups are more readily identifiable than is the case in broader policies or regulation.

The case studies suggest that in most of the cases, active dissemination of evaluation results is not a priority: “interested people will read the report anyway so posting it on the internet is sufficient” – which to a certain extent is probably true. However, better and more targeted dissemination may contribute to the improved awareness, and eventually improved use, of evaluation results, to obtain their acceptance by a wider audience than those directly involved with the implementation of an intervention.

Exhibit 18 shows selected dissemination practices on top of the regular practice encountered for each case except FISH, to publish evaluation reports on the Internet.

**Exhibit 18  Selected dissemination practices**

| ENTR 02 02 | IDA: Press release and Website publicity  
MAP intermediate: through public consultation and public consultation summary document  
For the MAP final evaluation: presentation to Management committee in July (EPMC); this committee is established by the legal base. The evaluation report has been on the agenda of the business organisations |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMPL 04 03</td>
<td>Conferences have been organised in the Member States following the evaluation and there is a continuous debate on how to improve the health and safety at the workplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC 15 03</td>
<td>In all three cases (LdV, Cedefop, ETF) the evaluations were obligatory meaning that they were input into formal publications from the Commission and, in case of the two agencies, followed up by action plans which are published on their respective homepages. This gives the possibility to anyone to hold the agencies accountable for the follow-up of their own action plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANCO 17 04</td>
<td>Publication of the evaluation report on the Internet, stakeholders meeting around the new legislation proposal, feed-back to the Member states through the working group official meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A good practice to improve dissemination of evaluation results is not to focus on one single evaluation but to perform evaluation syntheses. This – by necessity since evaluations are both very numerous and devolved – was done by DG REGIO for the Objective 1/2 intermediate evaluations. Other DGs which as far as the case studies were concerned conducted series of similar evaluations (FISH, AGRI, EMPL, EAC,…) did not show such dissemination practice so far.

**4.3.8 Less important and “commonplace” factors**

This section discusses the factors that have a low impact on use, were found through the case study analysis to be of less relevance or are simply common sense. These are the “reason to evaluate” which does not appear to be determining for evaluation use; the role of internal vs external evaluation (where the choice is not one of quality of the evaluation but merely one of credibility towards the outside world), and financial

---

60 Op.cit. The initial goal of this (non legally obligatory) overview performed by DG REGIO’s evaluation unit was of course to understand what conclusions could be drawn from the whole set of Objective 1 & 2 evaluations; however, this exercise yielded a comprehensive document which is used to communicate on these evaluations to the outside world.
resources, which are of course crucial (without money no evaluation) but that is such a commonplace finding that it was decided to discuss the issue under the present heading. The reason is also that in the case studies no real problems were encountered with regard to financial resources for evaluation and that evaluations do not generally seem to be underfunded.

These three items will be discussed in turn, below.

4.3.8.1 Reason to evaluate

The reason to evaluate is a relevant but not determining factor for the “level of use” of evaluation results. Most of the evaluations encountered in the case studies are legally obligatory (so that was, strictly speaking, the reason to conduct them), but it goes without saying that a legal obligation to evaluate is no guarantee for evaluation use per se. Although there is no explicit evidence from the case studies, evaluation functions experience is that it may sometimes even be counterproductive for operational units to have an obligation to evaluation: “we do it since we must.” Voluntarily initiated evaluations are rare but a better guarantee for uptake of evaluation conclusions and recommendations since they are directly inspired by a need rather than an obligation. DG Enterprise & Industry is undertaking an evaluation of its own activities with regard to the Open Method of Coordination (OMC). Even if other DGs are equally concerned, the evaluation of the OMC is not a legal obligation and those other DGs appear difficult to mobilise for performing a strategic or cross-cutting evaluation of the OMC. Most of the DGs encountered for the case studies indeed explicitly limit themselves to the obligatory evaluations, financial, but especially human resources explaining that not much can be done on top of this.

It is a finding of the case studies that the increased demonstration of evaluation use and usefulness (independent of the reason to evaluate) appears to produce a “virtuous circle” and has a positive effect on evaluation use. The involvement of users of the evaluations, and, in the decentralised model to which all evaluations studied belong, the involvement of operational units has turned evaluation, we observe, from an obligation to an increasingly appreciated management tool (see also section 0 on the Involvement of (potential) users). Here again the role and agility of the evaluation function is of importance. This is clearly shown by cases such as EAC, FISH or AGRI where, over time, operational units have seen the utility of evaluations for their work and have started to use them in a productive way – in the case of FISH even “saturating” the framework contract that was put in place.

4.3.8.2 Role of internal vs external evaluation

The case studies do not yield enough systematic evidence to analyse the role of external vs external evaluation since most individual evaluations analysed within the framework of the different case studies were performed by external contractors, often because external evaluation was a legal obligation. The exceptions are the MAP intermediate evaluation (which is the only “pure” internal evaluation to be found within the case studies); the Lifelong Learning 2007-2013 ex ante evaluation for which the Leonardo da Vinci II mid-term evaluation was an input; and the SANCO evaluation of the Novel Food regulation. The latter two are a little hybrid however since for EAC’s ex ante evaluation there was methodological involvement of an external consultant; the SANCO evaluation referred to was performed internally but
preceded by a public consultation supervised and summarised by an external consultant. All the internally performed evaluations encountered had a very good follow-up in the decision making process and there is no reason to think that internal evaluations would lead to lesser or more use than external ones. The consideration to perform an evaluation externally does not depend on the use that can be made of it but on issues of credibility (external meaning “independent” evaluation), on resource availability and on evaluation competence. On the contrary, there is evidence that the different internally performed evaluations were well followed-up precisely because those who performed them had a good knowledge of the internal workings of the Commission – a competence that is often lacking, as testified by the case studies, at the side of external evaluation, having an impact on the quality of the report (see § 4.3.3.1) and therefore on the uptake of the evaluation results.

4.3.8.3 Financial resources

Financial resources are those resources dedicated to conducting the evaluation (paying contractors in case of external evaluation), its preparation (comprised in Commission overheads and generally marginal as compared to the costs for a contractor) and eventually the post-evaluation process (organisation of workshops, report printing...).

By definition, financial resources are crucial for external evaluation since without them, such an evaluation can simply not be carried out and hence not used. This said, no specific evidence was obtained from the cases that financial resources pose a particular problem in any of the cases studied, i.e. that evaluations would be under-funded and that this would be a cause that hampers use. So it can be viewed as a “commonplace” factor.

An interesting case is provided by DG REGIO who performed a meta-analysis of the Objective 1 and Objective 2 mid-term evaluations. It should be recalled that in the case of the mid-term evaluations, DG REGIO’s evaluations of the structural funds are “devolved” i.e. carried out by Regions, not by the Commission itself. The report makes the following observations with regard to the financial cost of the evaluations:61

Over €35 million was spent on the Objective 1 and 2 mid term evaluations with an average cost per evaluation of €172,000. The cost of the evaluations represented on average 0.08% of total annual allocations. The ultimate cost effectiveness depends on the usefulness of the evaluations in improving the quality and relevance of programmes. The Commission’s perception is that the resources allocated to the mid term evaluation were appropriate and higher than previous allocations, but that cost effectiveness was limited by a number of factors, including the late or slow start of programmes, the broad nature of the evaluation and methodological weaknesses (p.60)

The low costs of an evaluation may in theory impact on the quality of an evaluation (cf quality below) but no cases were encountered were such a relationship was found. Only in the SANCO case, there existed the idea amongst the interviewees that if the

---

budget for the evaluation would have been higher, more countries could have been covered in the evaluation (of Labelling food stuff), hence improving the quality of the evaluation. Also in the case of the final evaluation of IDA II, mention was made that with a larger budget, a more detailed, in depth evaluation may have been produced, leading to a better quality evaluation.

4.3.9 Relevance of different factors in the different stages of the evaluation project

It was part of the analysis to put into perspective the different factors with regard to the different phases of any evaluation “project,” i.e. planning, preparation & design, conduct, reporting and follow-up. Below follows a brief summary of the findings of the case studies, which summarise some of the issues encountered earlier.

