



**FAMENET**

Working paper on EMFAF  
evaluation – Fiche 1:  
Process evaluation

FINAL  
December 2023

**Copyright notice:**

© European Union, 2023

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION – Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries

**Disclaimer:**

*The information and views set out in this working paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Commission. The Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this working paper. Neither the Commission nor any person acting on the Commission's behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.*

*The approach and methodologies proposed do not constitute legal interpretation and are not binding. They are considered recommendations by technical experts to enhance exchange among stakeholders and to enrich the body of knowledge on EMFAF implementation.*

**Recommended citation:**

EUROPEAN COMMISSION - Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Unit D.3 (2023): FAMENET Working paper EMFAF evaluation, fiche process evaluation, Brussels

**Authors:**

Richard FREEMAN, Megan GARDNER BLASCO, Christine HAMZA, Pernille Skov JENSEN, Matthew RUDH, Angelos SANOPOULOS

**Contact:**

FAMENET

Boulevard de la Woluwe 2

1150 Brussels

info@famenet.eu

## Table of Contents

1	Introduction .....	4
1.1	Background .....	4
1.2	Why process evaluation?.....	4
1.3	Structure of the evaluation fiche.....	4
2	Evaluation questions and evaluation matrix .....	5
3	Evaluation matrix.....	7
3.1	Stakeholder involvement.....	7
3.2	Programme management.....	8
3.3	Communication .....	18

## Table of Figures

Table 1:	Main evaluation criteria and questions for EMFAF process evaluation .....	5
Table 2:	EQ 1.1. - Evaluation matrix.....	7
Table 3:	EQ 2.1. - Evaluation matrix.....	8
Table 4:	EQ 2.2. - Evaluation matrix.....	10
Table 5:	EQ 2.3. - Evaluation matrix.....	11
Table 6:	EQ 2.4. - Evaluation matrix.....	12
Table 7:	EQ 2.5. - Evaluation matrix.....	13
Table 8:	EQ 2.6. - Evaluation matrix.....	14
Table 9:	EQ 2.7. - Evaluation matrix.....	15
Table 10:	EQ 2.8. - Evaluation matrix.....	16
Table 11:	EQ 2.9. - Evaluation matrix.....	17
Table 12:	EQ 3.1. - Evaluation matrix.....	18
Table 13:	EQ 3.2. - Evaluation matrix.....	19
Table 14:	EQ 3.3. - Evaluation matrix.....	20



## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Background

This process evaluation fiche complements the FAMENET working paper on EMFAF evaluation (2023). The aim is to support the Managing Authority (MA) and experts who evaluate the EMFAF. It also aims to improve consistency in the evaluation of EMFAF programs.

### 1.2 Why process evaluation?

A process evaluation is one of the possible 'ongoing evaluations' of the EMFAF that may be delivered in line with CPR regulation (EU) 2021/1060 Article 44(1). It focuses on the delivery mechanism of the EMFAF programme. The evaluation should help to identify, reduce and/or eliminate inefficiencies in the delivery mechanism during the programme period, allowing for potential improvements to be made while the programme is ongoing, if needed. The process evaluation therefore focuses not only on what was delivered, but also on how the delivery was achieved.

It addresses the **effectiveness and efficiency** of the delivery system and any improvements made to the delivery system compared to the previous period by implementing lessons learned. Several process evaluations can be conducted during the programme period.

Ideally, the first process evaluation occurs in the first half of the programming period to identify at an early stage any issues that might have a negative impact on effectiveness and efficiency. It is usually followed by a second evaluation at a later stage, ideally early in the last third of the programming period to verify whether the implemented improvements have yielded the intended results. It may also cover other relevant criteria other than effectiveness and efficiency, such as gender equality, inclusiveness, non-discrimination, visibility and sustainable development.

### 1.3 Structure of the evaluation fiche

This fiche is structured into three main topics and 13 evaluation questions. Each evaluation question shows an evaluation matrix with judgment criteria, monitoring and evaluation indicators and proposed methodologies. In some cases, additional key points to consider are mentioned.

