



European Union

European Regional
Development Fund
Investing in your future

PEACE III Programme

GUIDANCE NOTE 12

MONITORING, REPORTING and EVALUATION

G12/PIII

1.0 Introduction

This guidance note sets out the monitoring, reporting and evaluation requirements for the PEACE III Programme and it informs the Intermediate Bodies, other programme authorities and Lead Partners of their responsibilities in relation to providing information to the Managing Authority for reporting purposes. The purpose of this guidance note is to provide notice of the key elements of the reporting calendar to enable programme bodies plan their reporting activities and to outline the policy and requirements in relation to evaluation for the Programme.

2.0 Maintenance of the database.

The primary reporting tool for the programme is the System 2007 database. Where possible the Managing Authority will commission reports from the database to supply the information required. Consequently, it is essential that the database is maintained and kept up to date, particularly in relation to the approval of projects and reporting against indicators.

3.0 JTS and Consortium Reporting Requirements

The Managing Authority has a number of key reporting cycles:

3.1 Monthly Reports for Monitoring Committees

In order to ensure that Monitoring Committee members are updated regarding programme implementation, the Managing Authority issues a monthly report during the first week of the following month. This report provides information relating to both the physical and financial progress of the programme and also highlights any programme management issues which are being addressed by the Managing Authority and the Intermediate Bodies. A table of information requirements to complete the monthly report is below:

Information Need	Source	Responsible Manager
Dates of Steering Committees	Supplied Manually	PEACE Theme 1.1 – JTS Programme Manager (Omagh) PEACE Theme 1.2 – Consortium PEACE Theme 2.1 – JTS Programme Manager (Omagh) PEACE Theme 2.2 – JTS Programme Manager (Belfast)
Details of applications received	Systems 2007	
Details of projects approved by Steering Committee	Supplied Manually	
Details of LoO's issued	Systems 2007	
Date of next Steering Committee (if known)	Supplied Manually	
Dates of future planned calls (if known)	Supplied Manually	
Expenditure details	Systems 2007	Programmes Manager (Managing Authority)

The Managing Authority expects to move to quarterly reporting during 2010 when it is expected that full programme implementation will be in place.

3.2 Monitoring Committee Papers

Monitoring Committees are usually held on a bi-annual basis in April and October each year. Papers are required to be distributed 3 weeks in advance of the meeting, therefore, the Managing Authority requires updated information 1 month prior to the

meeting, in September and March each year. The table below outlines the information required and responsibilities for producing it:

Information Need	Source	Responsible Manager
Programme Implementation Information		
Dates of Steering Committees	Supplied Manually	PEACE Theme 1.1 – JTS Programme Manager (Omagh) PEACE Theme 1.2 – Consortium PEACE Theme 2.1 – JTS Programme Manager (Omagh) PEACE Theme 2.2 – JTS Programme Manager (Belfast)
Details of applications received	Systems 2007	
Details of projects approved by Steering Committee	Supplied Manually	
Details of LoO's issued	Systems 2007	
Date of next Steering Committee (if known)	Supplied Manually	
Dates of future planned calls (if known)	Supplied Manually	
Project Summaries	Supplied Manually	
Managing Authority*		
Programme monitoring information*	Systems 2007	Managing Authority Programmes Manager in consultation with NISRA
Programme Finance		
Commitment figures	Systems 2007	Programmes Manager (Managing Authority)
Expenditure details	Systems 2007	Programmes Manager (Managing Authority)

*Programme monitoring information must be updated on the System 2007 database quarterly. It is the responsibility of the relevant Intermediate Body manager to ensure that this is done in time to meet programme reporting requirements.

3.3 Annual Implementation Report

The Annual Implementation Report (AIR) is due to be with the Commission by 30th June each year¹. Ongoing work begins on the AIR in January each year with the target that a draft report will be tabled at the April Monitoring Committee meeting for approval.

