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Cohesion Policy in the Czech Republic: some basic facts...

- Czech allocation = 26.7 billion EUR (EU-sources).
- National co-financing of 15% = 5 billion EUR.
- Main areas of investments: transport, environmental issues, business support and science and research support.
- The Czech Republic has the 4th highest allocation.
- Highest allocation per head.
- High absorption capacity in all OPs (120% - 360% more application in average for every call for proposal).
- High attention of public and media to the implementation of SF and CF.

**NATIONAL STRATEGIC REFERENCE FRAMEWORK**

- **Strategic objective I**
  - Competitive Czech Economy
  - OP Enterprise and Innovation: 11.39%
    - MA: Ministry of Industry and Trade
    - IB: 2x
  - OP Research and Development for Innovations: 7.76%
    - MA: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports
    - IB: -

- **Strategic objective II**
  - Open, Flexible and Cohesive Society
  - OP Human Resources and Employment: 6.88%
    - MA: Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs
    - IB: 4x
  - OP Education for Competitiveness: 6.85%
    - MA: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports
    - IB: 13x
  - OP Prague – Adaptability: 0.40%
    - MA: Capital City of Prague
    - IB: -

- **Strategic objective III**
  - Attractive Environment
  - OP Transport: 21.63%
    - MA: Ministry of Transport
    - IB: 1x
  - OP Environment: 18.42%
    - MA: Ministry of the Environment
    - IB: 1x

- **Strategic objective IV**
  - Balanced Development of Territory
  - 7 x Regional OP: 17.46%
    - MA: 7x Regional Councils
    - IB: -
  - OP Prague-Competitiveness: 0.90%
    - MA: Capital City of Prague
    - IB: -
  - Integrated OP: 5.93%
    - MA: Ministry of Regional Development
    - IB: 5x
### Convergence Objective Allocation 2007 – 2013 (mil CZK)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>168 163.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>88 346.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>53 251.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Interventions</td>
<td>7 198.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Competitiveness and Employment Objective</td>
<td>9 996.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Territorial Cooperation</td>
<td>5 +1 +1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF EXISTING LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

„Functioning system“ – view of NCA
- The established framework is fully functioning: MA OP – NCA – EC
- Experiences from programming period 2004 – 2006
- Problematic issues and barriers continuously solved
- Sufficient methodological materials
- System of risk management
- Fully functioning monitoring system
NSRF Evaluation Plans (EP)  
part of Evaluation System 2007-2013

NCA – coordination and methodological role in evaluation and EP preparation

- Working group for evaluation (NSRF, MA)
- Model of EP (identic content)
- NCA provides advice to MA in relation to EP
- Purpose and content of EP is instructed within the evaluation training (Training system of the Implementation System staff)

Evaluation plans of MA (TOPs, ROPs)

- Evaluation plans 2007-2013 and annual EP
- Identic content of EP
- Approval of EP (by Monitoring Committee)
- Subject of actualisation annually or due to ad hoc corrections of objectives of some evaluations
- EP are not always publicly accessible
- Progress in design of evaluations and the methodologies applied
- Only in the last years - focus on evaluation of results of OP interventions, on objectives’ achievements, effectiveness, fund’s contribution...
EP Content

- Purpose of EP
- Subjects involved in the process of evaluation (RO, WGs, MC, EC)
- Forms and types of evaluations
  - EX-ANTE, STRATEGIC, OPERATIONAL (absorption capacity, implementation/monitoring systems, indicators, annual evaluations, progress evaluations)
  - AD HOC EVALUATIONS
- Budget
- Evaluation capacity strengthening
- Some EP include ‘List of evaluations conducted’
- Plan for the next year and the evaluation terminology

Positive experience

- Continuous development of EPs
- Instructive use of evaluation plans (EP)
- Cooperation of subjects in evaluation
- Exchange of experiences within the WGs
- Use of Standards of the Czech Evaluation Society
- Presentation of evaluation findings to the stakeholders becomes part of evaluations
- Follow-up of evaluation recommendations (case of ESF)
- Involvement of strategic analyses regarding 2014-2020 and etc.
Lessons learned/weaknesses (out of many)

• Commissioning and implementation of ‘big’ evaluations on NSRF level hasn’t result well (aggregation of OP data)
• Low quality of evaluations
  • Quality and use of ad hoc evaluations is poorer vs. planned
  • Efforts of the Czech Evaluation Society – peer review of evaluations including ToR
• Difficulties with procurement (budget allocation versus budget contracted)
• Week focus of evaluations on getting evidence about effects of the interventions /achievements of the programme’ objectives
  ➢ evaluation specification should be prepared more carefully, well in advance and the quality of outputs rigorously maintained!!!!!!!!!

The main message

We have had the implementation + evaluation systems fully operational!
We have used the evaluation plans!
We have been conducting evaluations!

BUT

We have disbursed 47% of SF allocation only!!

AND

We do not know what has been achieved!
Thank you for your attention!
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