## 2 Evaluation questions and evaluation matrix

The evaluation questions proposed for process evaluations address mainly effectiveness and efficiency of the programme delivery system. FAMENET recommends the following set of evaluation questions along three main topics (stakeholder involvement, programme management, communication).

**Table 1: Main evaluation criteria and questions for EMFAF process evaluation**

Evaluation criteria	Evaluation question
<b>1. Stakeholder involvement</b>	
Effectiveness	1.1. How effectively were the relevant stakeholders involved?
<b>2. Programme management</b>	
Effectiveness	2.1. Are the administrative processes from project application to project finalisation (the project cycle) effective?
	2.2. How effective is the management structure?
	2.3. How effective is the monitoring system in collecting, analysing and monitoring the output, financial, procedural and result indicators as defined by the programme?
	2.4. How effective is the progress towards the milestones and targets?
	2.5. How did the programme management benefit from lessons learned from the previous period?
	2.6. Have actions to mainstream and promote the horizontal principles of equality between men and women and non-discrimination been implemented effectively?
	2.7. Have actions to mainstream and promote the horizontal principle of sustainable development, i.e. to preserve, protect and improve the quality of the environment, been implemented effectively?
Efficiency	2.8. How cost- and time-efficient is programme delivery system?
	2.9. How cost- and time-efficient are the programme implementation activities targeted at the beneficiaries?
<b>3. Communication</b>	
Effectiveness	3.1. How effective is the communication strategy in terms of reaching, informing and supporting the identified target group in the project application process?
	3.2. Does the communication strategy contribute to improving the awareness of the achievements of the programme?
Efficiency	3.3. Are the instruments of the communication strategy efficient (in terms of costs per output and timing)?

For each evaluation question an evaluation matrix is provided which includes the following elements:

- **Evaluation question (EQ):** The evaluation question provides a fundamental framework for the evaluation process, shaping the information sought after by Managing Authorities (MAs) and

stakeholders. The consensus on evaluation questions simplifies the determination of data collection methods, analysis approaches and reporting strategies.

- **Judgment criteria (JC):** These criteria are used to specify the evaluation question and describe where the merit of the intervention lies, bringing clarity to the underlying assumptions of the objectives and helping the identification of the required indicators.
- **Evaluation indicators:** Evaluation indicators address the key points to consider in quantitative and qualitative form. Ideally the chosen indicators do not result in added workload as they should be derived from existing data sources.
- **Evaluation methodology:** Complex interventions may require a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. The listed evaluation methodology serves as a guidance and support tool. Each MA should employ the methodologies that offer the most cost-effective solutions and the ones that provide the best value.

Key points are provided for further clarification of elements of the evaluation matrix.

### 3 Evaluation matrix

#### 3.1 Stakeholder involvement

This chapter focuses on evaluating the effectiveness of stakeholder involvement. There is no evaluation question on the efficiency of stakeholder involvement.

The main aim of the stakeholder involvement evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of consultation and the involvement of stakeholders and partners in the preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the programme.

**Table 2: EQ 1.1. - Evaluation matrix**

Evaluation question 1.1	How effectively were the relevant stakeholders involved?
<b>Judgment criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The most relevant social, economic stakeholders have been identified and addressed.</li> <li>• The stakeholders have been actively involved in preparation and implementation of the EMFAF programmes.</li> <li>• The stakeholders have been actively involved in the monitoring and evaluation of the EMFAF programmes.</li> <li>• The stakeholders have been actively involved in the Monitoring Committee (MC) meetings.</li> <li>• The involvement of the stakeholders has contributed to the smooth implementation of the programme.</li> <li>• The involvement of the stakeholders has contributed to achieving better results.</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number and type of stakeholders involved in MC meetings</li> <li>• Frequency of involvement of stakeholders/partners in MC meetings</li> <li>• Gender balance in MC meetings</li> <li>• Consideration of stakeholders/partners inputs in meetings and the decision-making process</li> <li>• Satisfaction of stakeholders with their involvement and influence in different programme phases (e.g. Preparing, implementing, and evaluating the programme, MC Meetings)</li> <li>• Satisfaction of the MA and other implementing bodies with the involvement of the stakeholders in terms of smooth implementation and quality/outcomes of the funding</li> </ul>
<b>Methodology</b>	<p>Desk research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data analysis (e.g., MC meeting data: frequency of meetings, number and types of participants etc.)</li> <li>• Qualitative analysis (review of minutes etc)</li> </ul> <p>Field research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey: Satisfaction and needs of stakeholders in different programme phases</li> <li>• Interviews (Stakeholders, Implementing bodies, managers of EMFAF interventions; MA, MC)</li> </ul>

