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This document is a shortened and simplified version of the Commission’s guide to the Mid Term Evaluation, adapted to the circumstances of the URBAN Community Initiative. It has been prepared in order to give more specific guidance to managing authorities on how the mid term evaluation of URBAN should be organised and the key issues it should address. The document takes account of the later start of URBAN programmes as compared to mainstream programmes and the consequently reduced amount of activity to evaluate. It also provides some guidance on the evaluation of the specific urban aspects of the programmes.
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FOREWORD

This methodological document is aimed at national, regional and local authorities responsible for managing 2000-2006 URBAN Community Initiative Programmes and specifically at those responsible for organising evaluation. It should also prove useful for those carrying out the evaluations. The document provides a guide to how the mid term evaluation should be organised and what it should contain. It is a shortened and simplified version of the Commission’s Working Document No. 8 on the mid term evaluation of all Community structural interventions.

The mid term evaluation is not an end in itself but a means to improve the quality and relevance of programming. It provides an opportunity to identify reorientations to the programming which may be needed to ensure the achievement of the original objectives. The starting point for the mid term evaluation is the ex ante evaluation and the agreed Programme and Programme Complement. The mid term evaluation will revisit the main elements of programming examined in the ex ante evaluation to review them for continued relevance, to assess first outputs and to review likely results and impacts. Therefore, the key concerns arising for the mid term evaluation are:

– If appropriate, a re-assessment of the relevance and the consistency of the strategy
– The Quantification of Objectives – Outputs, Results and Impacts;
– Effectiveness To Date and Expected Socio-Economic Impacts; and
– Quality of Implementation and Monitoring Arrangements.

The core of the evaluation, however, will be the assessment of how well the form of assistance is performing in reality, judged on the basis of its relevance and the effectiveness of its implementation. Impact will be dealt with only insofar as first outputs and results are known and whether or not they or any changes in the context are likely to affect the expected impact.

Structure of the Guide

The guide is divided into two parts. The first part deals with the practical issues of how to carry out the mid term evaluation in a manner which will ensure its quality, utility and value for money. The second part focuses on the content of the mid term evaluation, highlighting the key issues which need to be addressed. There may be further issues which national or regional authorities wish to see explored in the mid term evaluation and these should be included. A key concern for URBAN will be the assessment of the mobilisation of local actors, the use of innovative approaches and the effectiveness of the URBAN-specific programme features.

The guide is intended to be used as an aid for those commissioning and those undertaking a mid term evaluation and it is emphasised that it should be used flexibly, as long as the key components are covered. It is a simplified version of the Commission’s working document on the mid term evaluation. Three key components of the evaluation have been omitted - the review of newly available evaluation results, the continuing validity of the SWOT analysis because of the short timescale since the relatively late agreement on the URBAN programmes, while the performance reserve does not apply to Community...
Initiatives. The text of the guide has been simplified with some additions to refer more specifically to the URBAN programme and what its mid term evaluation should contain.

**INTRODUCTION: AIM OF MID TERM EVALUATION OF URBAN II IN THE CONTEXT OF STRUCTURAL POLICIES**

The overall aim of the mid term evaluation of URBAN programmes is to assess their establishment and initial outputs and to make recommendations for any changes needed to ensure that they achieve their objectives. This aim can be broken down into a number of key objectives:

- **To review how far progress has been made towards the achievement of the objectives and the extent to which they can actually be achieved.**

  The experience of implementation for one to two years will give first insights into the appropriateness of the strategy in relation to the development problems and the extent to which the aims and objectives of the form of assistance are likely to be achieved. A particular focus should be an examination of the projects selected to date and their coherence with the URBAN objectives.

- **To assess the quantification of objectives, specifically the extent to which they have facilitated monitoring and evaluation.**

  The mid term evaluation should draw conclusions on the effectiveness of the quantification exercise undertaken in the programming phase. Do the core indicators sufficiently reflect the activity being co-financed? Are the targets set still appropriate? Has timely information been made available to the monitoring committee? Was the information necessary for evaluation provided by the quantification of objectives? On foot of answers to these questions, the mid term evaluation should make recommendations for any necessary improvements or refinements to the quantification of objectives.

- **To analyse the adequacy of the implementation and monitoring arrangements.**

  By the time the mid term evaluation is underway, the monitoring committees will have met on a number of occasions and the evaluation should comment on their effectiveness and the effectiveness of implementation procedures. The adequacy of project selection criteria and procedures should be reviewed. A particular concern will be to analyse the quality of monitoring systems in terms of organisation, regularity and quality of data and other information.

