

### List of implemented changes – comments Ex-ante evaluation July 2014

Date	Comment Ex-ante evaluation OP 2.0	Implemented change OP 3.0
31-07-2014	<b>Involvement of stakeholders and national administrations</b>	
31-07-2014	The involvement of stakeholders seems to have raised a few concerns on procedural issues which need to be addressed when defining the interventions.	<b>Accepted.</b> The concerns on procedural issues raised by the stakeholders will be reflected during the Programme implementation stage.
31-07-2014	<b>Internal coherence</b>	
31-07-2014	Good coherence among SOs though their influence on each other could be strengthened. Actions should be foreseen and defined taking advantage of the envisaged expected results so as to better define the appropriate interventions/typologies of actions	<b>Accepted.</b> The text was adjusted accordingly.
31-07-2014	A merging of SO 2.1 and 2.2 in order to avoid possible overlapping and unclear accountability;	<b>Not accepted.</b> The proposed intervention logic, including Thematic priorities, Priority axes and Specific objectives was broadly discussed during the public consultation stage and adopted by the Joint working group with consensus. The decisions of the JWG could not be reconsidered at this stage.
31-07-2014	Reconsider the definition of SO 3.1 for empowering its link with other SOs.	<b>Not accepted.</b> There is probably a technical mistake. There are no other SOs under Priority axis 3.
31-07-2014	Some examples of actions appear to be potentially overlapping to each other, though they are quite cross cutting. It would be preferable to reconsider their merging in some cases. A tendency to identify actions umbrella in which specific interventions can be envisaged should therefore be appreciated.	<b>Accepted.</b> The text was adjusted accordingly.
31-07-2014	The examples of actions are all intensively coherent with the SO. Although this confirms the forcefulness of the choice made so far, the Evaluator suggests to further define the actions so as to make the picture of the IL fully clear and consistent with the financial allocation.	<b>Accepted.</b> The text was adjusted accordingly.
31-07-2014	<b>Horizontal principles</b>	
31-07-2014	The Programme appear to cope with the principles though they could be better defined in the SO and in the selected actions	<b>Accepted.</b>
31-07-2014	As for the horizontal principles, the Evaluator, though considers satisfactory the existing approach of the OP as it is, suggests to further develop them into both actions' and SOs' definition and/or aims.	<b>Accepted.</b> The horizontal priorities have been taken into consideration at the level of activities and target groups and will be further developed during the Programme implementation stage. Monitoring on the achievements will be provided through the progress and annual implementation reports.
31-07-2014	<b>Indicators, monitoring and evaluation</b>	
31-07-2014	The suggestion of resorting only to quantitative data is very appealing though challenging. A common understanding of the data (indicators) to be monitored should, therefore be mandatory.	<b>Accepted.</b> Baselines for quantitative results have been established on the basis of data from statistical data, information from the 2007-

Date	Comment Ex-ante evaluation OP 2.0	Implemented change OP 3.0
	<p>The results indicators seem to be better defined since their first definition, though some room for improvement seems still existing.</p> <p>It appears more appropriate a monitoring which is not too ambitious (e.g. yearly) and that is in any case according with the state of implementation of the actions;</p> <p>It appears important to underline that it is essential to have a deep look into the final budget allocation for each SO. The final figures would surely enable a sound assessment not only of baseline and target values but also of the relevance of the results identified.</p>	<p>2013 programming period as well as from PHARE/CARDS programmes.</p> <p>As regards the target values they have been identified based on an assessment of the available budget under each SO.</p> <p>In case of qualitative indicators, surveys are foreseen and baselines and target values will be further established.</p> <p>Output indicators are established on the basis of the indicative activities that are foreseen under each SO as well as on the past experience and budget allocation.</p> <p>Strategic projects are envisaged as an option that is a matter of approval by the Joint Monitoring Committee. Detailed requirements, scope and budget have to be further discussed and adopted by the JMC.</p>
31-07-2014	<p>It is essential to quantify as soonest the baseline so as to define realistic target for the results.</p> <p>Output indicators targets, though apparently in line with past experience and financial allocation, need more clarification as far as the methodology for their identification is concerned. Finally more info on strategic projects could be useful for a efficient assessment of those quantification</p>	
31-07-2014	Indicators to be broken down by gender, where possible	<b>Accepted.</b>
31-07-2014	<b>Administrative capacity, data collection procedure and evaluation</b>	
31-07-2014	<p>The indicative list of members of the JMC shall identify more precisely which are the institutions and organizations which will take part in the work of the body.</p> <p>The number of members of the JMC is rather high, and this can affect the efficiency of its functioning in general and of decision making process in particular.</p> <p>It could be considered a selection of the most relevant types of organizations, simplifying the structure of the JMC, ensuring in the meanwhile that all relevant institutions and organizations are represented.</p>	<b>Accepted.</b>
31-07-2014	The Programme may use the possibility of involving more bodies and/or individual experts in the work of the JMC with advisory role, since they can provide valuable input for the programme coordination	<b>Accepted.</b>
31-07-2014	The set up and functionality of the management and control system should be better described	<b>Accepted.</b> The text in chapter 5 is further developed. Due to limitation in the number of characters in the OP template, the comprehensive description will be provided for the compliance assessment that will be carried out by the Audit Authority after programme approval.
31-07-2014	Procedures of establishing, role and tasks of the Secretariat could be stressed	<b>Accepted.</b> The recommendation is reflected in the latest version of the OP.
31-07-2014	The role and tasks of the National Authority should be described and explained	<b>Accepted.</b> The recommendation is reflected in the latest version of the OP.
31-07-2014	A brief description of the organization of the most important programme management procedures shall be included in order to have an overview of the system.	<b>Accepted.</b> The text in chapter 5 is further developed. Due to limitation in the number of characters in the OP template, the

Date	Comment Ex-ante evaluation OP 2.0	Implemented change OP 3.0
		comprehensive description will be provided for the compliance assessment that will be carried out by the Audit Authority after programme approval.
31-07-2014	The description of the management and control system is missing	<b>Not accepted.</b> The management and control system is described in its general aspects, covering the main implementation and control principles. Due to limitation in the number of characters in the OP template, the comprehensive description will be provided for the compliance assessment that will be carried out by the Audit Authority after programme approval.
31-07-2014	Considering outcomes of the evaluation of 2007-2013 programming period	<b>Accepted.</b> The outcomes of the evaluation of 2007-2013 programming period were taken into consideration.
31-07-2014	Considerations about the guiding principles for the selection of operations	<b>Accepted.</b> The guiding principles for the selection of operations were provided in section 5.
31-07-2014	The selection criteria for Strategic Projects makes general comments on the effects envisaged by the respective initiatives; more detailed/clearer criteria should have been selected.	<b>Accepted.</b> The guiding principles for the selection criteria for strategic projects were provided in section 5.