### Key Points to consider

When collecting data on stakeholders it is essential to consider the minimum requirements according to the regulation CPR Article 8.

- Type of stakeholders included (at least):
  - regional, local, urban and other public authorities
  - economic and social partners
  - relevant bodies representing civil society, such as environmental partners, non-governmental organisations, and bodies responsible for promoting social inclusion, fundamental rights, rights of persons with disabilities, gender equality and non-discrimination
  - research organisations and universities, where appropriate
- Role of stakeholders and relevant actors in the decision-making processes within the MC meetings
  - To what extent is it even possible for stakeholders to be involved?
  - At which stages does stakeholder involvement play the most important role?

### 3.2 Programme management

The programme implementation constitutes the central component of the delivery mechanism. This aspect of evaluation holds significant importance in revealing challenges and discrepancies between the planned and actual implementation outcomes.

The main aim of the evaluation of the programme implementation is to assess:

- the effectiveness of the implementation structures and processes;
- the effectiveness of the data collection and monitoring system;
- the extent to which the horizontal principles have been considered in preparing and implementing the OP; and
- the administrative costs and efficiency of the implementation structures.

**Table 3: EQ 2.1. - Evaluation matrix**

<b>Evaluation question 2.1</b>	<b>Are the administrative processes from project application to project finalisation (the project cycle) effective?</b>
<b>Judgment criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The programme produces outputs of the requested quality and in the requested time frame.</li> <li>• The administrative burden is kept to a minimum.</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation indicators</b>	From preparation to submission of application: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gaps in programme management procedures</li> <li>• Duration between different steps in the programme management cycle</li> <li>• Availability of guidelines for applicants for application procedure (yes/no)</li> <li>• Satisfaction of applicants with clarity and utility of information and application guidance</li> <li>• Satisfaction of applicants with the application process</li> <li>• Satisfaction of applicants with support of MA</li> </ul>

<p><b>Evaluation question 2.1</b></p>	<p><b>Are the administrative processes from project application to project finalisation (the project cycle) effective?</b></p>
	<p>From application assessment and selection to approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of applications</li> <li>• Duration of selection procedure</li> <li>• Number of external experts used for consultancy in selection procedure</li> <li>• Number of contacts made by MA with potential applicants</li> <li>• Number of approved operations</li> <li>• Ratio operations approved/applications submitted</li> <li>• Satisfaction of applicants with transparency of selection process and selection criteria</li> </ul> <p>Operation monitoring to operation closure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of operations interrupted or abandoned</li> <li>• Number of financial and reporting irregularities detected</li> <li>• Number of financial corrections</li> <li>• Number of appeals</li> <li>• Number of applicants applying again</li> <li>• Satisfaction of MA with workload for reporting</li> <li>• Satisfaction of applicants/beneficiaries with simplicity of the procedures for making changes to the operation</li> <li>• Satisfaction of applicants/beneficiaries with pre-financing options</li> <li>• Satisfaction of applicants/beneficiaries with simplicity of using SCO and flat rates</li> <li>• Satisfaction of applicants/beneficiaries with clarity of technical issues (eligible and non-eligible costs, earnings, proof of spending)</li> <li>• Satisfaction of beneficiaries with duration needed to process payment claims</li> </ul>
<p><b>Evaluation methodology</b></p>	<p>Desk research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data analysis: operation documentation for EMFAF operations (e.g. application forms, progress reports, final reports)</li> <li>• Process mapping (e.g. analysis of management systems/workflows in managing an intervention)</li> </ul> <p>Field research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structured focus groups involving applicants/beneficiaries, experts</li> <li>• Interviews with implementing bodies, applicants/beneficiaries, experts</li> <li>• Surveys of selected applicants/beneficiaries (e.g. Topic: Satisfaction with application process, selection process, monitoring)</li> <li>• Case studies</li> </ul>

