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Workshop Outline

- Introduction
- 2 Questions to guide discussion
- Hear from our panellists
- Hear from you the participants
- Wrap up
Results orientation vs. Performance framework

- **Results orientation:** is about understanding the needs of the programme area and choosing specific objectives that address these needs and related result indicators.

- It is also about a right mix of measures to achieve these objectives and selecting appropriate projects.

- Monitoring inputs and outputs + reporting

- **Performance framework:** is about implementing the programme in line with the its planning and taking stock in 2019.
What is the performance framework?

- For each priority axis, financial and output indicators (or key implementation steps) must be included (except for TA)

- Output indicators in the performance framework are a subset of output indicators already selected for this priority axis, representing the majority of EUR allocation

- Milestones and targets set for all indicators in each performance framework

- The milestones are to be achieved by the end of 2018 - formally reviewed in 2019

- The targets are to be achieved by the end of 2023 - formally reviewed in 2025
Performance review - 2019

- Each Programme reports on milestones set for the end of 2018 in the annual implementation report by **30 June 2019**
- Commission carries out the review, based on the data reported **within 2 months of receipt** (no scope for negotiations)
- Commission adopts a decision on the programmes and priorities which have attained their milestones
- A priority will pass the milestones if all indicators selected in a corresponding performance framework have attained at least 85% of their milestones (if there are 3 or more indicators, one may attain less than 85% of its milestone, but no less than 75%)
- **There is no performance reserve for Interreg programmes**
Round 1

How do programmes assess performance in the Interreg co-operation context?

(Or, How do I know if my programme is on track?)
Central Baltic Programme

- Result-orientation as the key for a meaningful assessment
- Knowing from the start what we want to achieve
- Internal evaluations (MC, AIR, communication...) Impact evaluation
- Close contacts with projects, also beyond reports
Interreg V-A Czech Republic – Poland

2 tools for assessment of performance:

- **monitoring of projects** – information mainly on outputs and expenditures
- **evaluations** – information on programme results

Keeping on a track is a long process that started with the start of programme
- Programme performance assessed through monitoring **projects capacity** in implementing what planned
- Monitoring activities refer to up to 6-months project implementation period
- Projects performance assessed through:
  - Planned deliverables and outputs
  - Financial capacity
  - Targeted reporting on topics of specific interest and relevant to the EU macro-regional strategy EUSAIR

good project performance = good programme performance
- Projects performance reflects on **programme performance**

- Focus on:
  - Priority axis
  - Type of funds absorbed (ERDF; IPA II)
  - Type of projects
  - Calls for proposals

- Definition of a tolerance underperformance threshold (content and finance)
Round 1: Comments from the floor?

How do programmes assess performance in the Interreg co-operation context?

(Or, How do I know if my programme is on track?)
Study on ETC 2014-2020 output and results indicators for DG REGIO

Analysis of:
• 12 transnational programmes
• 54 cross-border programmes

• All thematic objectives

• Common and non-common outputs indicators
• Result indicators
1. The 66 analysed programmes have adopted 1,458 output indicators

2. Limited use of common output indicators (vs 50:50 in IGJ)
Main findings 1/2

• No significant differences in character of indicators adopted by TN and CBC programmes

• Inconsistent matching between output indicators and the variety of activities (many indicators used for similar actions/activities):
  
  o With focus on different action/activities implementation steps
  o Some specific indicators are “refinement” of common output indicators
  o Different definitions used in similar output indicator
  o Different words used for describing the same action/activities
Main findings 2/2

- High number of specific indicators impedes a correct and comprehensive overview of ETC activities

- Misuse of indicators

- Current output indicators only partially capture ETC essence and under-report its contribution to the territorial integration process

- Further streamlining and aggregation of data necessary and possible
Round 2

What purposes will the 2019 performance review serve?

(Or, What will the review mean for my programme?)
Purpose of the 2019 review:

- Considering the programme a result-oriented tool
- Indissolubly linking between programme and projects
- Verifying if the programme is currently being implemented as it should
- Verifying if the programme is capable to achieve its objectives
- Complementing and supporting programme evaluation
- Complementing minimization of de-commitment risk
We will use review to take stock on where the programme stands:

• Adequacy of programming and on adopted actions in relation to the specificities of the programme area

• Quantifying the impact of late programme approval on programme implementation

• Assess the capacity of programme implementing bodies in steering complex processes in a brand new programme

• define actions to be eventually further implemented
Interreg V-A Czech Republic – Poland

2019 performance review:

• gives complex information on mid-term achievements of the programme

• indicates whether the programme is on track to achieve its targets

• valuable information with regard to the preparation of new programme post 2020 (learning process)
Central Baltic case

- One tool for internal evaluation and communication
- Keeping the programme on track
- A reward for a job well done
Round 2: Comments from the floor?

What purposes will the 2019 performance review serve?

(Or, What will the review mean for my programme?)
Modification of Interreg performance milestones

The Managing Authority may propose modification of milestones (CPR Annex II § 5), in duly justified cases, such as:

- Significant changes in economic, environmental and labour market conditions
- Linked to changes in the financial allocations to a given priority
- Incorrect assumptions in the original methodology (present the original methodology and the corrected methodology)

The procedure for amending programmes applies to this revision.
Closing Comments

- The 2019 performance review is a rendez-vous to check on performance
- For Interreg, no performance reserve
- Any modification of milestones in 2018 to be based on clear reasoning and chronology
- Engage with the Monitoring Committee and Commission
- Adjust implementation, strategy and correct targets to more realistic values