Therefore, the Managing Authority requires up to date information on the preceding year

¹ Article 67 – Annual Report and Final Report on implementation - Council Regulation (EC) 1083/06 of 11 July 2006.

by the end of February. The table below outlines the information required and the responsibilities for providing it:

Information Need	Source	Responsible Manager
Managing Authority		
Summary of Monitoring Committee activity	Supplied Manually	Managing Authority Programmes Manager
Summary of Working Group activity	Supplied Manually	
Report on Managing Authority implementation	Supplied Manually	
Summary of economic and political context	Supplied Manually	
Report on complementarity with other instruments	Supplied Manually	
Analysis of implementation of Priority 3 (Technical Assistance)	Supplied Manually	
Cumulative Breakdown of allocations of the Community contribution by category (see template below) ²	Systems 2007	
Priority Axis by Sources of Funding (see template below) ³	Systems 2007	
Report on indicators ⁴	Systems 2007 / Manual Commentary	Managing Authority Programmes Manager in association with NISRA
Report on context indicators	Supplied Manually	
Development Path Analysis report	Systems 2007 /Supplied Manually	
JTS		
Qualitative report on implementation by Theme	Supplied Manually	PEACE Theme 1.1 – JTS Programme
Case studies by theme	Supplied	

² In the format specified in Annex 1 of this Guidance Note and Annex II (Categorisation of Funds Assistance for 2007-13) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1828/2006

³ In the format specified in Annex 2 of this Guidance Note and Annex XVI (Financial Plans for Operational Programmes) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1828/2006

⁴ In the format specified in Annex XVIII (Annual and Final Reporting) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1828/2006

	Manually	Manager (Omagh) PEACE Theme 1.2 – Consortium PEACE Theme 2.1 – JTS Programme Manager (Omagh) PEACE Theme 2.2 – JTS Programme Manager (Belfast)
Dates of Steering Committees held	Supplied Manually	
Dates of calls	Supplied Manually	
Details of applications received	Systems 2007	
Details of projects approved by Steering Committee	Supplied Manually	
Details of LoO's issued	Systems 2007	
Certifying Authority		
Summary of claims, payments and analysis (see template below) ⁵	Systems 2007	Certifying Authority Manager
Communications		
Information and publicity update		Communications Manager

3.4 Ad hoc Reports

The Managing Authority frequently receives request for Programme reports on an ad hoc basis. This is to facilitate responses to Assembly Questions (AQs), Parliamentary Questions (PQs), NSMC or requests from the Commission, the Monitoring Committee, Accountable Departments, Member States or other stakeholders. Where possible, the Managing Authority will access this information from the database, however, there may be occasions when information will have to be sought from Intermediate Bodies.

4.0 Reporting Requirements for Lead Partners

The following are the requirements for Lead Partners to report to the JTS and the Consortium:

4.1 Quarterly Reports

Both the JTS and the Consortium require a quarterly progress report to accompany the quarterly claim for payment from the Lead Partners. These progress reports should be cumulative for the projects and report on progress over the previous quarter.

⁵ In the format specified in Annex 3 of this Guidance Note

4.2 Aid For Peace Reporting

The PEACE III Operational Programme recognised that monitoring and evaluating the previous EU Programmes for Peace and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland and Ireland had not been straightforward. The Peace Programmes are unique amongst EU Structural Fund Programmes in their aims and objectives, and as a result do not easily lend themselves to the type of measurement and quantification that can be applied to more conventional economic and social development programmes. This is particularly true when it comes to assessing the impacts of the interventions.

In an effort to inform this issue, the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group of the Peace II Monitoring Committee commissioned consultants PWC to develop a monitoring and evaluation framework for peace building. The key recommendation from their report⁶ was for the use of the Aid for Peace Approach.

The Aid for Peace Approach⁷ is an evaluation methodology for examining peace building interventions. It builds on Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment⁸ (PCIA) and focuses on assessing the needs for peace building in a given country or area and then tailoring the intervention's objectives and activities to these needs by identifying their peace building relevance and developing appropriate indicators. The Approach can be broken down into four key stages.