**Table 4: EQ 2.2. - Evaluation matrix**

Evaluation question 2.2	How effective is the management structure?
<b>Judgment criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Management Authority (MA) has sufficient resources and organizational capacity to manage the programme.</li> <li>• The staff has knowledge, necessary skills and capacity to manage the programme.</li> <li>• The implementing bodies have structure and processes to manage the programme implementation.</li> <li>• A system of guidelines is developed.</li> <li>• The MA is able to implement the Simplified Cost Options (SCO).</li> <li>• Audit of expenditure incurred and operation settlement is developed.</li> <li>• The Certifying Authority is able to carry out the certification procedure.</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation indicators</b>	<p>Performance of management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Type of process (e.g. payment process, decision-making process)</li> <li>• Frequency of process</li> <li>• Average duration of process</li> <li>• Number of errors that occur during process implementation</li> <li>• Output of process</li> <li>• Satisfaction of MA/beneficiaries with management structure and management capability</li> </ul> <p>Personnel capacity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of staff available</li> <li>• Number of financial resources for staff available</li> <li>• Number of staff received relevant training/certificates/qualifications.</li> <li>• Transparency of job descriptions and command chains</li> </ul> <p>Management Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of management standards used (e.g. ISO 9001 for Quality Management, Tools: Six Sigma, Total Quality Management (TQM), Kaizen)</li> <li>• Satisfaction of implementing bodies and staff with the application of management standards used (utilization, improvements)</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation methodology</b>	<p>Desk research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process mapping (e.g. analysis of management systems/workflows in the management of an intervention)</li> </ul> <p>Field research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with implementing bodies and managers of EMFF interventions</li> </ul>

**Key points to consider**

When addressing the evaluation question it is valuable to specifically address the existence of programme management systems and how applied standards are understood by staff members.

**Table 5: EQ 2.3. - Evaluation matrix**

<b>Evaluation question 2.3</b>	<b>How effective is the monitoring system in collecting, analysing and monitoring the output, financial, procedural and result indicators as defined by the programme?</b>
<b>Judgment criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The monitoring system is able to collect, analyse and monitor the required indicators as defined by the programme.</li> <li>• Reporting is on time and fulfils all the requirements of the European Commission CPR, Article 42 and EMFAF Article 46), and of European Commission implementing regulation (EU) 2022/79.</li> <li>• Infosys is known and accessible among all programme management bodies.</li> <li>• Validation and plausibility checks are regularly done.</li> <li>• Infosys is compatible with the national/regional system.</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of Infosys error reports</li> <li>• Number of differences between EMFAF system and national monitoring system</li> <li>• Number and frequency of validation checks</li> <li>• Type of differences between EMFAF system and national/regional monitoring system</li> <li>• Duration of approval and submission of reports</li> <li>• Satisfaction of MA/MC with accessibility of database</li> <li>• Satisfaction of MA/MC with quality of data (available and complete data)</li> <li>• Satisfaction with clarity of the reports for MC members</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation methodology</b>	<p>Desk research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data analysis and plausibility assessment</li> </ul> <p>Field research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with MA</li> <li>• Interviews with experts</li> <li>• Interviews with MC members</li> </ul>

**Key points to consider**

The key source for the evaluation is the Infosys data base. Therefore the continuous monitoring is important for evaluation. For example to address delays in measuring effects, it is crucial to maintain continuous monitoring beyond the program period.