The following issues to enhance use are important with regard to the different stages of the evaluation project:

1. It was argued earlier (§ 4.3.1) that timing and purpose of the evaluation are crucial. As concerns the planning of an evaluation it is therefore important to have a good overview of the timing of the evaluation with regard to when its results should be taken up. It is therefore both important to know the reason (for instance a legal obligation) and its purpose (who and when should the results be used, in order to do what). This may sound obvious, yet the case studies show nevertheless that planning is not always perfect, even for DGs with a long track record in evaluation, and this decreases their use. Having a well-designed multi-annual evaluation plan (today an obligation) is good practice.

2. The importance of the quality of evaluation (§ 4.3.2) is linked to the preparation & design of an evaluation it is crucial to have a good terms of reference whereas again the advisory role of the evaluation function is also important. Good practices encountered are the following.

2.1 The case studies show that it is becoming a common practice for the evaluation functions (when responsibility for evaluation is decentralised) to propose a template for the Terms of reference that can be adapted by an operational unit responsible for the evaluation. A well-designed terms of reference with good evaluation questions will have an impact on the whole conduct of the evaluation and especially on the quality of the end result. The quality of the end result in turn influences use.

2.2 In the selection of the evaluator and the proposal, the advisory role of evaluation functions with regard to proposed methodology, workplan and, especially, deliverables proposed by the tenderers (in case of external evaluation) is much appreciated if it is the operational units who are in charge of managing the evaluation process.

2.3 It is crucial to have an inception meeting to fix the methodology

2.4 In case of an internal evaluation one should have an internal Terms of Reference – sort of “scenario” clearly describing the steps in the evaluation project.

3. Again related to the quality of the evaluation, as concerns the conduct of the evaluation, two issues are important to enhance use

3.1 Regular meetings between (internal but especially in the case of external) evaluators and steering group to check progress of the evaluation

3.2 Involvement of users and wider stakeholder group may enhance the validity and therewith the use of evaluation results

4. As concerns the reporting stage
4.1 In the case of external evaluation, the quality depends very much on how the contractors have been managed during the process.

4.2 Quality can be improved through quality assessments by steering group.

4.3 The evaluation function may be given a right to veto the draft final report for reasons of quality.

4.4 In the case of an internal evaluation the quality depends very much on goodwill and management of the process. An external eye can be useful in an internal evaluation. A practice that has been encountered once (DG ENTR) is to produce a Terms of reference exactly as if it were an external evaluation.

5 In the follow-up of an evaluation it appears especially important for the evaluation function to monitor the implementation of recommendations (cf § 4.3.4). This is increasing practice, but is also thought to bring the evaluation function in a policing role which may not be appreciated by operational units. We have not encountered operational units that share this vision – rather they appear as quite constructive, in particular if they have themselves put a major effort in the evaluation.

4.4 Factors that foster or discourage the use of evaluations at the level of the organisation

While the previous section focused on the level of individual evaluations, this section shifts the focus of the analysis to the level of the organisation. Since most of the factors have already been analysed in the previous section, they will be touched upon briefly only.

4.4.1 Planning / Timing

Since, as we have seen, it is crucial that evaluations are planned it appears consequently crucial that the planning of evaluations is organised on DG level and their eventual use anticipated in regard to important policy decisions to be taken since this may necessitate to eventually bring forward an evaluation in comparison to the legally obligatory or planned date.

An annual plan and even more so a multi-annual programme (Evaluation Standard B2) help to organise and co-ordinate evaluations. It also helps the evaluation unit to anticipate its capacity to prepare, manage or accompanying them: for many of the DGs studied, 2003-2004 was a very hectic evaluation period because of a very high number of mid-term evaluations that had to be carried out, as well as the preparation of the new programming period (financial perspectives) 2007-2013, since they required ex ante evaluations and/or impact assessments. This laid a great burden on the capacity of evaluation functions or units. However, while planning can help foresee capacity problems it cannot necessarily resolve them.

4.4.2 Human and financial resources

The importance of human and financial resources for the use of the results of individual evaluations was discussed in § 4.3.6 and § 4.3.8.3.

---

62 For an overall analysis of the existence of such plans see Analysis of the Planning, Provision and Use of Evaluation-related Information in the ABM/SPP Cycle, DG Budget, November 2003, p4
Evaluations are labour-intensive processes and all evidence points to the need for a thorough investment from the side of the Commission in order to guarantee the optimal quality of an evaluation. At the same time, time investment was not mentioned as being a problem, and evaluations were not seen as a burden in this respect, even if they were generally found to be “time consuming.” This observation seems to be evidence per se of a certain usefulness of evaluation.

As indicated, financial resources have not emerged from the case studies as being a problem in evaluation. It should be noted that DG BUDG, through the establishment of the AER, which includes the figures for evaluation at the Commission, already makes an effort in understanding the cost of evaluation. This idea could be pushed further by establishing benchmarks relating, for instance, different DGs or types of interventions, and/or their size. Such benchmarking between the cost of evaluations within, let alone between, DGs, does not seem to exist.

The Evaluation Standards besides foresee that evaluation today be clearly identified and budgeted in the list of each DG’s operations in order to be able to set aside human and financial resources.

4.4.3 Relationship with stakeholders

Relationships with internal and eventually with external stakeholders are important for the use of evaluation results. As indicated under the heading concerning the involvement of evaluation users in individual evaluations (§ 4.3.5.2), the survey suggests that the most important user group of evaluations is the services of the commissioning DG, and this is confirmed by the case studies. Widening the Steering Group is not common practice and seems only to depend on the content of the intervention. There do not seem to be policies on the organisational level (it is presumed that guidelines for this would normally have to come from the evaluation function of a DG).

- DG FISH has DG DEV and DG ENV on its Steering Groups for the evaluation of the Fishery agreements (but interviews indicate the weak presence of DG SANCO)
- DG SANCO (labelling foodstuff) involves for instance DG TRADE
- DG ENTR, having a horizontal function, often involves representatives of ECFIN, RTD, etc., depending on the subject to be dealt with.

The issue of the involvement of external stakeholders is an issue at the level of individual evaluations rather than for improving the use of evaluation at the organisational level. Again it should be cited that external stakeholders are only very seldom directly involved (i.e. through participation in a Steering Group); their indirect involvement through general public consultation or targeted stakeholder consultation in an evaluation is increasing, though best practice – it is also an issue in IA – is yet to be developed on this issue.

---

63 That is, apart from addressing stakeholders as the normal component of the evaluation methodology through surveys, interviews or case studies.

64 Examples: EAC ex ante / IA; SANCO novel food, where consultation process was managed by external consultant and the subsequent evaluation performed internally.
Stakeholder groups are often represented in official bodies that are associated to programmes or organisations (Management committees, etc.) and hence are informed about evaluation results in this manner.

4.4.4 Evaluation Function

The size of an evaluation function determines its capacity to prepare, manage or otherwise be involved in evaluations. Since, as indicated, evaluation use depends on obtaining an optimal result for each of the individual stages of the evaluation process, and since, as outlined in section 4.3.9, the role of the evaluation function is important in all stages of this process – planning, design, accompanying the conduct and finalising the evaluation as well as in the implementation of the recommendations.

The cases do not provide evidence that there is a relationship between the composition (in terms of the competence or background of the members of its team) of the evaluation function and evaluation use, although past experience with evaluation is helpful if a representative of an evaluation function is responsible for setting up the DG-internal evaluation process.

In all cases, the evaluation functions emphasised the importance of their relationships with operational units and with senior management in order to obtain good quality evaluations and, eventually, uptake of evaluation results:

- Vis-à-vis the operational units who are the experts of their area, the evaluation function has to build credibility in their (methodological and process) support role. No friction (on either of the sides interviewed) was encountered and evaluation functions seem to be well accepted in this role by operational units.65
- The relationship with senior management is crucial, not to obtain acceptance of individual evaluations per se66 but to set up the DG evaluation “system” which are to a large extent designed, implemented and co-ordinated by the Evaluation Function.

