Příloha EN_D_P_1

Příručka
pro evaluátory průběžné evaluace
prioritních os 1 a 2
(Anglická verze)

Verze č.	Účinnost od	Zpracoval		Ověřil		Schválil	
		Jméno	Podpis	Jméno	Podpis	Jméno	Podpis
2.0	1. 8. 2012	Mgr. Steven O´Connor, MSc		Ing. Jan Kříž		Ing. Michal Zaorálek	

Tato verze příručky byla hromadně schválena jako součást OM OP VaVpI, verze 8.0.

Příloha Operačního manuálu OP VaVpI

MINISTERSTVO ŠKOLSTVÍ, MLÁDEŽE A TĚLOVÝCHOVY

EVROPSKÁ UNIE
EVROPSKÝ FOND PRO REGIONÁLNÍ ROZVOJ
INVESTICE DO VAŠÍ BUDOUCNOSTI

2007–13
OP Výzkum a vývoj
pro inovace

Contents

1. Introduction

The evaluation process is conducted on the basis of rules contained in the Operating manual of the Operational Programme Research and Development for Innovation (OP RDI) and its annexes. This manual outlines the process of evaluation of individual projects implemented under priority axes (PA) 1 and 2 of the OP RDI. The management of the evaluation process falls within the competence of the Managing Authority (MA) of OP RDI.

The methodological documentation for this evaluation was devised by officials of the OP RDI in cooperation with external experts and has been approved by the Director General of Section IV/1 of the Ministry for Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) of the Czech Republic.

Hierarchy of objectives

Purpose
    To ensure that projects funded under PA 1 & 2 of OP RDI are better managed and thus more likely to achieve their planned objectives

Results and expected impacts
- MA senior management's and PA1&2 project management teams's better able to implement their projects
- Improved awareness of benefits of evaluation among R&D community
- Greater involvement of key MA staff in evaluation leading to a wider appreciation of its importance as a management tool

Activities
- Development/piloting of methodology
- Self assessment

- Selection of expert teams
- External evaluation
- Quality control of evaluations
- De-briefing of evaluations
- Thematic focus groups
- Analysis of outputs/drafting of synthesis report

Overview of the evaluation exercise

Evaluand
- OP RDI PA 1 projects
- OP RDI PA 2 projects

Methodology

This will be an ongoing/interim/mid-term type evaluation with a strong *peer review* component. The method combines programme performance information (provided to the experts) with the many years of cumulative experience of the subject-matter held by the external evaluation experts. It focuses their expertise and experience towards answering key questions about the projects supported under PA 1&2 of the OP RDI. While information from other sources, including other methods of evaluation, may provide influential evidence, the ultimate conclusions about performance are based on the judgment of the experts[1].

The evaluation exercise will be based around a set of evaluation questions using the following approach:
- An evaluation methodology/framework containing standardised questions for all projects (see Annexes 2 and 3)
- A set of bespoke evaluation questions developed separately for each project.

EUROPEAN UNION

INVESTING IN YOUR FUTURE

OP Research and
Development for Innovation

The first part (basic evaluation framework) will be developed by the staff of the MA OP RDI's Evaluation Unit. The second part (bespoke questions) will be developed by the team of evaluation experts with inputs from the MA staff ahead of each individual project evaluation. These questions represent the structure upon which the the evaluation report will be prepared. In addition each beneficiary will draft a self-assessment report prior to their project's evaluation, which will be one of the main source documents for the evaluation. More on the methodology for the evaluation exercise can be found in section 2.

<u>Outputs</u>

The evaluation exercise will generate the following outputs:

- Self assessment report developed by project beneficiary for each evaluated project
- External evaluation report (including its de-briefing) for each project
- Focus group reports on selected topics (maximum 5 groups)
- Synthesis report

<u>Main users of evaluation results:</u>

- Management and research staff of research centres – PA 1&2
- Other R&D/management experts in the wider R&D/management community
- Managing Authority OP RDI
- MEYS
- The R&D Council
- European Commission

2. Evaluation Approach

i.   General Remarks

The project evaluation has three distinct elements. The first element evaluates the current state of project implementation. The second assesses the prospects for the project achieving its planned objectives and its sustainability. The final element comprises the evaluators'

recommendations for future action, both for the project beneficiary as well as the MA.