- *Peace building needs analysis*
- *Peace building relevance assessment*
- *Conflict risk assessment*
- *Peace and conflict effects assessment*

The Aid for Peace Approach shaped the development of Peace III at the programme level. It will also be applied at operation level. Prior to the issue of a letter of offer, each

⁶ PriceWaterhouseCoopers LLP (2007) *A monitoring and evaluation framework for peace building, Final Report*, June 2007

⁷ Paffenholz, T. (2005) *Third Generation PCIA: Introducing the Aid for Peace Approach*, <http://www.berghot-handbook.net>

⁸ Bush, K. (2003) *Hands-on PCIA, Part 1, A Handbook for Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA)*, October 2003

lead partner will be taken through the four key stages of Aid for Peace by a facilitator.

The use of the Aid for Peace Approach is not expected to be an onerous task for Lead Partners since much of the thinking required for the initial report will have been done in the development of the application. The Approach provides a structure through which the anticipated and actual impacts of an operation on peace and reconciliation can be defined. It also assists with the development of operation-specific monitoring indicators which can be used throughout the operation to assess progress.

4.3 Lead Partners requirements under Aid For Peace in Themes 1.1, 2.1 and 2.2

Each lead partner will be required to propose indicators which would be used to monitor and evaluate the operation. These indicators will be drawn from the Programme/Priority indicators, alongside others more specific to the operation. These indicators should emerge from the needs analysis and the relevance assessment. To supplement these indicators, each Lead Partner will be responsible for undertaking three concise evaluative reports:

Evaluation Report 1: This report is to be produced within the first six months of the operation and should detail the results of working through the Aid For Peace Approach Stages with the facilitator and provide baseline information and agreed project level indicators.

Evaluation Report 2: At the mid term stage of the operation the Aid For Peace stages should be reviewed and an update report produced commenting on progress achieved to date against the indicators and baselines agree in Report 1.

Evaluation Report 3: Upon completion of the operation/project there is a requirement for a post project evaluation. The details of this are outlined in section 5.0 below and in Annex IV. The post project evaluation includes the Aid For Peace information and constitutes the final report.

The operation level reports will be used extensively by the Managing Authority in the production of Programme level information for progress reports, AIRs and evaluations.

This bottom-up approach should provide a fuller indication of the overall impact of the PEACE III Programme.

4.4 Lead Partner requirements under Aid For Peace in Theme 1.2

Lead Partners in Theme 1.2 follow a similar approach as outlined above, but should follow the advice provided by the Consortium in relation to Aid For Peace reporting to the Consortium.

5.0 Evaluation

5.1 Introduction

This Guidance Note aims to clarify the role of Evaluation in the PEACE III Programme. It is written to comply with Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 Articles 47-49 and with the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan that has been approved for the Programme. The Managing Authority recognises the importance of effective evaluation for the Programme. However, in light of the current economic environment the maximum amount of funding should be made available for front line services and consultant fees kept to a minimum.

5.2 Definition of Evaluation

The European Commission in 2006, through EVALSED, the online and interactive resource for the evaluation of socio-economic development, defines evaluation as,

'Judgement on the value of a (usually) public intervention with reference to criteria and explicit standards (e.g. its relevance, efficiency, sustainability, equity etc.). The judgement usually concerns the needs which have to be met by the intervention, and the effects produced by it. The evaluation is based on information which is specially collected and interpreted to support the judgement.'

Evaluation is an exercise that assesses the relevance, performance and success of ongoing and completed programmes. An important aspect of evaluation involves the interrogation of the information from monitoring and other sources to find out and

explain the effects of the interventions. Article 47[2] outlines that evaluation should centre on two functions; strategic and operational.

The **strategic** function should assess the contribution of the OP to domestic and European strategies. From an EU perspective, it is important that evaluation can show the contribution of Structural Funds in Northern Ireland and the Border Region. In addition, the impact of the programme needs to be considered in light of the domestic policy context to identify areas of synergy as well as additionality with respect to Structural Funds interventions and the domestic economy. It may focus on macro-economic impacts at an operational level or specific strategic themes within the OP (such as innovation), or horizontal priorities (equality of opportunity, environmental sustainability).