**Table 6: EQ 2.4. - Evaluation matrix**

Evaluation question 2.4	How effective is the progress towards the milestones and targets?
<b>Judgment criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress towards milestones and targets is in line with the programme.</li> <li>• The Managing Authority (MA) is able to implement corrections if the achievement of target values or milestones is low.</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of milestones and targets set</li> <li>• Type of milestones targets set</li> <li>• Target value of milestone/target</li> <li>• Realistic and measurable milestones and targets</li> <li>• Remedial actions</li> <li>• Achieved current value of milestone/target</li> <li>• Number of programme modifications</li> <li>• Type of programme modifications</li> <li>• Change of performance target</li> <li>• Performance target ratio</li> <li>• Existence of early warning mechanism (e.g., contact with the representatives of the main groups of beneficiaries)</li> <li>• Rate of expenditure declared and certified (current performance compared to Performance Framework milestones/target), both incremental and cumulative</li> <li>• Average time of operations moving from Infosys field 16 value 01 (operation selected) to value 03 (operation fully implemented) or 04 (operation completed)</li> <li>• Average time of operations moving from Infosys field 16 value 01 (operation selected) to value 02 (Operation interrupted/abandoned following partial implementation) and time needed for de-commitments at the level of operations</li> <li>• Amount of de-commitments (N+3), payment interruptions, financial corrections</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation methodology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data analysis (e.g. financial, procedural and indicator-related data in the electronic monitoring system (Infosys))</li> <li>• Interviews with relevant actors (implementing bodies/managers of EMFAF interventions, DG MARE Geographical Policy Officers)</li> </ul>

**Table 7: EQ 2.5. - Evaluation matrix**

Evaluation question 2.5	How did the programme management benefit from lessons learned from the previous period?
<b>Judgment criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The programme management identified valuable lessons.</li> <li>• The programme management improved effectiveness based on their experience.</li> <li>• The evaluation plan and monitoring system considers the lessons learned.</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number and type of implemented improvements and adjustments in the programme implementation</li> <li>• Satisfaction of MA/beneficiaries with reporting and communication of challenges, lessons learned and recommendations for improvement</li> <li>• Satisfaction of MA/beneficiaries with improved measures</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation methodology</b>	<p>Desk research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports, minutes</li> <li>• Programme documents, evaluations</li> </ul> <p>Field research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with programme managements staff, implementing bodies, managers of EMFAF interventions, stakeholders, partners, beneficiaries</li> </ul>

**Key points to consider**

- The evaluation report can inform stakeholders and policymakers of the outcome of the evaluation, presenting the judgment and lessons learned. It should present what was achieved, and how, as well as **what was not achieved, why it was not achieved, and what lessons were learned**. This allows the description of the **critical factors for success and/or failure**, which can then inform the conversation on lessons learned and enable the organisation to learn and raise critical issues for attention.
- Clear reference should be made to lessons learned relating to issues identified such as regulatory or unnecessary burden, simplicity/complexity, efficiencies/inefficiencies and the achievement of objectives at low/high (appropriate/reasonable) cost. The evaluation is not the end of the process. The findings should stimulate discussions, inform follow-up action (to put into practice the lessons learned) and feed into the next cycle of decision-making.