The areas to be evaluated are supplemented by a series of guidance questions. Their purpose is to provide the maximum possible consistency between the approach of the evaluator and that of the beneficiaries[2], as well as between the evaluators themselves. These questions are not in the form of 'sub-criteria' serving individual assessments, but rather they aim to ensure that the evaluators cover all principal aspects of the project under assessment. Not every guidance question (or indeed answer to it) carries the same importance for every project – their purpose is to encourage the evaluators to assess the project from all relevant angles and ultimately provide an evaluation that is both detailed and comprehensive.

The evaluation exercise will be conducted mainly in English. All key documents, such as the self-assessment report, submitted to the evaluators will be in English, while the on-site mission is expected to be carried out using English as the principle language of communication. The de-briefing meeting may be conducted in Czech depending on which expert (national or international) leads the event.

ii.   Detailed Description of the Evaluation Process

The objective of the evaluation is to assess the actual state of project delivery for the purpose of improving its implementation and to enable learning. The evaluation itself will be carried out by external experts (see above). In the first phase of the evaluation each expert will conduct preparatory work individually based on documentation submitted to him/her by the Evaluation Unit of the MA OP RDI and the project beneficiary (principally the self-assessment report). This will be followed by a site visit conducted by the evaluation team to verify the information already provided as well as to gain additional insights of the project's status and performance.

Within two weeks of the conclusion of the evaluation mission the expert team will submit

___

[2] Beneficiaries will provide their own 'self-assessment report' of their project that will serve as one of the key documents used by the external evaluators for their own evaluation. It will largely follow the same format as that outlined in this document.

their evaluation report, which should correspond to the evaluation questions given in Annex 2. This phase of the evaluation will be completed by a de-briefing and presentation of the evaluation report by at least one member of the evaluation team, with the participation of representatives of the beneficiary and MA OP RDI.

The evaluation process is described in the following section. It is augmented by a summary table which provides an overview of the steps in the process, the bodies responsible for their action and the main outputs of the individual stages.

Step A: Individual preparation for the evaluation

Three months prior to the commencement of the on-site evaluation phase (evaluation mission) the beneficiary will be notified by the Evaluation Unit of the the MA OP RDI that their project is to be the subject of evaluation. This will be followed up by a visit of MA representatives to the beneficiary to explain the purpose of the evaluation and gain the beneficiary's support for the exercise. Once the visit is completed, the beneficiary will be provided with the template of the self-assessment report by the MA and will be expected to commence its drafting immediately thereafter. This report should be drafted in English (see Annex 3 for copy of report template). The beneficiary returns the completed report to the MA OP RDI within six weeks of receiving the template.[3] The purpose of the self-assessment report is to provide detailed information on the performance of the project from the perspective of implementer (the beneficiary).

The self-assessment report along with the project's Technical Annex will be provided to the members of the evaluation team before the start of the actual evaluation – it will serve as the base document for the evaluators. In addition to this, the evaluation team may, as necessary, request further project-specific documentation from the MA Evaluation Unit. Additional documentation may include the project's monitoring reports and evaluation reports from the project selection process or other relevant documents.

Based on this documentation the evaluators will prepare a list of indicative 'bespoke' evaluation questions and submit them to the MA OP RDI at least two weeks prior to the

---

evaluation mission. This will be based around the evaluation questions contained in the evaluator's report template (see Annex 2), but should target themes that the evaluators judge to be key, based on the information provided and also on their expert knowledge of the sector or project type. Once received, the MA OP RDI may choose to edit the list of questions or add further points for consideration. The MA will submit the final list of evaluation questions to the members of the evaluation team no later than one week before the start of the evaluation mission.

Step B: Evaluation Mission (On-site visit)

Prior to the actual on-site visit (ideally the evening before its start), the evaluation team and representative(s) of the MA OP RDI Evaluation Unit will meet to discuss the evaluation mission and agree on a strategy for its conducting. This will cover aspects related to the roles of the individual evaluators, the MA representatives, logistical considerations etc.

