



Evaluation of effects of EEA and Norway funds 2009 – 2014

Thematic evaluation CZ02 Biodiversity

**Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services &
Environmental Monitoring and Integrated
Planning Control &
Adaptation to Climate Change**

Background information

- 16th February – 20th March
- Evaluation team – HaskoningDHV internal staff + external experts

Name of the expert	Role in the evaluation team
Lenka Brown	Team leader
Lenka Žáková	Main evaluator
Linda Dvořáčková	Evaluator-junior
Petr Jedlička	Expert-specialist in the area of PR
Milan Svoboda	Expert-specialist in the area of biodiversity and ecosystem services
Martin Hanel	Expert-specialist in the area of adaptation for climate change
Jan Pokorný	Expert-specialist in the area of adaptation for climate change

Methodology - Criteria

Evaluation criterion	Evaluation Questions
Relevance	<p>To what extent is the programme relevant to the objectives of the donor states?</p> <p>To what extent is the programme relevant to the strategic documents and policy in the area or environment in the Czech Republic?</p> <p>To what extent is the programme relevant regarding the current developments in the Czech Republic?</p>
Effectiveness	<p>To what extent were the programme objectives achieved?</p> <p>To what extent were the project objectives achieved?</p>
Efficiency	<p>To what extent can the programme be considered as efficient in regards to the achieved outcomes and used resources?</p> <p>To what extent can the realized projects be considered as efficient in regards to the achieved outcomes and used resources?</p>
Impacts	<p>Which real impacts were achieved by the programme and projects, including the impacts which were not planned or expected?</p>
Sustainability	<p>To what extent can be the achieved outputs and outcomes of the programme and projects considered as sustainable?</p>

Specific evaluation question: To what extent was the programme influenced by shortening of programme period in regards to the achieved outcomes and used resources?

Methodology – Sampling and methods

Type of projects	Number of approved projects in the programme CZ02	Number of evaluated projects
PDP	1	1
OC	35	35
SGS	48	20
Total	84	56

Methods:

- **Desk research** - available documents and sources of data relevant for this evaluation
- **Interviews** (with stakeholders in person or via phone or skype or email – Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Environment, the Norwegian Environment Agency, the Financial Mechanism Office)
- **Comparative analyses** - data available from information system and documentation
- **CAWI survey** - electronic survey for beneficiaries (31 respondents)
- **Outcome Harvesting** – 3 projects
- **Synthesis** – formulation of answers to EQs based on above mentioned methods



Methodology - Clusters

Clusters	Relevant programme areas	Relevant projects	
Cluster A. ECOSYSTEM SERVICES			
A1. Ecosystem services – avoiding fragmentation	02 Biodiversity and ecosystem services	EHP-CZ02-OV-1-016-2014 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-021-2014 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-027-2015	EHP-CZ02-OV-1-028-2015 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-043-2015 EHP-CZ02-PDP-1-003-2014
A2. Ecosystem services – sectoral policies and legislation	02 Biodiversity and ecosystem services	EHP-CZ02-MGS-1-002-2014 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-012-2014	EHP-CZ02-OV-1-013-2014 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-026-2015
A3. Ecosystem services – awareness and education	02 Biodiversity and ecosystem services	EHP-CZ02-OV-1-006-2014 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-008-2014 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-011-2014 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-025-2015 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-031-2015	EHP-CZ02-OV-1-032-2015 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-034-2015 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-035-2015 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-037-2015 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-040-2015
A4. Ecosystem services – Natura 2000	02 Biodiversity and ecosystem services	EHP-CZ02-OV-1-007-2014 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-022-2015	EHP-CZ02-OV-1-023-2015 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-024-2015
CLUSTER B. ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING, PLANNING AND CONTROL			
B. Environmental monitoring, planning and control	03 Environmental monitoring and integrated planning and control	EHP-CZ02-OV-1-015-2014 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-018-2014 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-020-2014	EHP-CZ02-OV-1-029-2015 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-030-2015
CLUSTER C. CLIMATE CHANGE			
C1. Climate change – strategies and measures	07 Adaptation for climate change	EHP-CZ02-OV-1-009-2014 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-010-2014 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-017-2014	EHP-CZ02-OV-1-019-2014 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-036-2015 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-039-2015
C2. Climate change – information exchange	07 Adaptation for climate change	EHP-CZ02-OV-1-014-2014 EHP-CZ02-OV-1-033-2015	