The **operational** function of evaluation is a key mechanism for improving programme implementation. This would focus on how the programmes are delivered and would include analysis of financial and physical data to ensure we are meeting targets, as well as making recommendations to improve performance. It should also assess the administrative functions and the quality of implementing mechanisms.

Evaluation must address a set of specific issues in order to adequately assess the delivery of a programme/project and fulfil the above requirements. Key issues identified by the Commission include:

- **Relevance:** How relevant are the programme/project's objectives in relation to evolving needs and priorities at a national and EU level?
- **Efficiency:** What mechanisms have been used to turn resources into outputs or results?
- **Effectiveness:** How far has the programme/project achieved its specific and global objectives?
- **Utility:** Did the programme/project have an impact on the target groups or populations in relation to their needs?
- **Sustainability:** To what extent can the changes (or benefits) be expected to last after the programme/project has been completed?

- **Added Value:** Would the intervention have happened without financial assistance?
- **Synergy:** Has the programme/project complemented and enhanced in any way the effect of other related domestic policies?

5.3 Evaluation at the Strategic/Programme Level

The Managing Authority, where appropriate, will carry out evaluations of the Programme/Theme/Priority/Group of Actions/major projects level throughout the life of the PEACE III Programme. These evaluations will be conducted in line with the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, the requests of the PEACE III Monitoring Committee and the work of the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group comprises of Members and Advisors of the Monitoring Committee and relevant experts. It acts as a source of specialist advice to the Monitoring Committee and has the capacity to commission informative research and evaluations relevant to their area of interest. The Working Group also contributes to the overall monitoring and planning of actions arising from reviews and is an important contributor to the coordination of the Operational Programmes. All evaluations are presented to the Monitoring Committee and made available on the SEUPB website.

5.4 Evaluation at the Operational/Project Level

Every project in the PEACE III Programme is required to have a Post Project Evaluation (PPE). This evaluation equates to a final project report and a template for this is enclosed in Annex IV. PPE's should be concise reports and carried out by the Lead Partner. In accordance with The Northern Ireland Guide to Expenditure Appraisal and Evaluation (NIGEAE) the PPE should be completed within six months of the end of the project. Where possible the PPE should be led by an individual independent of the Project and Project Team. The Managing Authority recognises that this may not be possible for every project and therefore in these instances the Managing Authority will review all PPE's to provide the level of independence required. External or independent consultants should only be employed when it is necessary and offers value for money.

Where it is deemed necessary and in agreement with the Managing Authority, external and independent evaluators may be commissioned in relation to project level evaluation. The principle of proportionality should be applied in that the amount of funding allocated to evaluation should be proportional to the total amount of funding allocated to the overall project. Project budgets may be utilised for evaluation, where these are identified in Letters of Offer. It is envisaged that where external or independent evaluators are utilised that costs would normally be in the range of €3,000 to €6,000.

Where budgets have already been agreed in relation to evaluations that exceed the range listed above, Lead Partners should agree a budget re-profile with the JTS and reallocate funding towards front line services where possible. If contracts have already been agreed with evaluators then Lead Partners will be required to honour those contracts.

5.5 Process of Approval for External or Independent Evaluators

If it is deemed necessary to commission external or independent evaluators, then the Lead Partner is required to implement the following steps in the approval process:

Step 1: A project level evaluation budget will have been approved by the Steering Committee and detailed in the Letter of Offer.

Step 2: The Lead Partner will draft a Terms of Reference and forward it to their Case Officer for approval. The Case Officer will consult with the Managing Authority and NISRA to ensure a consistent approach to evaluation and the incorporation of the Aid for Peace process. In addition to this, the Managing Authority will ensure that there are questions which will be of interest to the Monitoring Committee and the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group, prior to the project proceeding to advertising or seeking quotes for the contract.

Step 3: When all relevant approvals have been granted, the Lead Partner may proceed to tendering for the appropriate external/independent evaluator.