The actual evaluation at the location of the project's implementation (on-site visit) starts with a meeting of the evaluation team with the management of the project (beneficiary) and a presentation of both the evaluation team and the project under evaluation. This will be followed by a tour of the facilities/laboratories of the R&D centre with the assistance of project staff, and an in-depth inspection of the site. The mission should primarily include individual visits of selected locations where the project is being implemented, interviews or discussion with various levels of employees (centre managers, scientists and researchers both senior and junior, PhD students, users etc.). The evaluation mission will be concluded by a short pre-briefing session with the management of the beneficiary institution to present them with their preliminary findings. The evaluation mission has been allocated a maximum of three calendar days from start to finish.

Step C: Drafting of the evaluation report

Upon completion of the evaluation mission, the evaluation team will be required to draft the evaluation report. They should do this in close cooperation with each other and in a consensual manner. The evaluation team will have a lead evaluator – the rapporteur – who will be appointed by the MA OP RDI in the preparatory phase of the evaluation and be

responsible for the delivery of the final report as well as all direct communication with the MA OP RDI. The rapporteur should submit the draft report to the Evaluation Unit of the MA OP RDI within two weeks of the end of the evaluation mission. The MA will then have 2 weeks to conduct its own internal quality control on the draft report. The MA will also provide the beneficiary with the draft evaluation report, for commenting on its factual aspects. This will run concurrently with the MA's own quality control, with the beneficiary providing his comments to the MA within 1 week of receiving the draft report. The MA will then prepare a set of consolidated comments in writing and return them to the evaluation team's rapporteur for the team's consideration and incorporation into the final report. The evaluators then have one week to incorporate the comments of the MA into the draft report and re-submit it to the Evaluation Unit of the MA OP RDI.

The commenting process is considered complete once the relevant MA OP RDI staff member confirms to the evaluators that the report meets the MA's required quality control standards.

Once the commenting process is complete the final version of the report will be sent to the beneficiary as well as other key personnel of the MA. This report is the main output of the evaluation process.

Step D: Presentation and debriefing

The presentation and de-briefing of the evaluation report takes place once the final version of the report has been approved by the MA. This should be done as soon as is practicable for all key parties. The presentation of findings is delivered by a member of the evaluation team – either its rapporteur or a the national expert (the Czech evaluator) - with the assistance of staff of the Evaluation Unit of the MA. The debriefing that follows the presentation provides a forum for a detailed discussion on the evaluation's main conclusions, as well as an opportunity to reach agreement on the acceptance and implementation of recommendations contained in the report. Participants of this event are representatives of the beneficiary (the management team of the project/centre), relevant staff of the MA OP RDI, as well as other key stakeholders as judged necessary. The outcomes of the de-briefing

will be recorded by staff of the Evaluation Unit MA OP RDI and the final report updated accordingly.

Step E: Follow-up

Upon completion of the project evaluation process, the relevant project manager from the MA will, as part of his/her standard monitoring responsibilities, conduct a site visit to check the project's performance. This monitoring visit should inter alia focus on issues that have been identified as important by the evaluation process. In particular the project manager should check the status of any actions that should have been taken based on recommendations from the report. This follow-up should happen between 6-9 months after the evaluation's completion .

Step F: Focus groups

In addition to the standard project evaluation, a series of up to five focus groups will be run covering themes of particular importance or relevance to the programme. The groups will be composed of up to 8 members, who will be representatives of beneficiary projects, other key stakeholders and (potentially) international experts. The precise format of the groups as well as their themes will be defined by staff from the MA in the first part of the evaluation exercise. The focus groups will be run in the second half of the evaluation process. A list of indicative themes is given below (please note that these will be specified in the course of the exercise).

- Mission and growth of the Centres
- Recruitment
- Professional growth/coaching, career development
- Cooperation with the application sphere
- Management of knowhow and intellectual property
- Business and pricing policy
- Management of core facilities

Step G: Synthesis of evaluations

A strategic synthesis of the findings will be produced at the end of the evaluation exercise. This will be done by relevant MA staff in collaboration with their external advisers. The synthesis report will capture the main findings of the individual reports, identify recurring issues and common themes evident in them and offer insights at priority axis level to decision makers, in particular the OP monitoring committee, senior managers at the MA and the R&D Council.