4.4.5 Evaluation culture and Management culture

Although the present study does not cover all DGs, the general impression is that on the whole the distribution of the level of institutionalisation of evaluation across DGs remains the same as in the previous evaluation use study,67 but that the institutionalisation of evaluation has significantly increased leading to a “general upgrading” of all DGs previously characterised as Medium-I or Low-I.68 Overall this means that evaluation is more integrated into the decision-making processes in the services, and evaluation results are thus more likely to be used. There is greater acceptance of the relevance of evaluation and this especially true for ex ante, intermediate and final (though not necessarily ex post) programme evaluation.

65 There were – not on purpose – no cases of centralised evaluation in the case sample but we know by experience (RTD, INFSO) that there is an additional credibility step to be built in these situations and more effort needed to obtain acceptance of results.
66 Which is an additional effort to make for centralised evaluation functions.
67 See Williams et al., Chapter 3.
68 Gains for the Hi-I group have on the contrary been marginal – but theoretically the learning curve for these DGs would be less steep anyway.
Moreover, evaluation is starting to be increasingly used for other types of interventions.

Several reasons can be indicated for this rapid evolution of the institutionalisation of evaluation at the European Commission: the standards have been implemented since the previous evaluation use study and evaluation is now systematic part of management plan and annual report of each DG; also the Financial Regulation is major driver for performing evaluation.

As concerns the development of evaluation in the general management culture, the evaluation of programmes in particular has to a great extent become a routine activity and appears to be integrated in the day-to-day management processes as a useful tool. As said at several occasions in this report however, it remains very much with the Operational Units responsible for the implementation of the evaluations and subsequently of the recommendations. By contrast, evaluation results in their original form hardly seem to arrive at the higher levels of senior management (or at least their explicit use becomes more diffuse). So the vision of whether evaluation has become integrated in the overall management culture is probably to be nuanced as a function of the level of the management one is looking at, and the type of intervention concerned: in the case of expenditure programmes, evaluation has definitely become part of the management culture and the “tool box” of the operational units. For other management levels and other types of interventions this does not currently appear to be the case.

4.5 **Factors influencing the use of evaluation results related to the substance of the intervention and its position within a policy mix**

> “people are generally more interested in evaluating big expenditure programmes rather than big impact policies”

(A representative of an evaluation function)

The case studies suggest that political importance of interventions, their expected socio-economic impact or their external visibility (independently of their budget for the Commission) are not key determinants either for implementing evaluations or evaluation use. Other informational inputs, such as Impact Assessment, expert opinions, or purely political inputs are much more important in the formulation of such interventions.

Consequently, it must be concluded that there is a difference in the level of evaluation and the use of its results between different types of intervention.

As concerns the coherence between interventions and between their evaluations, the case studies without exception show a tendency to look at interventions and their

---

69 Initially not in the terms of reference it seemed important to briefly discuss the relation between the importance of the intervention (in budgetary and political terms) and evaluation and evaluation use.

70 And in particular EAC, FISH, AGRI, REGIO and to a lesser extent ENTR, ECHO – all the ABB Activities studied covering many different and sometimes different types of interventions.
evaluations in more co-ordinated fashion than has been the case before. Reasons are multiple and often interlinked:

- It can be due to the increased use of ex ante evaluation which necessitates an overview of past achievements.
- Evaluation functions themselves take the initiative to make “transversal” analyses of evaluations – a practice most developed in the traditional Structural Fund DGs (AGRI, REGIO) that were studied, but may well be useful for other DGs which have great series of similar interventions and thus evaluations, too (ECHO, FISH…).
- DG BUDGET has launched meta-evaluations and “strategic” evaluations which, for instance in the case of Financial Assistance Schemes for SMEs have impacted back on the relevant DGs (or at least the one studied for the present report, which was also the one most concerned).

---

71 It would for that reason be interesting to update the analysis of evaluation-related information in ABB Activity statements that was first performed by DG BUDG end 2003 (DG BUDGET, 2003, Analysis of evaluation-related Information in the ABB Activity Statements, BUDG B5/FA D(2003)).

72 Cf EAC-case and TREN cases where the ex ante evaluation worked towards integration of previously separate programmes even if in the TREN case timing of different evaluation was problematic and not all past evaluations could be taken into account to effectively make integrated use of them.

73 Cf The Mid Term Evaluation in Objective 1 and 2 Regions. Growing Evaluation Capacity, Final Report, DG Regional Policy, Evaluation Unit – REGIO.C.2; one of the operators for the INTERREG programmes on their own behalf have also made a meta evaluation, see A Study of the Mid Term Evaluations of INTERREG programmes for the programming period 2000 until 2006, INTERACT programme secretariat, Vienna January 2005.
5 Conclusions and recommendations

By summarising the different insights that were gained throughout this study, this last chapter aims to respond to the questions underlying this study and outlined at the beginning of this report (§ 1.3), i.e.:

1. Who are the users and what are the uses of the Commission’s evaluations?
2. Within the context of the elaboration of Commission acts/proposals, in the planning and budget cycle and in the management of ongoing activities, to what extent have the Commission’s evaluation activities actually contributed to different objectives that can be assigned to evaluation?
3. Are there certain factors that foster (or discourage) the use of evaluations? If so, what are these factors?

5.1 Who are the users and what are the uses of evaluation?

As explained in section 4.1, all empirical material converges to say that the main users of the Commission’s evaluations analysed for this report are, in the first place and most often, the services of the DGs which commission the evaluations. More precisely, the users appear to be the officials directly involved with the implementation of the interventions that are evaluated. The use of evaluation is most visible and explicit at an operational level, i.e. within and between different generations of expenditure programmes. Most of the use identified concerns adjusting the implementation of on-going programmes or policies and the preparation of their follow-up. Evaluation is less significantly used as an input to the design of entirely new interventions and the setting of political priorities.

The study brought to the fore several other interesting uses and users:

- The EAC case shows that evaluation is a good means to analyse the functioning of Commission agencies and in these cases the agencies plus the Commission are the main users of the evaluation results.74
- Several ABB Activities (EMPL 04 03, SANCO 17 04) studied testify of the importance and use of evaluation in the formulation of regulations and directives cases. The user group of evaluation goes typically beyond the ones directly responsible for drafting a legislative text since the consequences of the evaluation have a less well-defined perimeter than in the case of a programme.
- It is also in the case of evaluation of regulations and directives that one encounters generally more involvement of other DGs during an evaluation and in the uptake of evaluation results. Also the involvement of external stakeholders appears more common in these cases than in more traditional expenditure programme evaluation (structural funds excepted) and such involvement supports the use of the evaluation results.
- A very specific type of evaluation and evaluation use is linked to the preparation of agreements with third countries. In the relevant case studied (FISH ABB 11 03), such evaluations yield highly strategic information and are confidential.

74 In 2003, the Commission was asked by Parliament to carry out evaluation of agencies every three years.
• Evaluation use for agreements and policies concerning third countries, confirms some of the comments in the survey questionnaire pointing at the role of evaluation results in negotiations with external parties.

The last type of evaluation use is, precisely, the use of evaluation results in other evaluations or other studies such as impact assessment – mostly within the same DG (examples: TREN 06 04, EAC 15 03). Some examples of an integration or combination of both types of exercises (IA and EAE) are appearing. More generally, in all cases which involve expenditure programmes, the different subsequent evaluations very much relate to each other and often update earlier evaluations’ results.

5.2 The contribution of evaluation to different objectives
Section 4.2 has provided the evidence that evaluations are most used in the implementation and the design of interventions. Their contribution to accountability (often through a legal obligation) and awareness is also important. Evaluation intervenes in the policy process, and clear evidence is found of evaluations being used in Communications, and for some cases in documents discussed in Parliament.
Evaluation contributes however to incremental changes and certainly not to radical new changes in policy or to the choice of policy options, unless it would be used via an Impact Assessment. Finally, all evidence shows that evaluation does not make a significant contribution to the efficient allocation of resources.