**Table 8: EQ 2.6. - Evaluation matrix**

<b>Evaluation question 2.6</b>	<b>Have actions to mainstream and promote the horizontal principles of the Unions fundamental rights, equality between men and women, gender mainstreaming and non-discrimination been implemented effectively?</b>
<b>Judgment criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The principles of equal opportunities and non-discrimination for all (in particular accessibility for persons with disabilities) according to the CPR No.2021/1060 Article 9 are taken into account throughout the evaluation. (e.g. involving stakeholders in the programme implementation process, applying specific selection criteria, incorporating accessibility to disadvantaged people, implementing data in the monitoring database that allows the assessment of the promotion of gender equality/non-discrimination)</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of civil society stakeholders in MC</li> <li>• Number of women and men in MC</li> <li>• Number of women and men in MA (working on EMFAF)</li> <li>• Number of women and men participating in operations (Infosys if applicable)</li> <li>• Number of women and men benefiting from training services</li> <li>• Number of women and men benefitting from improved services</li> <li>• Number of disadvantaged people involved in any phase of the process (e.g. as part of MA/MC)</li> <li>• Number and weight of operation selection criteria related to the horizontal principles of the Unions fundamental rights, equality between men and women, gender mainstreaming and non-discrimination</li> <li>• Number of disadvantaged people benefiting from training and improved services</li> <li>• Satisfaction of beneficiaries and/or stakeholders with the level of adequate actions related to gender equality and non-discrimination</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation methodology</b>	<p>Desk research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data analysis (e.g. indicator-related from electronic monitoring system (Infosys), operation documentation of EMFAF operations e.g., application forms, progress reports, final reports), Steering and MC data e.g. participants, minutes)</li> </ul> <p>Field research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with relevant actors (implementing bodies/managers of EMFAF interventions, beneficiaries, stakeholders and partners)</li> <li>• Survey: Satisfaction of beneficiaries/stakeholders with gender equality and non-discrimination in evaluation process</li> </ul>

### Key Points to Consider

- Whether operations are subject to an assessment of compliance with equal opportunities and non-discrimination principles and criteria as defined in EU and national legislation
- Operation implementation:
  - User-friendly language
  - Disadvantaged should have access to the operation
  - The significance given to gender perspective in implementing operations
- Whether the evaluation plan considers equal opportunities and non-discrimination

**Table 9: EQ 2.7. - Evaluation matrix**

Evaluation question 2.7	Have actions to mainstream and promote the horizontal principle of sustainable development, i.e. to preserve, protect and improve the quality of the environment, been implemented effectively?
<b>Judgment criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The principles of sustainable development according to the CPR Article 9.4 are respected in all programme phases (operation selection, implementation, monitoring, reporting and evaluation)</li> <li>• The principles of sustainable development (environmental protection requirements, resource efficiency, climate change mitigation and adaptation, biodiversity, disaster resilience, risk prevention and management) are taken into account in the operation selection (e.g. selection criteria), implementation, monitoring (e.g. relevant data in database) and evaluation.</li> <li>• Measures concerning landing obligation, biodiversity protection, marine litter and Natura 2000, selectivity and fuel efficiency were implemented.</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of civil society stakeholders in MC</li> <li>• Number of environmental stakeholders in MC</li> <li>• Number and weight of operation selection criteria related to the horizontal principle of sustainable development</li> <li>• Number and type of actions promoting sustainable development in operation selection, implementation and evaluation</li> <li>• Satisfaction of beneficiaries and stakeholders with adequate implementation of sustainable development in EMFAF</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation methodology</b>	<p>Desk research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operation documentation for EMFAF operations e.g. application forms, progress reports, final reports, steering and MC meeting data (participants, minutes, etc.).</li> <li>• Procedural and indicator related data from electronic monitoring system, Infosys data Art. 97.1)</li> </ul> <p>Field research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with relevant actors (implementing bodies/managers of EMFAF interventions, beneficiaries, stakeholders and partners)</li> <li>• Consultation with selected experts (e.g. Delphi method, Focus groups)</li> </ul>

**Key points to consider**

The objectives of the Funds shall be pursued in line with the objective of promoting sustainable development as set out in Article 11 TFEU, taking into account the UN Sustainable Development Goals, the Paris Agreement and the “do no significant harm” principle. In order to promote informed decision-making, the impact assessment report can serve as an aid to policy-making and present an assessment of the impacts on the relevant sustainable development goals.