Evaluation Process – Summary Table

The following table lay out the tasks, timelines and responsibilities related to the evaluation process.[4]

Step	Activity	Output	Week	Responsible Party
Preparatory phase				
1	Notification to beneficiary of evaluation exercise Visit to beneficiary	Agreed date with beneficiary for start of evaluation process	0	MA
2	Provision of the self-assessment report (SAR) template to the beneficiary	Beneficiary equipped to prepare SAR	1	MA
3	Selection and contracting of evaluation team	Contracted team of experts of evaluation	1-10	MA[5]
4	Submission of self assessment report to MA	SAR	8	Beneficiary
5	Quality control of SAR	SAR usable for the purposes of the evaluation	9-10	MA, Beneficiary (where revisions are necessary)
6	Submission of evaluation report template, SAR and other supporting documents to the evaluators	Evaluators equipped with all base information needed to conduct evaluation	10	MA
7	Submission of indicative evaluation questions and list of interviewees to the MA	Key interview questions agreed by MA	12	Evaluators
8	Review and finalisation of indicative evaluation questions and list of interviewees		13	MA
9	Submission of finalised evaluation questions and interview list to the evaluators	Finalised evaluation questions and interview list	13	MA
	Evaluation mission			
10	Pre-briefing on-site between evaluation team and beneficiary	Evaluation mission completed	14 Day 1	Evaluators, beneficiary
11	Full site visit			
12	Interviews with key parties		14 Day 2/3	Evaluators
13	Pre-briefing with representatives of the beneficiary/MA[6]		14 Day 2/3	Evaluators

---

[4] The timeline given in the table is indicative only. Nevertheless, the expectation is that the evaluation process will follow the milestones as closely as practically possible. Some deadlines in the timetable (relating to the performance of the evaluators) are mandatory. These are the submission of the draft evaluation questions, draft report and final report.

[5] The MA may consult with the beneficiary on the final composition of the evaluation team to ensure their suitability for the assignment.

[6] Representatives of the MA will participate in the evaluation mission as observers and management support

	Reporting/feedback phase			
14	Drafting and submission of draft evaluation report to the MA	Draft evaluation report	15,16	Evaluators
15	Circulation of draft report to beneficiary for comments		16	MA
16	Quality control and commenting of draft report by the MA; Commenting by the beneficiary	Comments and proposed revisions to the draft report submitted to evaluators within 2 weeks of its reception.	17, 18	MA, beneficiaries
17	Submission of comments on the draft report from the MA and beneficiaries to the evaluators		18	MA
18	Integration of comments into final report	Final evaluation report	19	Evaluators
19	Approval of the final report	Approved evaluation report	20, 21	MA
20	De-briefing exercise	Report debriefed, recommendations discussed and approved.	24	Evaluators, MA

Timing

The projects will be evaluated one by one from the start of 2012 till the end of 2015. The synthesis report will be started in the 3rd quarter 2015. The evaluation sequence and exact dates will be determined according to the status of individual projects. An indicative timetable for the whole evaluation exercise is given below.

Indicative timeframe

Pilot testing & Start-up	2st Quarter 2012
Fine-tuning of methodology	2nd – 3rd Quarter 2012
Evaluation of research centres- PA 1 & 2	2nd Qtr 2012 – 3rd Qtr 2015
Production of synthesis report	End of October 2015

3. Role of Evaluators and Qualification Requirements

Candidates for the position of evaluator can register their interest in two ways; either by replying to a call for registration (issued by the MA of OP RDI) in the MA's Database of External Evaluators accessible on the MEYS's website or; by replying to an individual direct request from the MA RDI. In order to be included in the list of evaluators, candidates must meet the qualification requirements set out in the relevant call for registration of evaluators, which is attached as Annex 1 of this manual (basic eligibility requirements for evaluators). The selection of experts will follow the process outlined in Annex 1B.