5.2.1 Where evaluation is definitely highly influential: the design and implementation of interventions; awareness and accountability

Section 4.2.2 has shown that ex ante and intermediate evaluation are influential to the design of interventions – both examples for expenditure programmes and regulations were encountered. Generally, the changes induced tend to be incremental however.

The most common contribution of evaluation work lies in the improvement of the implementation of financial interventions, action programmes and the like. However, there are policy instruments of the Commission where evaluation is not yet so common and the influence is also less evident (legislation etc).

Section 4.2.5 argues on the basis of the evidence collected through, in particular, the survey and the case studies that evaluation contributes strongly to the aim of increasing accountability.

Improvement of awareness of interventions is normally not a major aim of Commission evaluation work, and in most of the cases studied no major publicity campaigns are organised around evaluation results. However, evaluations are generally published on the Internet (in only one case studied evaluation reports were not published) and in some cases major consultation and stakeholder events around evaluations and evaluation results have been set up.
5.2.2 Where evaluation is less influential: setting political priorities; efficient allocation of resources

Even though evaluations figure in proposals to Commission and Parliament (often since there is a requirement to do so), evaluations rarely provide inputs for setting political priorities or choosing between different options per se (unless via an Impact Assessment, to which evaluations often constitute an input). However, there are examples such as ex ante evaluation of Structural Fund programmes where political priorities have been influenced by evaluation at the national level and at Commission level (Cohesion policy).

The cases, the analysis of the financial statements, the survey and the interviews, show that overall allocation of EU resources is certainly not determined on efficiency grounds, but much more by political decision-making. The study shows especially that such decisions are generally very little informed by evaluation. Evaluation has however led to changes in resource allocation within interventions (especially expenditure programmes), in changes in eligibility criteria and incremental improvements in operational efficiency – the latter clearly resulting from evaluations exposing inefficiencies.

5.3 Factors that foster or discourage the use of evaluation

It was part of the study to identify factors that foster, or eventually discourage the use of evaluation. For this a list of factors was used provided by DG BUDGET on the basis of an earlier study into evaluation use and on the basis of DG BUDGET’s own accumulated experience in the analysis of evaluation practice across the Commission. These factors were notably studied through the case studies.

The analyses show that all factors have an importance for the use of evaluation. However, some factors are more important than others, and some turn out to be crucial. This is especially so for the timing and the purpose of the evaluation; the quality of the evaluation process and evaluation report; and the monitoring and follow-up of evaluation recommendations. The analysis and evidence given in section 4.3 allows us to establish the following hierarchy of the importance of the different factors, even if for individual cases the picture may be slightly different:

- Evaluation planning and timing; purpose of the evaluation
- Support of the senior management
- Quality of the evaluation, comprising the issues of the quality of the report and evaluator; and the focus of the evaluation (in-depth vs broad)
- Monitoring the follow-up of evaluation recommendations
- Involvement of potential users
- Human resources
- Dissemination of evaluation results

Some factors also appeared less important or “commonplace”, these are:

---

75 It was not found useful to analyse whether there was a correlation between the “level of use” of evaluation within the different case studied, and the influence of the different factors on this use in a linear fashion. The cases were simply too different and the types of use (i.e. related to substance) too heterogeneous for such an analysis to have any real meaning. The study hence much more focused on the evaluation practice in relation to the different factors to be analysed.
• Reason to evaluate
• Role of internal vs external evaluation
• Financial resources

It should be noted that these different factors sometimes relate to different stages of an evaluation project. This relationship is outlined in the following table.

**Exhibit 19  Main importance of different factors in the different stages of an evaluation project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important factors</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Preparation/Design</th>
<th>Conduct</th>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation planning, timing &amp; purpose</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of the senior management</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring follow-up of recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of (potential) users</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of evaluation results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was also analysed whether there is a relationship between the political importance of an intervention and evaluation use. The case studies suggest that political importance of interventions, their expected socio-economic impact, or their external visibility (independently of their budget for the Commission) are currently not key determinants either for implementing evaluations or for evaluation use. Other information inputs, such as Impact Assessment, expert opinions, or purely political inputs are much more important to help structure such interventions.

5.4 **Assessment of judgment criteria and indicators**

Finally, it was also one of the methodological aims of the study to assess the relevance of the judgment criteria and indicators that DG BUDGET proposed for the different types of evaluation use (section 4.2) of the study and that were completed in the inception phase and used, in particular, as checklists for finding evidence through the case studies. The following observations can be drawn.

The evidence shows that evaluations are quite systematically referred to in Communications (or their annexes). Reference can be implicit but nevertheless obvious (i.e. by referring to evaluation findings without making an explicit reference to it). Use of evaluations is also visible and explicit in the internal preparation process for new proposals, and, related to that, within Impact Assessments and other preparatory studies. Evaluation information is less visibly or directly referred to in the adoption process in Council or Parliament, although some good examples exist.
Little evidence was found of the evaluations cited in the case studies being explicitly used in the APS, the AAR, or the CLWP. More generally, these documents make only sporadic reference to evaluation (the CLWP does so most).

The evidence from the case studies hence shows that evaluations do intervene in the policy process. Several evaluations studied under the different ABB Activities have been reported on to Parliament and Council. It is however much more difficult to find direct evidence that Parliament or Council have subsequently used the evaluation outcomes. A major exception within the case studies is DG REGIO where a study for Parliament relies heavily on a synthesis on Structural Interventions’ evaluations.

Evidence of the use of evaluation for implementation of on-going activities is found, first of all, in the way in which the activity takes into account the recommendations made by the evaluation of concern. To a lesser extent (though examples (e.g. DG EAC case) exist) explicit such evidence is found in individual AMPs. It is an increasing practice to monitor the follow-up of recommendations from evaluations; and also the issue of timing is crucial.

The use of evaluations in view of accountability is readily identifiable. They are especially to be found in Commission Communications, however less in documents emanating from Council and Parliament.

As concerns the use of evaluation for improvement of awareness around evaluation, in some cases quite active communication strategies were identified. However, the most common dissemination way is by simply making the report available the report on the Internet.

As a special case of awareness building, one should mention **inter-DG communication** that can take place around evaluations. This is often not explicitly documented and takes place, mostly, through participation in steering groups.

Overall, it has been proven difficult to find evidence in any of the formal documents for the use of evaluation for more efficient allocation of resources.

### 5.5 Recommendations

This last section contains proposals for recommendations. The main purpose is to identify areas were improvements are needed and to present alternative options. It is outside the scope of this study to fully analyse the impact of each of the potential options. The recommendations are therefore not exhaustive and they are formulated in a general terms.

A first recommendation concerns the use of standards. It has been observed in this report that in comparison to the previous evaluation study, the DGs where evaluation was only weakly or moderately institutionalised have in most cases made very good progress with the institutionalisation of evaluation. A major reason for this has been, in our view, the introduction of the evaluation standards in the Commission as from 2002, with an effect of the structuration, planning and legitimation of evaluation and
evaluation functions. This, in turn has had an impact on the follow-up and use of evaluation results at the operational and management levels.

A first recommendation is therefore to continue the development and enforcement of the standards since this has visibly had a beneficial impact on evaluation and its use.

A second observation is that in several cases, the ABB Activities cannot be viewed as integrated “programmes.” It is therefore recommended to update and extend DG BUDGET’s past analysis of the role of, and reporting on, evaluation within ABB Activities with a view on the improvement of the internal coherence of ABB Activities.

The following sections will briefly sketch recommendations related to the conclusions discussed in the previous chapter.

5.5.1 Timing is crucial; improve planning of evaluations

All evidence indicates that timing and planning of evaluation is crucial for evaluation use and that still this is not always managed to satisfaction. It is suggested that evaluation results can be made more useful by – even – better timing and anticipation.