Methodology – Scale and limits

Grade	Characteristics of the grade in case the criterion can be quantified	Characteristics of the grade in case the criterion cannot be quantified
Excellent	Criterion was fulfilled from 80 – 100%	Criterion is entirely fulfilled
Very good	Criterion was fulfilled from less than 80% but at least 60%	Criterion is fulfilled with minor issues
Good	Criterion was fulfilled from less than 60% but at least 40%	Criterion is fulfilled with major issues
Poor	Criterion was fulfilled from less than 40% but at least 20%	Criterion is fulfilled only partially but it is possible to define a set of additional measures for improvement
Unacceptable	Criterion was fulfilled from less than 20%	Criterion is not fulfilled or it is fulfilled only partially but it is not possible to define a set of additional measures for improvement

Limits:

many projects are still not fully finished – data not available
quite short time for the evaluation – risk of not reaching all the people



Conclusions - Relevance

- highly relevant for the Czech Republic and is fully in accordance with the most important national strategies
- relevance to donor states in international co-operation

Cluster	Relevance
A1 cluster Ecosystem services – avoiding fragmentation	Very good
A2 cluster Ecosystem services – policies and legislation	Very good
A3 cluster Ecosystem services – awareness and education	Very good
A4 cluster Ecosystem services – Natura 2000	Very good
B cluster Environmental monitoring, planning and control	Very good
C1 cluster Climate change – strategies and measures	Excellent
C2 cluster Climate change – information exchange	Very good
Programme CZ02	Very good



Conclusions - Effectiveness

- Preliminary results due to majority of projects unfinished
- Projects (5 out of 56) which were finished at the time of evaluation show excellent effectiveness
- Expected excellent results – also due to low target values of indicators

Cluster	Effectiveness
A1 cluster Ecosystem services – avoiding fragmentation	Unacceptable
A2 cluster Ecosystem services – policies and legislation	Excellent
A3 cluster Ecosystem services – awareness and education	Excellent
A4 cluster Ecosystem services – Natura 2000	Good
B cluster Environmental monitoring, planning and control	Good
C1 cluster Climate change – strategies and measures	Good
C2 cluster Climate change – information exchange	Good
Programme CZ02	Good



Conclusions - Efficiency

- Based on typical indicators for outcomes and outputs – problem with unfinished reporting – preliminary results
- Generally - efficiency at the output level is predominantly good while the efficiency at the outcome level varies more significantly from poor to excellent

Cluster	Efficiency – output	Efficiency - outcome
A1 cluster Ecosystem services – avoiding fragmentation	Good	Poor
A2 cluster Ecosystem services – policies and legislation	Good	Very good
A3 cluster Ecosystem services – awareness and education	Good	Poor
A4 cluster Ecosystem services – Natura 2000	Good	Good
B cluster Environmental monitoring, planning and control	Poor	Good
C1 cluster Climate change – strategies and measures	Good	Excellent
C2 cluster Climate change – information exchange	Good	Very good
Programme CZ02	Good	Good

Conclusions - Impacts

- Qualitative assessment based on Outcome Harvesting
- All **short-term effects** foreseen during the project preparations achieved
 - raising environmental awareness
 - setting of new databases
 - data infosystems and simplification of access to the data
 - new data and information were collected
 - new knowledge/outcomes based on data analyses were obtained
- **Long term effects** (spreading the information about new data resources availability and increasing usage of these data) are to be confirmed (or not confirmed) in the future.
- **Unexpected effects**
 - Outcomes used also for educational purposes
 - publishing activity based on new data gathering and analysing was possible
 - new partnerships and collaborations were established
 - outcomes have potential to be used as argument for policy-making at regional and national level