The role of the evaluators is to conduct interim evaluations of projects implemented under PA 1 & 2 of the OP RDI, with the aim of assessing the actual state of project implementation, the extent to which the projects are meeting their objectives, and to propose measures that will ensure the projects' effective delivery. This is to be done in close cooperation with the beneficiaries of OP RDI and representatives of the MA OP RDI.

The evaluation teams will be made up of both international and local experts. Their selection will be based on the thematic focus of the project to be evaluated. The experts will be taken from the OP RDI database of experts and the call for their selection will take place in advance of the evaluation's commencement.

Up to three experts (1-2 international and 1 local) will be in the evaluation team. The size and composition of the teams will be selected on a project-by-project basis to ensure an optimal skills/expertise match. One of the evaluators will be selected as the lead evaluator. This evaluator will act as the rapporteur for the evaluation and will be responsible for the delivery of the final report, as well as all direct communication with the MA OP RDI.

The evaluators will assess the projects in their personal capacity, not as representatives of their employers, their state, or any other entity. The evaluators are expected to be independent, impartial and objective, and that they will maintain a professional approach throughout the course of the evaluation process.

Staff from the MA responsible for this evaluation exercise will also be actively involved in the evaluation exercise (see chapter 4 for more on the role of the MA OP RDI).

Before commencing their assignment the evaluators must confirm by signature their impartiality, as well as their acceptance of valid conditions of confidentiality. The evaluator is then bound by these conditions for the full period of the evaluation. The declaration covering impartiality and confidentiality is attached as Annex 4 of this manual.

After individual preparation, the evaluator will, as part of an evaluation team, conduct a comprehensive evaluation of a selected project or projects. This will be done principally in the form of an evaluation mission to the project in question. The evaluators should, on the basis of the information gathered, produce a joint evaluation report, which is the principal output of the evaluation exercise. Furthermore, the evaluators will be required to deliver a presentation of the evaluation results to the key evaluation parties (principally the beneficiary and MA OP RDI). This will be done either at the MA offices or at another pre-defined location. Evaluators may be requested to provide additional inputs into the drafting or finalisation of the evaluation report to ensure that it meets the required quality standards.

General guidance for evaluators when preparing the evaluation report (see also Annex 2 'Template for Evaluators' Report')

- Always ensure that findings and conclusions are substantiated and based on evidence.

- The evaluation report should be of appropriate length i.e. of sufficient length to cover all required areas of the evaluation without being so long as to undermine its readability.

- The evaluation should be based on the information received in documentary form and in the course of the evaluation mission. Any other forms of speculation or opinions that cannot be verified should not be considered by the evaluators or included in the report.

- The report should contain a series of recommendations that can be utilised in the course of further cooperation between the MA OP RDI and the beneficiary. These recommendations should be very clear and concrete. They should not be retrospective i.e. what should have been done better at some point in the past. They should be clearly focused to the future, and outline specific measures that address issues of importance identified in the report findings. The recommendations should be presented as a

separate section in the evaluation report.

- The evaluators should not be unduly cautious in their conclusions and recommendations. If there are issues of concern that need to be addressed, the evaluators should feel free to raise them in their report and propose solutions (even potentially radical ones) in their recommendations.

4. The Role of the OP RDI Managing Authority

The MA OP RDI is responsible for the delivery of an impartial assessment of each individual project in line with the methodological documentation approved by the Director General of Section IV/1 of the MEYS. Staff of the MA OP RDI will be directly involved in the evaluation process. Their role will be to support and supervise the evaluation experts through the evaluation process, provide methodological guidance and offer practical advice and support throughout their period of engagement. They will also be responsible for the provision of information required by the evaluation team. In short, they will facilitate the smooth and time-effective implementation of the evaluation process. Finally, they will ensure the security of information relating to the evaluated projects.

Selected staff of the MA OP RDI or individuals appointed by them can participate in the evaluation exercise as observers. However, staff of the MA are in no way permitted to influence the opinions of the independent evaluations, nor are they allowed to take particular standpoint vis-a-vis individual projects.

Annex 1: Basic Eligibility Requirements and Selection Procedure for Evaluators

A: Evaluation team

The evaluation teams will be made up of both international and local experts. Their selection will be based on the <u>thematic focus of the project to be evaluated</u>. The process for their selection is outlined in section B of this annex.