Recommendations

⇒ It is recommended that the important coordination role of evaluation functions in evaluation planning and its oversight, through the multi-annual evaluation plan and other evaluation coordination and planning activities, is confirmed

⇒ In many cases also the legal base appeared too prescriptive with regard to timing (especially intermediate) and the necessary flexibility should be built in – as some DGs have started to do in the definition of the legal bases of their programmes for the 2007-2013 period. It is recommended that the Commission further investigate the degree to which the definition of the exact timing in legal bases of interventions is generalised and to what extent this has lead to inflexibility

⇒ Flexibility can furthermore be built in by shorter contracting periods (through framework contracts for instance); through the further development of internal evaluation (with the proviso of having enough resources), and through the use of the mixed model of internal combined with external evaluation

5.5.2 Improved use of evaluation in programming and strategic planning of Commission activities

The study clearly shows that the main use of evaluation is in the design and implementation of interventions and that this for the majority concerns continuation

---

76 All three are in one way or another dealt with in the evaluation standards and good practices, through the “evaluation charter” or the like, the annual (and now multi-annual) evaluation plans, and the definition of roles in evaluation.

77 Follow-up of evaluation results is also accounted for in the standards although the way in which this should be done is not strictly prescribed – in many DGs however this starts to be translated into a spreadsheet with recommendations and their follow-up periodically submitted to the operational units by the evaluation functions – see section 4.3.2.

78 Programme is used here in the generic sense, not in the sense of expenditure programme.

or renewal of interventions. It is therefore suggested that evaluation results can be better used in programming and planning of Commission activities.

Recommendations

⇒ By positioning evaluation units/activities/managers with planning, strategy, policy and coordination functions within Directorates
⇒ By improving frameworks and knowledge management systems for evaluation so that learning is cumulative
⇒ By combining Impact assessment and ex ante evaluation with other evaluation activities
⇒ By investigating more systematically, within individual evaluations, the relationships between the individual intervention or sub-activity and the ABB Activity to which it belongs. This could shed additional light on the success as well as the coherence of the ABB Activity concerned
⇒ An effort should be made in synthesising and communicating key potential policy implications of evaluations to the senior management
⇒ Moreover, meta-type, cross-cutting and synthetic evaluation work could be further promoted at the level of both central and operational Services

5.5.3 Integrate Impact Assessment and Ex ante evaluation better

Following up on the previous recommendation, the evidence provided by the study shows that Impact Assessment and ex ante evaluation are in practice very complementary – good examples (e.g. EAC) start to exist which merge the two approaches into one coherent whole accepted by both DG BUDGET and the SG. Some of the high level interviews indeed put question marks on the efficiency of having two so similar methods-practices live parallel lives: this would not be defendable towards the Commissions “clients,” i.e. Council and Parliament. In practice, some of the detail work of ex ante evaluation is best confined to the preferred “policy option” of Impact Assessment.

Recommendations

⇒ It is recommended that combined guidance on Commission IA and ex ante evaluation would be helpful and should be further developed
⇒ It is recommended to increasingly combine the two approaches

5.5.4 Improve the use of evaluation in the legislative process

The results show that the use of evaluation information is limited in the legislative process, with several legislative financial statements failing to provide evaluative information.

Recommendation

⇒ The services involved in preparing legislative proposals should make an effort to use existing evaluation results in the legislative financial statements to better support legislative proposals. An increased co-operation between the operational units, the financial services and the evaluation functions could be a first step in this direction
5.5.5 Making increased use of evaluation in the budgetary process

The report also shows that whereas evaluations are being used to improve the intervention concerned and contributes to the design of future, similar interventions, they to a far lesser extent appear to contribute to the efficient allocation of resources. In order to further enhance the Commission’s capability to maximise the utility of evaluation in the budgetary process, the following options could be explored.

Recommendations

✔ The role of evaluation in the various parts of the SPP and budgetary cycles (e.g. APS, PDB, AAR) could be strengthened by optimising the use of the available evaluation evidence in the respective reporting exercises. This would also require enhanced co-ordination and co-operation between the strategic planning, evaluation and financial units in operational DGs

✔ In order to further enhance the usefulness of evaluation results for the budgetary process, evaluations should put more emphasis on cost-effectiveness and related issues
Annexe A Existing documentation and information

The following documents were at the disposal of the consultants for this study:

• **Focus on Results: Strengthening Evaluation of Commission Activities.** Communication to the Commission from Mrs Schreyer, July 2000.
• Study on the Use of Evaluation Results in the Commission Services, Technopolis France/The Tavistock Institute, October 2002.
• **Evaluation Standards and Good Practice.** Communication for the Commission from the President and Mrs Schreyer, December 2002.
• Analysis of Evaluation-related information in the ABB Activity Statements (PDB 2004), DG Budget, November 2003.
• Analysis of 2005 Activity And Financial Statements by the Budget Committee of the Council, June 2004.
• Evaluation information provided in Financial Statements in the Inter-service consultations, October 2004.
• Annual Evaluation Reviews 2002 and 2003 and mid-year update July 2004
Annexe B  Methodology

(“steps” refer to the ToR).

B.1 Step 1 a: Survey
The Commission services have drafted a questionnaire in order to find answers to the first evaluation question and also to identify evaluations that have been most (or least) used. All evaluations completed in 2002 – 2003 (194) have been selected for this survey on the basis of the Annual Evaluation Reviews 2002 and 2003. The questionnaire has been sent by e-mail to the Heads of Unit responsible for the evaluated activities. EPEC provided input to setting up the questionnaire and has analysed the results of the survey after data processing by DG BUDGET.

Within the framework of the present study, the survey has also been used to identify case studies.

B.2 Step 1 b: Review of Proposals for Council/Parliament legislative acts and Commission legislative acts
DG BUDGET has provided EPEC with an analysis of the Council/Parliament legislative acts and Commission legislative acts sent to Interservice Consultations. The basis of this was a systematic sample used for an existing study of 113 proposals undergoing Interservice Consultations (BUDG/B5 internal study: “Evaluation information provided in the financial statements in the inter-service consultations”). The aim of this study was to ascertain the influence of evaluation in programming and decision-making at all levels.

The evaluation unit has made an overview and analysis of these 113 proposals. These have been analysed following the following criteria, after which a synthesis has been drawn:

- Type of Inter-service consultation
- Type of Financial Statement used
- Need for Community intervention
- Objective setting
- Measures taken following ex ante evaluation
- Measures taken following ex post evaluation
- Output & costing information
- Monitoring & evaluation information
- Comments given by the unit B5 (Y/N).
- Types of comments
- Budgetary impact:

---

80 DG BUDGET, Evaluation information provided in Financial Statements in the Inter-service consultations (the present report is based on the version dated 21 October 2004).
B.3 Step 2: Field work – cases studies

Ten case studies were selected following the approach outlined in Annexe C. The unit of analysis chosen for these case studies was the “ABB Activity.” Evaluation use was analysed for evaluation related to the following ABB activities.

Exhibit 20 ABB Activities studied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Substance of the ABB Activity at stake</th>
<th>Evaluations identified in the period concerned</th>
<th>Evaluation types (ex ante, midterm, final, ex-post)</th>
<th>Relative impact on budget or external?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTR 02 02 (Encouraging entrepreneurship)</td>
<td>MAP &amp; IDA II programmes; MGS pilot</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Low impact on the budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPL 04 03 (work organisations and working conditions)</td>
<td>Transposal of a series of Directives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low impact on the budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRI 05 04 01 or 02 (Rural development)</td>
<td>Structural Fund Interventions (devolved)</td>
<td>Numerous (on local levels)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREN 06 04 (Conventional &amp; renewable energies)</td>
<td>Programmes</td>
<td>Several</td>
<td>Interim</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISH 11 03 (International Fisheries)</td>
<td>Fishery Agreement Protocols</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
<td>Final evaluations (all internal)</td>
<td>Low impact on the budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIO 13 03 (Regional development fund)</td>
<td>Structural Fund Interventions (devolved)</td>
<td>Numerous (on regional &amp; local level)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC 15 03 (Vocational training-Leonardo)</td>
<td>1 Programme and two Agencies</td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANCO 17 04 (Food safety etc)</td>
<td>Two regulations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low impact on the budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAI 18 04 (citizenship &amp; fundamental rights)</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Yes (Daphne programme)</td>
<td>Mid-term and final</td>
<td>Low impact on the budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO 23 02 (Humanitarian Aid)</td>
<td>Humanitarian Aid Operations; Partnerships; Themes/Thematic evaluations</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
<td>Diverse</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The detailed approach for the case studies, including interview guides for different types of interviewees, is given in Annexe C.
B.4 **Step 3: Overall analysis and judgement**

Question 1 and 2 of this study should *in fine* be addressed according to the indicative judgement criteria a revised version of which is given in Exhibit 23, Section D.1. As regards question 3, an indicative table of determinant factors for the use of evaluation has been drafted by the Commission services a revised version of which is also given below (Exhibit 24, Section D.2).