**PART 1: MID TERM EVALUATION – THE PROCESS**

If the process for carrying out the mid term evaluation is right, it is likely that the content will be of a high quality and be geared to the needs of those who will use it - national, regional and local authorities, the Commission, other organisations and the public in general. This document therefore devotes significant attention to how the evaluation should be carried out, who should be involved and the timescale of the exercise.
The Regulation\(^1\) states that the mid term evaluation shall be carried out under the responsibility of the managing authority, in co-operation with the Commission and the Member State. It shall be carried out by an independent assessor and be submitted to the Monitoring Committee and then sent to the Commission, as a general rule three years after adoption of the assistance, and no later than 31 December 2003. As a continuation of the mid term evaluation, it shall be updated no later than 31 December 2005 in order to prepare for subsequent assistance operations.

### 1.1. Evaluation Timetable

The deadlines contained in the Regulation and the relatively late agreement on some of the URBAN programmes imply the timetable and stages in the evaluation process as outlined in the table below. This timetable is meant to be indicative and should be adapted to suit regional circumstances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Stage of Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| September 2002 – December 2002 | Planning the Evaluation  
                          | Establish Steering Group  
                          | Agree Terms of Reference  
                          | Advertise or otherwise invite tenders |
| December 2002 – March 2003 | Award Contract  
                          | Evaluation Underway |
| March 2003 – July 2003 | Evaluation Underway  
                          | First Draft sent to Steering Group  
                          | Steering Group signs off on final draft |
| September 2003– December 2003 | Meeting of Monitoring Committee to consider Mid Term Evaluation  
                          | Evaluation Report forwarded to the Commission |

Particular points to note are the need to devote sufficient time to planning the evaluation before it is undertaken and to responding to it after it is complete. In addition, it is important the timescale allows the Steering Group to consider the first draft and to request further work from the evaluators if this is necessary.

### 1.2. Planning the Evaluation

The timetable outlined above demonstrates that it is necessary to start planning for the mid term evaluation in mid to late 2002. Even though the mid term evaluation is mandatory, the specificity of URBAN requires that proper consideration is given to the issues of budgets, level of detail to be addressed, appropriate methodologies, availability of data, etc.. Decisions need to be taken on these issues \textit{before} the evaluation commences.

---

The regulation (Article 42) states that the mid term evaluation shall be carried out under the responsibility of the managing authority, in co-operation with the Commission and the Member State. It also states that the Commission shall examine the relevance and quality of the evaluation on the basis of criteria defined beforehand by the Commission and the member State in partnership. The Commission may be consulted on the terms of reference for the mid term evaluations, the methodology and the draft report.

Given the small scale of the URBAN programmes compared to other Structural Fund interventions, the Commission invites the member States to consider how the mid term evaluation can be undertaken most effectively. The option of one mid term evaluation covering a number of small URBAN programmes or the scope for co-ordination of evaluations of individual programmes within a member State should be explored. This would allow a more strategic view to be taken in the evaluation of the URBAN Community Initiative.

1.3. Managing the Evaluation

The mid term evaluation could be guided by a Steering Group representative of the monitoring committee for the programme to be evaluated. The Steering Group’s role is largely technical. It will develop the terms of reference for the evaluation, select the evaluators, guide the evaluation, give feedback on the first draft and approve it for quality on completion. The involvement of one or more outside experts in evaluation on the Steering Group should be considered. Persons directly responsible for the delivery of programmes being evaluated should not be represented on the Steering Group.

In line with the requirements of the regulation, the Monitoring Committee must consider the evaluation before it is forwarded to the Commission.

1.4. Independence of the Evaluation Process

The General Regulation requires that the mid term evaluation is undertaken by an independent assessor. By this is meant that the evaluator is independent of those responsible for the management or implementation of the programme. The evaluator should be selected by means of a competitive tendering process, with the decision on whether an open or closed tender should be organised depending on the size of the form of assistance and the scale of evaluation required.

1.5. Respecting the principle of proportionality

The principle of proportionality quite simply draws attention to the need for evaluation work to be in proportion to the scale of the intervention.

1.6. Financing

The cost of the mid term evaluation will be met out of the Technical Assistance allocation in the form of assistance. Competent authorities should consider that the mid term evaluation can be costly. Member States can find some guidance on this matter in the MEANS collection, Volume 1\(^2\) and the SEM 2000 Communication on Evaluation\(^3\).