Up to three experts (1-2 international and 1 local) will be in the evaluation team, one of which will be appointed as lead evaluator. The actual size and composition of the teams will be selected on a project-by-project basis to ensure an optimal skills/expertise match.

Key eligibility requirements for experts:
Experts are expected to meet all these criteria:

International experts
1. Experience in the management of a research centre i.e. occupying a senior or middle management function (minimum 5 years)
2. Experience evaluating research and development projects[7] and/or;Experience evaluating research organisations (minimum 3 years)
3. Experience with research and innovation activity in the given area of expertise, relevant to the project(s) to be evaluated (minimum 5 years)

National experts
1. Experience with research and innovation activity in the given area of expertise, relevant to the project(s) to be evaluated (minimum 5 years)
2. Experience in the management of a research centre i.e. occupying a senior or middle management function (minimum 3 years) or experience of evaluating

---

research and development projects or experience evaluating research organisations (in either case a minimum 3 years)

All experts shall submit their CV together with a sworn affidavit confirming the accuracy of the provided information and fulfilment of the eligibility requirements.

B: Selection Process for External Evaluators

Evaluation Process

The evaluation of projects will be done on the basis of an annual evaluation cycle. Projects to be included in the cycle will be selected for evaluation based on their maturity i.e. how far they have proceeded in their implementation. Those projects that have advanced furthest in implementation will be evaluated in the first annual cycle (in 2012). Those less mature at the start of the exercise will be placed in the second (2013) and third (2014) cycles. An indicative list of project to be evaluated will be published always in the beginning of each cycle on the website of the Ministry.

The recruitment process is based on the methodology laid out in section 'B.6.2.8 Selection of external assessors/evaluators ' of the OP Operational Manual, and has been adapted to the specific requirements of the Interim Evaluation exercise.

Definition

An "external evaluator" is an external expert from whom an independent assessment of any project can be requested by the MA OP RDI. The external evaluator can be either an international expert (non-Czech) or national expert (Czech).

Recruitment of external evaluators

Prior to the start of the evaluation exercise the MA OP RDI (Department 45) will announce a call for external evaluators of projects funded under PA 1 & 2 of the OP RDI on its website. This call will state the expert profile required and will be based on the professional requirements stated in Annex 1 of the Manual for the Interim Evaluation of Priority Axes 1 and 2 of the Operational Programme Research and Development for Innovation (hereinafter 'the Manual'). Potential applicants will be able to declare their interest for selection as an external expert at any stage throughout the evaluation cycle i.e. the call for experts will be

open and limited only by the end of the evaluation cycle (the end of the calendar year in question).

In addition to the announcement on MA OP RDI's website, the Evaluation Unit of the MA will contact via email all external evaluators matching the expert profile and possessing the pre-requisite specific experience who are registered on the MA OP RDI's internal database of external assessors (DEA). They will be invited to declare their interest on the same basis as those who apply via the MA's website and no preference will be given to applicants who are already registered on the DEA. All potential applicants will have one calendar month to formally express their interest. Experts who register their interest after the one month period has expired will also be eligible for selection i.e. they will be added to the DEA. However, the process of selection of experts will formally start immediately after the expiry of the one month waiting period.

After the expiry of the one month waiting period, the Evaluation Unit of the MA will draw up a 'long list' of experts – both international and national - who have expressed an interest and who possess relevant experience for the projects to be evaluated in the upcoming cycle. This list will contain details of the expert's experience, qualifications, as well as their previous work record with the MA OP RDI, if any. This list will be reviewed jointly by the Head of Department 453 (who is responsible for the whole evaluation exercise), the department's evaluation officer and at least one of its external evaluation advisers. Their task will be to check the list for its consistency with the objectives of the evaluation exercise and projects to be evaluated.

The composition of the evaluation teams for the individual projects will be done as follows:
- The long list of evaluators will be screened by the Evaluation Unit of the MA to identify experts with experience directly pertaining to the project in question e.g. nanotechnology. Those experts who meet the specific criteria will be placed on a short list. At this stage the experts will be separated into two categories – international and national experts – to reflect the evaluation methodology.
- The Evaluation Unit will then select the expert team from these two 'shortlists' based on a random draw of names. This selection will be supervised by the Head of Directorate or his appointed representative plus one other staff member from Directorate 45. This will guarantee the transparency of the process.
- Should the selected external evaluator(s) not be available to participate in the project

evaluation as required, the evaluator in question will be removed from the team and selection process repeated.