As a part of the analytical process, a series of complementary interviews have been conducted (on 8 and 11 February 2005) with Commission officials likely to have a broad interest in the use of evaluation during the decision-making process. These interviews will *inter alia* be used to validate the preliminary conclusions reached. The interviewees have been proposed by DG BUDGET.
Annexe C  Methodology for case studies

C.1 Selection of case studies
Contrary to what was initially planned, it appeared not fully relevant to base the selection of case studies entirely on the two inputs proposed by the Commission services, i.e. the survey on the one hand (§B.1) and the analysis of the Financial Statements on the other hand (§B.2), since
• both were lacking the necessary information to make such a selection;
• a univocal unit of analysis could not easily be defined starting from these two inputs.\(^{81}\)

During the drafting of the inception report it was concluded therefore that more could be learned from instances where several evaluations would eventually contribute to a policy or a set of actions rather than studying either single evaluations or single proposals as initially planned. Therefore, it was proposed to modify the approach of the study and in agreement with the Evaluation Unit of DG BUDGET a new approach is proposed based on the “ABB activities” of the Commission as unit of analysis. The idea behind this shift in approach is that each ABB activity can mobilise one or several evaluations and types of evaluation and that that is the way in which evaluation may in reality work.

The survey and the analysis of the FS will still be useful, but from a new perspective: they will be used to identify, for each of the activities analysed, the evaluations that were thought to be more or less useful (and thus serve as starting point) and the proposals that according to the FS have been more or less using evaluation.

Although the choice remains somewhat arbitrary (i.e. not “water-tightly scientific”) the following heuristics have guided us in choosing the activities to be studied:
• Evidence of evaluations around the activity to be studied should exist (cf survey)
• An activity should preferably have a mixture of different types of evaluations (ex post, intermediary, ex ante); related to this, one may hope that within the overall set of activities finally chosen there will be a balance between different types of (instrumental) use namely, setting priorities, allocation of resources, design of interventions, improved implementation of on-going activities; this is however difficult to determine before having performed any fieldwork
• Within the set of activities finally chosen there should be a balance of different types of interventions (programmes, regulation, …)
• Within the overall set of activities finally chosen there should be a balance between activities with a high budgetary impact and those with a low (or insignificant) budgetary impact but expected high “external” impact (cf §B.2)

\(^{81}\) For information the initial choice based on this approach is annexed to this report.
## C.2 Proposal for case studies

Following the heuristics given in the previous section, the following activities were selected.

### Exhibit 21  ABB Activities selected for case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Evaluations identified?</th>
<th>Mix of evaluation types?</th>
<th>Intervention-type</th>
<th>Impact on budget or external?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTR02 02 (Encouraging entrepreneurship)</td>
<td>At least two per budget line</td>
<td>On-going?</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPL 04 03 (work organisations and working conditions)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The evaluation identified relates to transposals of Directives</td>
<td>Low on budget; mainly external impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRI 05 04 02 or 02 (Rural development)</td>
<td>Several</td>
<td>Mainly ex post</td>
<td>Programmes (devolved)</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREN 06 04 (Conventional &amp; renewable energies)</td>
<td>Several</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Various (programmes, regulation…)</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISH 11 03 (International Fisheries)</td>
<td>Several</td>
<td>Yes, but all internal</td>
<td>Agreements mainly</td>
<td>Low on budget, high external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIO 13 03 (Regional development fund)</td>
<td>Several</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Programmes</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC 15 03 (Vocational training-Leonardo)</td>
<td>Several</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Programmes mainly</td>
<td>Budget mainly (economic impact difficult to measure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANCO 17 04 (Food safety etc)</td>
<td>Several</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Diverse</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAI 18 04 (citizenship &amp; fundamental rights)</td>
<td>Yes (Daphne programme)</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO 23 02 (Humanitarian Aid)</td>
<td>Several</td>
<td>On-going evaluation mainly(?)</td>
<td>Programme / External funding</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have not included activities for which mainly IA’s were mentioned in the survey.

## C.3 Case study set up

The shift in the unit of analysis means that the analysis will have to revolve around the **complex** of evaluations associated to each activity studied. This idea is represented below.

Exhibit 22 is meant to illustrate that within an activity several “sub-activities” (preparation of a directive, implementation of a programme, rolling out a publicity campaign…) can take place which can or not draw upon various types of evaluations.
For each of the selected cases, first a documentary analysis will be performed. This serves the following purposes:

- Systematising the analysis following the analytical frameworks given earlier (see Exhibits Exhibit 23, Exhibit 24, Exhibit 25 & Exhibit 26).
- For each activity, model/reconstruct/map the process regarding the way in which the evaluations that have been identified –theoretically– may have been used (especially instrumental use) in the specific policy process associated with the activity at stake.

This will lead to a first “map” (which is not necessarily an illustration but will also very much consist of text), following the idea proposed by Exhibit 22, of the way in which evaluations function or have functioned within the activity. This formalisation will be an input into the interviews. The map will be refined throughout the case study.

C.4 Types of interviewees

The following types of interviewees will be interviewed:

- The identified (potential) users of the evaluations
- Managers of the interventions evaluated lying within the activity
- Decision-makers/planners at horizontal level likely to use evaluation results
- Managers of the evaluation process
- Participants in the evaluation process
- High-level officials with a potential interest in evaluation.

As a complement to the case studies and not necessarily linked to individual cases, interviews will be carried out with Commission officials with a general interest in
evaluation. These interviews will help to validate the feasibility of the options for the overall conclusions and recommendations.

**C.5 Interview items**

The shift in the unit of analysis also involves a more delicate approach to the case study interviews since questions have to revolve around the complex of evaluations associated to the activity that was outlined in Exhibit 22. The following issues will therefore have to be addressed not only for each or part of the interviewee categories cited in the previous section but also for each relevant evaluation.

Issues and questions may be more or less relevant depending on the category of interviewee and will also depend on the specific case study of concern. Hence the list of issues laid down in the following sections is the backbone from which tailor made questionnaires will be drawn for each person encountered. This can only be done however once the case studies are selected, more material for each case study is gathered and it is clarified which persons are exactly going to be interviewed.

**C 5.1 Involvement in Evaluation**

- Do you have a general involvement/responsibility for evaluation in your Directorate general (DG) or Unit?
- Have you been involved in one or more of the [evaluations identified for this activity]?

**C 5.2 Initiating the Evaluation** (should as much as possible already be established through the documentary analysis)

- Did the evaluations undertaken follow from a specific legal obligation, regulations etc.? (this should already be established in the documentary analysis)
- How did each particular evaluation get started?
  - The initiative of the evaluation unit
  - Requests from operational units
  - Decision of operational units (decentralised model)
  - Requests from horizontal units (policy, coordination…)
  - Decision of Directors/Director General
  - Decisions of Cabinet
- Were you involved in initiating, planning or specifying the Terms of Reference for evaluation X, Y, Z…?
- If yes, please indicate how you were involved:
  - Discussing policy/management priorities with the evaluation function
  - Developing indicators in cooperation with the evaluation function
  - Drawing up evaluation questions in cooperation with the evaluation function
  - Fully responsible for the specification/preparation of the evaluation (decentralised model)
  - Other
- How satisfied were you that your interests and priorities were fully taken into account in the specification/design stage?
• Have you any suggestions how to improve the design/specification stage of evaluations based on this experience?