**Table 10: EQ 2.8. - Evaluation matrix**

Evaluation question 2.8	How cost- and time-efficient is the programme delivery system?
<b>Judgment criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applications are processed and funds provided to beneficiaries in a timely manner.</li> <li>• The administrative processes are efficient in terms of resources used and timing.</li> <li>• The measures/schemes have been implemented at reasonable cost to the administration.</li> <li>• The administrative costs of the measures/schemes are reduced compared to the previous period.</li> <li>• The programme management achieved a reduction of workload by implementing digital solutions.</li> <li>• The programme management increased efficiency of the communication system among programme management bodies.</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost (i.e. expenditure for programme management) per application compared to similar actions in the previous programming period or compared to other ESIF funds in the programming period 2014–2020</li> <li>• Costs compared to similar interventions funded by other national or regional programmes</li> <li>• The complexity of comparing quantitative inputs (e.g. money; costs) and qualitative outputs</li> <li>• Complexity of reporting</li> <li>• Cost per operation</li> <li>• Number of applications</li> <li>• Average time spent from application to decision compared to the previous period</li> <li>• Average time spent from operation approval to funds being provided for approved operations</li> <li>• Ration between operation implemented and costs of the delivery system</li> <li>• Average time of contracting procedure</li> <li>• Average time of payment procedure</li> <li>• Type, quality and frequency of communication among programme management and implementing bodies.</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation methodology</b>	<p>Desk research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost analysis (e.g. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis, Cost-Benefit Analysis)</li> <li>• Data analysis (e.g. Cost recordings: fees, variable costs, fix costs, outputs, operation project related data; applications, funds, approvals, rejections)</li> </ul>

<b>Evaluation question 2.8</b>	<b>How cost- and time-efficient is the programme delivery system?</b>
	<p>Field research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with relevant actors (implementing bodies/managers of EMFAF interventions, beneficiaries, stakeholders and partners)</li> <li>• Survey among beneficiaries</li> </ul>

**Table 11: EQ 2.9. - Evaluation matrix**

<b>Evaluation question 2.9</b>	<b>How cost- and time-efficient are the programme implementation activities targeted at the beneficiaries?</b>
<b>Judgment criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The management enabled efficient implementation of simplification measures such as Simplified Cost Options (SCO) and financial instruments (FI),</li> <li>• The programme management achieved a change/reduction of requirements in the application and reporting process (simplified forms, user friendly IT tools etc.)</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number and type of SCOs.</li> <li>• Complexity of SCOs.</li> <li>• Perceived efficiency of payment procedures due to the implementation of SCOs.</li> <li>• Number and type of FIs.</li> <li>• Number and type of IT tools.</li> <li>• Perceived influence on efficiency of IT tools.</li> <li>• Resources spend on administrative activities by beneficiaries compared to the previous programming period</li> <li>• Ratio between resources put into administrative activities and the size of the project</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation methodology</b>	<p>Desk research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operation documentation for EMFAF operations</li> <li>• Procedural and indicator related data from the electronic monitoring system, Infosys data Art. 97.1)</li> </ul> <p>Field research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with relevant actors (implementing bodies/managers of EMFAF interventions, beneficiaries, stakeholders and partners)</li> <li>• Survey among beneficiaries</li> </ul>

### 3.3 Communication

The main aims of the evaluation of the communication strategy are to assess:

- the effectiveness of activities to inform the general public and potential applicants and beneficiaries about EMFAF funding and the results achieved; and
- the efficiency of the communication strategy and instruments.

The following chapter presents evaluation questions on the effectiveness in reaching target groups (general public, potential applicants, beneficiaries) and the awareness of achievements. Finally, the efficiency of the communication strategy in terms of costs and time is considered in another evaluation question.