Date of issue: 12 March 2010

Annex I

AIR Template 1 - Cumulative Breakdown of allocations of the Community contribution by category

Commission Reference No. - CCI 2007 CB 163 PO 047

Name of Programme – EU Programme for Peace and Reconciliation 2007-2013
Northern Ireland and the Border Region of Ireland

Date of the last Commission decision for the Operational Programme concerned:
6 November 2007

Combination of codes of dimension 1 to 5										
Dimension 1 Priority Theme		Dimension 2 Form of Finance		Dimension 3 Territory		Dimension 4 Economic Activity		Dimension 5 Location		Amount (€)
Code	Amount (€)	Code	Amount (€)	Code	Amount (€)		N/A		N/A	
85		01		08						
86		01		08						
Total										

*Figures for Technical Assistance expenditure are calculated using an indicative £/€ exchange rate of 1.45. This may vary from the actual rate used at drawdown.

Intervention Codes

Code	Dimension 1	Priority Theme (Description)
85	Preparation, implementation, monitoring and inspection	
86	Evaluation and studies; information and Communications	
Code	Dimension 2	Form of Finance (Description)
01	Non repayable aid	
Code	Dimension 3	Territory (Description)
08	Cross Border Co-Operation area	

Annex II

AIR Template 2 - Priority axes by source of funding (EUR)

	Expenditure paid out by the beneficiaries included in payment claims sent to the managing authority	Corresponding public contribution	Private expenditure	Expenditure paid by the body responsible for making payments to the beneficiaries	Total payments received from the Commission
Priority Axis 1 Reconciling Communities					
Of which ESF type expenditure					
Of which ERDF type expenditure					
Priority Axis 2 Contributing to a Shared Society					
Of which ESF type expenditure					
Of which ERDF type expenditure					
Priority Axis 3 Technical Assistance					
Of which ESF type expenditure					
Of which ERDF type expenditure					
Grand Total					
Total in transitional regions in the grand total					
Total non-transitional regions in the grand total					
ESF type expenditure in the grand total where the Operational Programme is co-financed by the ERDF					
ERDF type expenditure in the grand total where the Operational Programme is co-financed by the ESF					

Annex III

AIR Template 3 - Summary of Claims, Payments and Advances.

Date of Claim / Advance	Amount Claimed €	Paid €	Not Paid €

STRUCTURE OF THE POST PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT

1. Title page

- Report title, author and date

2. Contents page

3. Executive Summary

- A few paragraphs summarising the report, including key findings, strengths and weakness of the project and recommendations for future actions.

4. Information on the Project (Stages 1-3, Aid for Peace)

Include the following:

- A Brief history of the project and key stages in development of the project
- Assessment Of Need (Stage 1 Aid for Peace): Provide a brief description of the need for your project (as per application form and any other needs analysis undertaken during the lifetime of the project) focusing in particular on the peace building need.
- Relevance (Stage 2 Aid for Peace) Detail how your project is relevant to the identified need. Include a description of the projects main activities and intended objectives linking them to the overall theme and programme objectives.
- Risk Assessment (Stage 3 of Aid for Peace) Detail the conflict related risks identified for your project, highlighting if any of these has an impact on the outcome of the project (as per application form and any additional analysis undertaken during the lifetime of the project)

5. Impacts/Outcomes of the Project (Stage 4, Aid for Peace)

- Outline the key achievements and impact of the project by reporting against the targets, milestones and project plan as set out in the Letter of Offer. Has the project achieved what it set out to do? This should include benefits to project participant, benefits to the sector (where appropriate) and potential strategic benefits at a local or national level. Have any 'assumptions' been proved accurate (e.g. by comparing outturns with target outturns). Include an explanation of any over or under achievement of targets.
- Comment on the **Value for Money and Added Value of the project**. Could some or all of the outcomes have been achieved without the financial assistance received from Peace III? Could the identified outcome have been achieved at less cost or could a greater output have been delivered for the same cost?
- **Synergy**: How did the project complement other work being carried out in the area/sector? What new ways of working/ partnerships/ relationships have been created as a result of this project?
- Outline any learning points, strengths and weaknesses, good practice and methodologies which could be transferred to other projects

6. Sustainability

- Briefly outline the project's future, following funding. Will the project continue or has it reached a natural end? If it will continue, how will it be funded in the future?