\(^3\)
1.7. **Structure of the Evaluation**

At the European Commission’s Fourth Conference on Evaluation\(^4\), the view was expressed by a number of speakers that Structural Fund evaluations tend not to feed into public or political debate. The reasons for this may include the over use of technical language, overly long evaluations and the lack of clear conclusions and recommendations for action. In an attempt to encourage debate, the Commission proposes the inclusion in the mid term evaluations of short, non-technical summaries of conclusions and recommendations. They should facilitate debate on the appropriateness of the conclusions and how the recommendations can be implemented. In the interests of encouraging debate, but also in the interests of quality, the mid term evaluation should aim for conciseness and avoid the use of long descriptive material. The emphasis should be analytical, not descriptive. Evaluators should aim to produce clear documents which avoid unnecessary technical language.

While not wishing to be overly prescriptive as regards the content of the mid term evaluations, given their diversity, evaluations should reflect the broad structure outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Structure for Mid Term Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations (in English, French or German – maximum 5 pages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Methodology - outlining the approach of the evaluators and to include a description of the research undertaken as well as the sources of data and information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chapters 1 – XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main body of the report (parts 3 to 5 according to the proposed Structure above) will present the results of the evaluation, structured in a manner which is appropriate to the URBAN programme being evaluated. The conclusions chapter should focus on each of the issues listed in Section 2.5 below, as well as any other issues which arise from the specificity of the programme. The basis for each conclusion should be clearly rooted in the findings of the evaluation. The final chapter should contain recommendations for action which respond to conclusions on weaknesses in the programme strategy or implementation.

1.8. **Quality**

An important task for the Steering Group is to assure the quality of the mid term evaluation. The Steering Group should report to the Monitoring Committee assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the evaluation report. In establishing the quality criteria at the start of the process, the MEANS quality criteria may be of use (MEANS, Vol. 1, p. 179) if national quality standards are not available. The eight quality criteria are listed below.

---


\(^4\) Evaluation for Quality, Edinburgh, 18/19 September 2000
MEANS Quality Criteria

- **Meeting needs:** Does the evaluation adequately address the requests for information formulated by the commissioners and does it correspond to the Terms of Reference?
- **Relevant scope:** Have the rationale of the programme, its outputs, results, impacts, interactions with other policies and unexpected effects been carefully studied?
- **Defensible design:** Is the design of the evaluation appropriate and adequate for obtaining the results?
- **Reliable Data:** Are the primary and secondary data collected or selected suitable? Are they sufficiently reliable compared to the expected use?
- **Sound Analysis:** Are quantitative and qualitative data analysed in accordance with established rules, and are they complete and appropriate for answering the evaluative questions correctly?
- **Credible Results:** Are the results logical and justified by the analysis of data and by interpretations based on carefully presented explanatory hypotheses?
- **Impartial Conclusions:** Are the conclusions just and non-biased by personal or partisan considerations, and are they detailed enough to be implemented concretely?
- **Clarity:** Does the report describe the context and goal, as well as the organisation and results of the evaluated programme in such a way that the information provided is easily understood?

1.9. **Consultation with Partners and Stakeholders**

Consultation should take place at two levels during the process of the mid term evaluation. In the first place, consultation with a wide range of stakeholders should form a part of the methodology adopted by the evaluators. Stakeholders in the programme have valuable insights which the evaluators should harness in assessing the performance of programmes. Evaluators should include members of the Monitoring Committee in this consultation.

Secondly, the partners involved in the Monitoring Committee will consider the evaluation report when it is complete and the views of the Monitoring Committee will be forwarded to the Commission along with the mid term evaluation itself.

1.10. **Publication**

The summary of the mid term evaluation should be made available to the public once the evaluation is forwarded to the Commission. Where possible, summaries should be placed on the internet either on Structural Funds related websites or the websites of the authorities managing the URBAN programme. The Commission regards it as good practice to make public the entire evaluation report.

1.11. **Consideration of Evaluation Findings**

The mid term review may deal with a range of issues thrown up by the mid term evaluation and will involve a detailed consideration by the member States and the Commission of its
conclusions and recommendations. In line with Article 42 of the General Regulation, the Commission shall examine the relevance and quality of the evaluation in this context, on the basis of the MEANs criteria presented above. The mid term evaluation will have been forwarded to the monitoring committee and the Commission regards it as good practice that the monitoring committee should be consulted for its views to contribute to the debate. The Member State and the Commission will agree appropriate changes to be made to the forms of assistance to respond to the mid term evaluation findings. Specifically in relation to the Community Initiatives, the General Regulation (Article 21(4)) states that they shall be re-examined following the mid term evaluation and amended as required.

PART 2: THE MID TERM EVALUATION – COMPONENTS

The first part of this document outlined the processes involved when organising the mid term evaluation. In this second part, its content is considered. It must be emphasised that the guidance given should be adapted as appropriate to the contexts and contents of the different URBAN programme. This document outlines a simplified version of the guidance developed specifically for the URBAN context. At the end of each section key issues are identified. These are pulled together at the end of the document, highlighting the need for the mid term evaluation to draw conclusions on each of the key issues. The list of key issues can act as a checklist for those who will plan evaluations as well as those who undertake them.