**Table 12: EQ 3.1. - Evaluation matrix**

<b>Evaluation question 3.1</b>	<b>How effective is the communication strategy in terms of reaching, informing and supporting the identified target group in the project application process?</b>
<b>Judgment criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant target groups have been identified and described.</li> <li>• The different communication channels are appropriate to the target groups.</li> <li>• The horizontal principles are communicated.</li> <li>• The identified target groups, sectoral stakeholders and multipliers have been reached and appropriately informed.</li> <li>• Multipliers have been reached and appropriately informed.</li> <li>• Communication activities are coherent and connected through campaigns.</li> <li>• The target groups are aware of the support available and how to apply.</li> <li>• The awareness of the potential operation applicants has been raised.</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of communication actions</li> <li>• Number of engagements with communication actions</li> <li>• Number of views of each communication and publicity action</li> <li>• Average time spent on respective communication channel and publicity action</li> <li>• The degree to which the identified target groups have been reached and informed</li> <li>• Ratio of number of applications to number of operations selected</li> <li>• Frequency of communication activities in different channels</li> <li>• Satisfaction with level of information by target group</li> <li>• Satisfaction with level of information by MC/MA</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation methodology</b>	<p>Desk research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data Analysis (operation documentation for EMFAF operations: e.g. application forms, progress reports, final reports)</li> <li>• Media and communication analysis (e.g. Google Analytics, Adobe Analytics, Social Media analysis: Social Media listening, keyword tracking, media breakdown)</li> </ul> <p>Field research</p>

<b>Evaluation question 3.1</b>	<b>How effective is the communication strategy in terms of reaching, informing and supporting the identified target group in the project application process?</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey: Satisfaction with level of information by target group and MC/MA</li> <li>• Interviews with target group and MC</li> </ul>

### Key Points to Consider

- Number of channels is not always significant as quantity is not a direct indication of quality, and a large presence does not necessarily equate to high engagement with content and channels.
- Views and time spent on a channel can provide more insight into effectiveness.

**Table 13: EQ 3.2. - Evaluation matrix**

<b>Evaluation question 3.2</b>	<b>Does the communication strategy contribute to improving the awareness of the achievements of the programme?</b>
<b>Judgment criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The public and sectoral stakeholders are aware of the achievements of the programme.</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Type of communication channels and means of communication (e.g. Social media, articles, events, stories)</li> <li>• Number of articles and stories in specialized public media</li> <li>• Number of stories selected by FAMENET and published on europa.eu</li> <li>• Hits of articles and stories in specialized public media</li> <li>• Extent to which operations have been transformed into stories for the public</li> <li>• Number of external communication items published</li> <li>• Average time spent on articles and stories in specialized public media</li> <li>• Average time spent on stories selected by FAMENET and published on europa.eu</li> <li>• Level of awareness regarding programme achievements among target groups</li> <li>• Satisfaction of target groups with communication channels and content</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation methodology</b>	<p>Desk research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data analysis (e.g. websites and web publications, minutes of events)</li> <li>• Media and communication analysis (e.g. Google Analytics, Adobe Analytics, Social Media analysis: Social Media listening, keyword tracking, media breakdown)</li> </ul> <p>Field research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with marketing/communication experts, MA and applicants/beneficiaries</li> <li>• Survey: Satisfaction of target groups (applicants/beneficiaries) with communications channels and content/level of awareness regarding programme achievements</li> </ul>

## Key Points to Consider

Achievements should be communicated in a clear and transparent manner.

**Table 14: EQ 3.3. - Evaluation matrix**

<b>Evaluation question 3.3</b>	<b>Are the instruments of the communication strategy efficient (in terms of costs per output and timing)?</b>
<b>Judgment criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The costs of the communication strategy are in line with similar costs of other communication strategies or with the communication strategy of the previous programming period.</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs of different communication channels (internet, press, events, etc.) versus reach out</li> <li>Costs of communication actions compared to the previous programming period</li> <li>Costs of different communication actions and the perceived effect on target groups</li> <li>Hit of each communication action</li> <li>Average time required to implement a communication strategy</li> <li>Satisfaction with perceived effect of communication channels (view of MA and applicants/beneficiaries)</li> <li>Ratio between perceived effect and costs</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation methodology</b>	<p>Desk research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data analysis (e.g. cost recordings: advertising costs, fees, variable costs, fix costs, outputs: views, applications)</li> <li>Cost analysis (e.g. cost-effectiveness analysis, cost-benefit analysis)</li> </ul> <p>Field research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with experts, MA and applicants/beneficiaries</li> <li>Survey: Perceived effect of communication channels (target group: MA and applicants/beneficiaries)</li> </ul>





**FAMENET**