C 5.3 Progressing the evaluation and considering findings

• Once the evaluation was underway, how were you kept up to date with its progress, and how effective were these ‘mechanisms’ in your opinion?
  – Meetings of the evaluation steering committee without the evaluation contractor
  – Meetings of the evaluation steering committee in the presence of the evaluation contractor
  – Intranet site, emails, memos etc.
  – Contacts through internal DG network of evaluation correspondents
  – Workshops/seminars/presentation of results
  – Contacts through inter-DG network of evaluation correspondents
  – Contacts through network of SPP/ABM correspondents
  – Other

• Were there positive benefits from the process of your involvement in this evaluation? (For example, clarifying thinking/concepts, useful discussions with colleagues and consultants). If yes, please give examples

• At what stage were results fed back to you?
  – Results entirely fed back at the end/final report stage
  – Results also fed back at fixed points, such as intermediate report
  – Results fed back continuously
  – Other (please specify):

• How were results fed back?
  – Circulation of draft reports
  – Circulation of final reports
  – Ongoing discussions
  – Dedicated workshops
  – Discussion at reporting stage
  – Dedicated Briefings
  – Other (please specify)

• How were final reports of this evaluation presented to you and relevant colleagues?
  – Final meeting of the evaluation steering committee
  – Workshops or other specifically organised feedback sessions
  – Meeting of network of evaluation correspondents
  – Meeting of network of SPP/ABM correspondents
  – Posting on the intranet
  – Other

C 5.4 Usefulness and Use of Evaluation

• Indicate concretely how results were used in
  – setting priorities
  – allocation of resources
  – design of interventions
  – improved implementation of on-going activities

• Give examples of how the evaluation was used
• Please indicate the positive and useful results of the evaluation
• Indicate any aspects from the different evaluations that were not as useful as you had hoped
• Can you indicate how in the future better use could be made of evaluation within the policy cycle?

C 5.5 Specific questions for Evaluation Functions
• Do you think the evaluations undertaken within the framework of this activity are a) used and b) seen as useful by colleagues with operational, management and planning responsibilities?
• Which of the evaluations undertaken for this activity would you suggest have been ignored or under-used?
• Can you describe the evaluations that have fed directly into commissioned decisions, new regulations, Communications, etc? Indicate how this process was organised? If the interplay between evaluations is important, indicate how.
• Please indicate what in your view would make it more likely that evaluations would be used more effectively by your colleagues to support management and policy making (x-check with the three “factor” tables)
Annexe D  Revision of criteria and success factors

The ToR asked for a further analysis and adaptation, if need be, of a provisional table of judgment criteria provided by DG BUDGET. It also asked for an assessment and revision of the factors fostering or discouraging use. The results are given in this annexe.

D.1  Assessment and revision of the judgment criteria

Exhibit 23 contains the finally adopted version of the initial Annexe A in the ToR. This version has been used as a checklist in for the individual case studies. It may be noted here that the main changes with regard to the initial list of judgment criteria are:

- It refines the “objectives” column, that is, it makes the different potential uses of evaluation more precise by tearing them apart. The items in the other two columns have been modified accordingly.
- It proposes new indicators in the right column: items marked with a (*) are new with regard to the Terms of reference

---

Exhibit 23  Indicative list of judgement criteria for Question I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Examples of indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. To provide input for setting political priorities and choosing between different policy options | • Evaluation results are used to elaborate/support proposals to Council and Parliament (e.g., reform communications, framework regulations, other regulations/directives)  
• Evaluation results are used in internal process (which can be an ex ante evaluation or impact assessment) that leads to new proposal | - Use in (legislative) financial statements and explanatory memoranda  
- Referred to in Communications or their annexes (*)  
- Referred to in the adoption process in Council or Parliament  
- Use in the APS / CLWP  
- Use in internal preparation process for new proposals (*)  
- Use of evaluations within Impact Assessment (*) |
| 2. To support the implementation of an intervention to Council | • Evaluation results are used to describe the implementation of an intervention to Council | - Use of evaluation |

---

82 In particular the first objective initially took together the choice for different options and the design of an intervention. It is suggested to separate these since in reality these can be separated in time (even if the choice for a policy option and the way in which it is worked out may appear in one single Communication in the end).
| Design of interventions | Evaluation results are taken account of when designing interventions at the level of the Commission | Evaluation results support the annual planning cycle | Results in (legislative) financial statements\(^83\) and explanatory memoranda  
- Referred to in Communications or their annexes (*)  
- Referred to in the adoption process in Council or Parliament  
- Use in the APS / CLWP  
- Use of elements of Impact Assessment in ex ante evaluation accompanying a proposal (*) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3. To assist in an efficient allocation of resources | Evaluation results support establishment of Financial Perspectives  
- Evaluation results are instrumental in determining the appropriate level of funding within concrete Commission proposals  
- Evaluation results are instrumental in determining the appropriate level of funding in Commission acts  
- Evaluation results underpin financial decisions at management level  
- Evaluation results underpin budget allocation choices within the budgetary and ABM/SPP processes | Use in (Legislative) Financial Statements and explanatory memoranda  
- Use in financing acts/decisions  
- Referred to in the adoption process in Council or Parliament  
- Use in Activity statements  
- Use in APS  
- Use in operational decisions with financial implications |
| 4. To improve the implementation of ongoing activities | Evaluation results support management decisions on operational level spending/activities  
- Evaluation results underpin the Commission's own administration / internal procedures | Use in individual AMPs  
- Use in designing / modifying internal procedures  
- Referred to in Commission responses or fiche contradictoire to (external) evaluation (*)  
- Check/control by evaluation units of follow-up of recommendations (*) |

\(^83\) See Section 5.5.5B.2 for a comment: so far evaluation results appear only weakly used in the Legislative Financial Statements and even less in the other Financial Statements.
5. To improve accountability on achievements

- Evaluation results are used to account for achievements in the context of decision making processes
- Evaluation results are referred to in dealings with the Council and Parliament

5. To increase awareness on achievements

- Evaluation results are referred to in dealings with stakeholders

| Use in AAR and related processes |
| References in Communications Commission working documents, etc |
| Referred to in discharge documents |
| Referred to by ECA |
| Referred to in replies to Parliamentary Questions |
| Referred to in other Council or Parliament documents |

The indicators in the right column of the table naturally only refer to “explicitly identifiable use,” i.e. written references to evaluation. There would be two additional ways in which use can be expressed, namely through interviews (which may capture more implicit aspects such as awareness raising and organisational learning) and by finding a correlation between recommendations in an evaluation and subsequent action without the latter making explicit reference to the former.

The case studies will, inter alia, have to investigate whether, if evaluations remain unmentioned in official documents (such as for the Financial Statements, see Section B.2), this is due to effective absence of use, of simply absence of citation of relevant evaluations.

D.2 Assessment / revision of the factors fostering or discouraging use

Based on the results of the study on evaluation use conducted in 2002, a distinction was made between the use of evaluation results at the level of the individual intervention and at the level of the organisation.
Extending the results of the previous study we suggest a third angle, relating to the 
*substance* of the intervention as well as the related issue of the position of the 
intervention within a broader “policy mix.” This is on the one hand inspired by the the 
study of the analysis of the use of evaluation in the Financial Statements (see above) but 
also by recent empirical evidence (for the moment not theorised) which suggests that the 
search for increased coherence between different interventions of the Commission (as 
well as with outside partners such as the member states) induces an increased demand for 
understanding these other interventions and their eventual synergies – our hypothesis is 
that, as a result, this would call for evaluation of these different interventions and enhance 
the use of evaluation results. 84 In other words adding this dimension allows us to 
understand issues of coherence and the focus/scope (or narrowness) with which 
individual evaluations are conducted. 85

Finally, contrary to the tables initially proposed, we have chosen not to make any 
theses as to in which stage of the evaluation project cycle a factor would be 
important. As a matter of fact in the initial tables most of the boxes were already ticked, 
indicating that most factors were thought to be potentially important in different phases 
anyway.

Apart from the above considerations the tables have only slightly been adapted. The 
versions that will be used are shown on the following pages.