2.1. Re-Assessment of the Relevance and the Consistency of the Strategy

A core element of the planning process was the analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats facing the URBAN area concerned, since it formed the basis for the strategy of the programming document. The ex ante evaluation verified this analysis, including the priority to be assigned to the various economic needs and the appropriateness of the opportunities and challenges identified. If changes have occurred, the mid term evaluation should briefly review the continuing validity of the analysis. Recent developments in the economy or the availability of new information, including the availability of any new evaluations, may need to be incorporated into the analysis. The objective is to ensure that the priorities of the programme comprise the most appropriate response.

Once the question of the main needs and socio-economic problems has been reviewed, the mid term evaluation may assess again the appropriateness of the balance between the combination of policies and activities being co-financed. As with the ex ante evaluation, this may be done by checking how each priority area or axis will contribute to the overall objectives. The continuing relevance and consistency of the priority areas or axes may be assessed.

This means that if the initial logic was obscure or poorly justified (i.e., if the ex ante evaluation was not performed properly or if its conclusions were not taken into account), the mid term evaluation provides an opportunity to restore logic to the programme.

5 The examination of previous evaluation results and the analysis of the continuing validity of the SWOT analysis are the first key components of mid term evaluation as set out in Working Document No. 8. Given the relatively short time since the URBAN programmes were agreed, these elements have been omitted from this simplified guide. However, if new evaluations are available since the programme was agreed or if changes have taken place which would materially change the SWOT analysis (or if the SWOT analysis was inadequate), the implications should be considered under this element of the evaluation.
Key Issues

- If appropriate, a review of any new evaluations which have become available since the agreement of the programme and an identification of any implications their findings have for the SWOT analysis.

- If appropriate, an assessment of the continuing validity of the SWOT analysis and recommendations for any changes which should be adopted.

- If appropriate, an appraisal of the continuing consistency between the strategic, specific and operational objectives.

2.2. Quantification of Objectives - Outputs, Results and Impacts

The mid term evaluation should appraise the effectiveness of the process of quantification of objectives. This includes an analysis of how the quantification of objectives links logically together from Programme Complement (operational objectives) to programme (specific objectives).

The quantification of operational objectives at measures level may need to be reviewed in the mid term evaluation since performance against the objectives of programme.

The mid term evaluators should also appraise the data gathering systems to ensure that appropriate information is supplied for monitoring and evaluation purposes.

Past Experience and Practical Issues

The mid term evaluation provides an opportunity to review progress made and to suggest where further improvements can be made. Any badly defined indicators and speculative targets should be highlighted. To the greatest extent possible, indicators should reflect a relatively clear causal relationship and any which are strongly influenced by outside factors should be identified and alternatives suggested.

The mid term evaluation will have available to it the Annual Implementation Report for 2001 and where information for the 2002 report is gathered before the mid term evaluation is complete it should also be made available to the evaluators. These reports will provide the essential information for this stage in the mid term evaluation. The Commission’s documentation Working Paper 3 concerning indicators can also be consulted. The evaluators should also examine if the indicative core indicators agreed in the programmes by the Commission are used and if data is collected and reported to the monitoring committee in relation to these indicators.

Key Issues

The mid term evaluation should:

- Review the relevance of the indicators identified which aim to quantify objectives and key disparities;

- Verify the relevance of the indicators for global, specific and operational objectives;

- Assess the appropriateness of indicators;

- Assess the reliability and timeliness of procedures of data collection; and
Appraise the usefulness of the indicators, both quantitative and qualitative, in the context of giving an accurate and timely picture of the implementation of the programme and thereby feeding through to effective monitoring and evaluation.

2.3. Evaluation of Effectiveness and Expected Impacts and, on this basis, Evaluation of the Financial Resources Allocation

Having assessed the continuing relevance of the strategy, the mid term evaluation should review effectiveness on the basis of outputs achieved and expenditure to date. In the light of these outputs it should form a view as to the likelihood of the expected results and impacts being achieved. Normally, the key unit of analysis would be the measure, but in the case of URBAN, where projects are at an early stage, the evaluation will have greater added value if it focuses on the projects selected to examine them for likely effectiveness in terms of the outputs, results and impacts which they are likely to achieve. Analysis of effectiveness at project level should build up to an analysis of the progress being made towards the achievement of measure level objectives (operational objectives) and then specific and global objectives.