Conclusions - Sustainability

- at this stage of programme realization assessment based only on the commitments of project promoters described in the project applications
- the way the sustainability is planned to be ensured at the level of individual projects differ significantly

Cluster	Sustainability
A1 cluster Ecosystem services – avoiding fragmentation	Very good
A2 cluster Ecosystem services – policies and legislation	Poor
A3 cluster Ecosystem services – awareness and education	Excellent
A4 cluster Ecosystem services – Natura 2000	Very good
B cluster Environmental monitoring, planning and control	Very good
C1 cluster Climate change – strategies and measures	Good
C2 cluster Climate change – information exchange	Very good
Programme CZ02	Very good



Conclusion - SEQ

- ***EQ: To what extent was the programme influenced by shortening of programme period in regards to the achieved outcomes and used resources?***
- The programme shortening had negative impact on both the outcomes achieved and resources used
 - Some of the projects did not apply - most probably high quality projects were lost due to the short programme period.
 - 68% of respondents in survey declared negative effects on the outcomes of their projects
 - No appropriate adjustment of amount of controls (and reporting)
 - Later-on prolongation with no rise in project budgets had little effect on the project outcomes and in some cases it caused lack of financial resources for project management
 - 52% of respondents in the survey claimed, that the amount of resources used by their project was effected by shortening of programme period. Typically, longer period would result in higher budget requirements.
 - Outcome harvesting revealed these possible effects of programme shortening on the projects:
 - outcomes related to activities aimed at target groups of professional and general public would be better (publicity, campaigns etc.)
 - stressful working conditions for project team (including working extra hours with no refundation)
 - part of the budget returned at the end due to lacking time to use the money efficiently
 - outsourcing some of the project activities to external companies
 - knowledge about the time pressure negatively effected the position of the project team in negotiations with third parties.



Recommendations

No.	Recommendation	Significance	Owner
1	Specify the programme indicators and provide their detail definition including examples of applicable outputs (to ensure common understanding and proper targeting)	High	Programme stakeholders involved in the preparation of new programme
2	Based on experience from previous EEA grants programme periods and other grant schemes, predefine set of project indicators with detailed definition to ensure their broad common understanding	High	Programme stakeholders involved in the preparation of new programme
3	Ensure longer programme period with no changes during implementation, allowing higher quality projects to apply for support and more reliable and better quality project outcomes achievement (including their further dissemination and popularization)	High	Programme stakeholders involved in the preparation of new programme
4	Ensure continuity in programme areas (as they are still relevant) to achieve synergic effects of project outcomes	High	Programme stakeholders involved in the preparation of new programme
5	Continue the support of monitoring and data collection activities	Medium	Programme stakeholders involved in the preparation of new programme

Recommendations

No.	Recommendation	Significance	Owner
6	Consider ensuring of the post-implementation budget chapter for further dissemination of project outcomes among target groups	Medium	Programme stakeholders involved in the preparation of new programme
7	Ensure an ex-post evaluation of CZ02 programme in two years after the programme is finished	Medium	Ministry of Finance of the Czech Republic
8	The commitments for sustainability should be taken into consideration more during the assessment of the project applications	High	Programme stakeholders involved in the preparation of new programme
9	The practical guideline related to sustainability should be prepared for the project promoters	High	Ministry of Finance of the Czech Republic in cooperation with Ministry of Environment
10	Ensure longer realization period for thematic evaluations in the area of effects of EEA and Norway grants	High	Ministry of Finance of the Czech Republic



Thank you for your attention!

Mgr. Lenka Žáková
lenka.zakova@rhdhv.com





































