---

84 Examples are the construction of the European Research Area or the increased coherence between 
the research component and the regulatory/internal market component of the Information Society 
policies managed by DG INFSO (cf the latest 5 Year Assessment of European IST RTD 1999-2003). 
85 Since it seems to us that, as a management tool evaluation should benefit to the organisation as a 
whole as a management tool: even if evaluations may be very worthwhile for individual 
interventions, at the end of the day the organisation as a whole should find itself improved from all 
the evaluation activity that is going on, and this concerns more than simply the sum of individual 
interventions.
Exhibit 24  Factors influencing the use of evaluation results at the level of an individual intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Evaluation Project Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation-internal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Planning / Timing within the policy cycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason to evaluate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of the evaluation (in-depth, broad)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal/External evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data gathering &amp; reliability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of senior management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of pot. users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the report (and: has this been assessed) and linked to this, of the evaluator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table for the organisation level is given below.

---

86 Although they may look closely related, there is quite a difference between “reason” (to evaluate), e.g. since it is a legal obligation and the “purpose” of the evaluation i.e. how its results are expected to function in the policy cycle.

87 At several times in the survey the evaluator’s quality is criticised, e.g. [19] “the quality of some external evaluations of successor programmes to this programme has been very mixed. The choice of an evaluator who is really familiar with the policy area and management issues of complex financial programmes in non traditional EU fields (i.e. venture capital and guarantee programmes rather than grant programmes) is the key to the quality and usefulness of evaluation results to the programme managers and other stakeholders”; [80] “the methodology applied by the external company was very light, the finding were evident ( and already known by us since we are organizing course evaluations ) and the recommendations were trivial”; [119] “it was largely a waste of time - especially as of the 5 days spent in Ethiopia, two were week-end and one was a public holiday, and the evaluators never left the capital”; [132] “unfortunately the company chosen through the tendering was not the best,” etc.
### Exhibit 25  Factors influencing the use of evaluation results at organisational level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Evaluation Project Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning / Timing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Function:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- composition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relationship with operational units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relationship with senior management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- centralised/devolved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- belief in relevance of evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- evaluation practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exhibit 26  Factors influencing the use of evaluation results related to the substance of the intervention and its position within a policy mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Evaluation Project Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Budget/Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(programme, directive, ...)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External visibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence with other interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence with other evaluations and evaluation results (^{88})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that there may be correlations between different factors in different tables: i.e. since an intervention is viewed as politically important, since expected to have a high impact, more resource may be allocated to it and the results taken more seriously at higher hierarchical levels.

\(^{88}\) This refers to the possible situation where the results of one evaluation are aligned with those from others and are therefore considered as contributing to the reinforcement findings. Conversely when the results of an evaluation contradict the results of others, they may be more likely to be considered aberrant and thus not used.
### Annexe E

**Persons interviewed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Persons interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ENTR 02 02 (Encouraging entrepreneurship) | Andrew WILLIAMS, evaluation function  
Belinda PYKE (also as high level interview), Director resources  
Vemund RIISER – responsible for IDA programme  
Jean-François AGUINAGA – responsible for the MGS (and involved with MAP evaluation)  
William NEIL – Entrepreneurship  
Maarit NYMAN – Entrepreneurship; responsible for MAP final evaluation |
| EMPL 04 03 (work organisations and working conditions) | Sylvie FINNE, Evaluation Function  
José BIOSCA, EMPL/D0.4 responsible for the evaluation studied |
| AGRI 05 04 01 or 02 (Rural development) | Martin Scheele – DG AGRI – Head of Unit 4 Evaluation of measures applicable to agriculture, studies  
Detlev Clemens – DG AGRI – Unit 4 Evaluation of measures applicable to agriculture, studies – Evaluation manager  
Anastasios Christidis – DG AGRI – Unit 3 Consistency of rural development – Policy desk officer – Horizontal coordinator  
Dirk Ahner – DG AGRI – Deputy Director-General (Responsible for Directorates E.I, E.II, F and G) |
| TREN 06 04 (Conventional & renewable energies) | Amador RICO-SANCHEZ, Evaluation Cell  
Filomena LOMARTIRE, Evaluation Cell  
B. MOENCH, Evaluation Cell |
| FISH 11 03 (International Fisheries) | Armando Astudillo – DG FISH – Head of Unit 3 Environment and health  
Fabrizio Donatella – DG FISH – Unit 3 Bilateral agreements – Coordination and Management Officer  
Martin Newman – DG FISH – Unit 2 Fisheries inspection – Administrator (Desk officer International Waters)  
Linda Van Nerom – DG FISH – Unit 1 Audit and Evaluation – Assistant Evaluation Officer  
Frédérique Lorenzi – SG – Unit 3 Policy coordination II – Policy coordinator  
Norbert Probst – DG DEV – Unit 4 Environment, rural development – Policy desk officer  
José Rizo-Martin – DG ENV – Unit 2 Protection of Water and Marine Environment – Desk Officer marine protection  
Plus a telephone interview with Dominique Discors (DG FISH – Head of Unit 1 Audit and Evaluation). |
| REGIO 13 03 (Regional development fund) | Veronica GAFFEY – Evaluation Unit  
Armando MIRANDA CARDOSO – Interreg  
Sonja HAERTEL – URBAN  
S. GARCIA-PATRON RIVAS – URBAN |
| EAC 15 03 (Vocational training-Leonardo) | Peter BAUR, responsible for Leonardo evaluation  
Joao DELGADO, responsible for Leonardo implementation  
Margarida GAMEIRO, formerly responsible for Leonardo; formerly head of internal relations (and therewith of the evaluation function); currently member of Mr Figel’s Cabinet  
Steve ROGERS, evaluation function |
| SANCO 17 04 | Jacques Humières – DG SANCO – Unit 4 Food law and biotechnology – Food |
| (Food safety etc) | Law and Labelling - General food labelling, review of food labelling legislation  
Mette Joranli – DG SANCO – Unit 4 Food law and biotechnology – Food Law and Labelling - Evaluation  
Jose Manuel Lopez de la Mano – DG SANCO – Unit 1 Audit and evaluation – Evaluation staff  
Brian Marchant – DG TRADE – Agriculture, fisheries, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, biotechnology – Principal administrator  
Written contribution from Hippocrates Vounakis – DG ENTR – Unit 4 Food industry – Desk officer legislation |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| JAI 18 04        | Patrick TROUSSON, Head of Unit, Financial support for justice, rights and citizenship and Manager of Daphne programme  
Dora CORREIA, Evaluation function, member of the Steering Group of the Daphne evaluation |
| (citizenship & fundamental rights) |----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ECHO 23 02       | Patricia CAVANAGH – DG ECHO – Unit 1 Africa, Caribbean, Pacific – Desk Officer Angola, Namibia, Zambia, Sao Tomé/Principé  
Peter CAVENDISH – DG ECHO – Unit 4 General policy affairs; relations with European institutions, partners and other donors; planning co-ordination and support; general support for major crises – Head of evaluation sector  
Javier MENENDEZ – DG ECHO – Unit 3 Asia; Central and South America – Desk Officer for Thailand, Burma/Myanmar  
Martine VANACKERE – DG ECHO – Unit 4 General policy affairs; relations with European institutions, partners and other donors; planning co-ordination and support; general support for major crises – Administrative assistant – Evaluation Sector |
| (Humanitarian Aid) |----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Interviews outside case studies | Jacques SANT’ANA CALAZANS, Head of Unit A3, DG BUDG  
Rene VANDERMOSTEN, Head of Unit A4, DG BUDG  
Juan Antonio CHUECA DEL REAL & Stephan WEBERS, Unit A6, DG BUDG  
Eckart GUTH, Deputy Secretary General, SG  
Jean-Paul MINGASSON, former Director General ENTR, BUDG  
Belinda PYKE, Director, DG ENTR/R  
Dirk AHNER, Deputy Director General, DG AGRI  
Christopher KNAUTH - Horizontal Unit of the Asia Directorate, RELEX/H01 |
Annexe F  Questionnaire used for the survey by DG BUDGET B5