The URBAN Community initiative by its programme rationale and intervention principles differs from other structural funds interventions. It is based on an integrated approach with a wide range of eligible measures and a concentration of funds in a small geographic area. The evaluator should assess if the results of the effectiveness analysis support the chosen policy mix, the intended synergies between projects and measures, the scope of eligible measures, the aid intensity and the strategy as an answer to the development problems in the specific URBAN area.

Key Issues

The mid term evaluation should draw conclusions on the continuing sound footing of the strategy and of the financial resources allocation on the basis of its response to the needs stated as well as its expected impact:

- The outputs achieved to date should be reviewed to assess progress towards the achievement of objectives and consistency with the strategy of the programme.
- Adequacy of project selection criteria: do the selection criteria favour projects that are of high quality and relevant to the programme strategy.
- Competitive and participative procedures for project selection.

2.4. Quality of Implementation and Monitoring Arrangements

The impact of the policy also depends on management capacity and the performance of implementation bodies. For URBAN the degree of implication of the local authorities is of special relevance. The mid term evaluation should review the adequacy and quality of the management and delivery mechanisms. The mid term evaluation should address the quality of implementation, monitoring and evaluation arrangements, as they operate on the ground. It should:

- Review the clarity of management and implementation responsibilities on the one hand and consultation procedures on the other.
• Assess the role of the local authorities in the management and implementation of the programme.
• Review control mechanisms on the basis of audit reports, reported irregularities or fraud and meeting the requirement for audit of 5% of the programme.
• Appraise the contribution of the partnership to the quality of monitoring and implementation, in the context of the new provisions on partnership in the Regulation. In the context of URBAN an assessment of the involvement of stakeholders from the programme area will be especially important.
• Examine the operation of implementation and management processes in projects which have been approved.

The mid term evaluation should also review the participation of equal opportunities and environmental bodies in the monitoring process and their influence on project selection and other implementation systems.

**Key Issues**

• Effective management and monitoring at programme and project level.

**2.5 Community Added Value**

The fundamental objective of the Structural Funds is to support economic and social cohesion across and within member States of the European Union and the mid term evaluation should draw conclusions on progress being made towards this overall objective. The community added value of the Structural Funds is made evident in studies which examine the counterfactual situation, i.e., what would have happened in the absence of Structural Fund support.

An assessment of community added value is particularly relevant in the case of Community Initiatives where it should be significant. For URBAN, the task could include a judgement on:

- the innovative character, high quality and relevance of actions in comparison with national standards and objective 1/objective 2 programmes,

- the possible value added created by the intervention of a relatively small but citizen oriented EU programme (visibility of EU structural policy, promotion of the European idea, mobilisation effect).

Other aspects of a value added may be related to specific implementation principles of the Structural funds like the development of programming documents, development of partnership through the monitoring committee structures, broadening the range of implementation bodies through open tendering procedures, development of an evaluation culture, etc.

The evaluation may find other, unexpected aspects of Community value added. The Commission encourages the Member States to start a process of identifying and tracking these features.

**2.6 Conclusions and Recommendations**

Under each point of this part of the working document, key issues have been identified. Conclusions should be drawn in relation to each of these key issues and if these conclusions point to weaknesses in the planning or implementation of programmes, recommendations for
improvements should be made. The table below summarises each step of the evaluation and the key issues under which the evaluation should draw conclusions and make recommendations, as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component of Evaluation</th>
<th>Conclusions and Recommendations on:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. If appropriate, a re-assessment of the Relevance and the Consistency of the Strategy</td>
<td>• A review of any new evaluations which have become available since the agreement of the programme and an identification of any implications their findings have for the SWOT analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Possible changes to the SWOT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If appropriate, an appraisal of the consistency between the strategic, specific and operational objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quantification of Objectives – Outputs, Results and Impacts</td>
<td>• The relevance of the indicators which aim to quantify objectives and key disparities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The relevance of the indicators for global, specific and operational objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The appropriateness of indicators to monitor impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The reliability and timeliness of procedures of data collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The usefulness of the indicators, both quantitative and qualitative, in giving an accurate and timely picture of implementation and thereby feeding through to effective monitoring and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluation of Effectiveness To Date and Expected Socio-Economic Impacts</td>
<td>• The outputs achieved to date and progress towards the achievement of objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adequacy of project selection criteria in promoting relevant and high quality projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality of Implementation and Monitoring Arrangements</td>
<td>• Effective management and monitoring at programme and project level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The involvement of local authorities in programme management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                                                                         | • Competitive procedures for project
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Contribution of the partnership.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Community Added Value</td>
<td>Aspects of added value evident which stem from the existence of the Structural Funds investment in the region concerned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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