The outcome of the selection process will be an evaluation team composed of 1-2 international external evaluators and one national external evaluator.

This selection process will be repeate for each project to be evaluated.

Annex 2: Template for Evaluators' Report

Introduction

This template provides a mandatory evaluation framework that evaluators should follow when conducting their project assessment and drafting their evolution report as part of the assessment of projects funded under Priority Axes (PA) 1 and 2 of the Operational Programme Research and Development for Innovation (OP RDI).

The evaluation template is based around three components. The first component focuses on the current implementation of the project and largely corresponds with those areas covered by the beneficiary's self-assessment report. The second component provides an analysis of the future performance of the project (delivery of outputs and results, sustainability). The third component is a series of recommendations that relate to the project's current or future performance as well as to any related issues relevant to the beneficiary or the Managing Authority (MA) of the OP RDI.

The evaluators' report drafted using this template will serve as a valuable feedback mechanism for its two principal target groups – the beneficiary delivering the project and the MA responsible for the overall success of the PA. Therefore the authors of the report should aim to draft a report that has the following characteristics:

- It should be <u>analytical</u>. The report should provide a series of findings and conclusions based on an analysis of the facts established in the evaluation process. The evaluators should avoid merely presenting facts that they have found out during the evaluation.
- It should be <u>concise</u>. The report will need to cover all the areas outlined in the template. At the same time, it should not be over-long or present excessively detailed findings unless required. The evaluators to aim to produce a main report of no more than 20 pages.
- It should therefore be focused and <u>relevant</u>. The evaluators should target their report at those issues that they judge to be of most importance and relevance to its readers

(principally the beneficiary and the MA), and which influence the successful performance of the project.

- Finally, it should be <u>readable</u>. Aside from being concise and relevant, the report should be written in a style that is easy to read and presented in a logical and (preferably) attractive way. It should also contain a short executive summary.

The evaluators are expected to make full and appropriate use of both primary and secondary sources of information for their assessments. These sources include:
- The beneficiary's self-assessment report
- The Technical Annex of the project itself
- Information from other secondary sources and documentation
- Own observations and impressions from the site visit
- Discussions and interviews with project staff
- Discussions and information obtained from other relevant parties, including MA staff, project users, supervisory and advisory boards and foreign partners of the beneficiary

The evaluators should inform the MA of any other additional documents that they might require in advance of their evaluation mission. The evaluators should bear in mind that in most cases additional project documentation will be in Czech and that this will not be translated into English except in specifically justified cases.

Report structure

The section below outlines the themes and issues to be considered by the evaluators across the three main components i.e. operational assessment, assessment of future performance and recommendations.

Component I: Assessment of implementation to date/achievements

In this component the evaluators should provide an assessment for each of the 7 sections. Please note that the factors listed within each of the sections are not exhaustive and the evaluators may chose to add further issues to them depending on their importance or

relevance to the project under evaluation.

1. *Management performance and organisations: How well is the project being managed?*
This section covers the overall management of the project. Within this question, the evaluators should consider the following factors:
- Whether all the relevant management structures are in place and in accordance with the Technical Annex (TA). This includes, for example, the supervisory and advisory boards, IP management, quality control management;
- The overall quality of the project management team; i.e. Are the right people managing the project? Are they devoting sufficient time to this job?
- The quality of relations with its key stakeholders i.e. mother institution(s), the Managing Authority/Ministry (or ministries), other research institutes or centres in the Czech Republic or abroad, Industry etc.
- Risk management i.e. what are the risks to the success of the project, is the management aware of them, and does it have measures in place to reduce/manage them should they materialise?

2. *Human resource management: To what extent are the human resource management arrangements sufficient to ensure that the project functions properly, and that they facilitate the successful delivery of results?*

Human Resource (HR) management relates to the recruitment, training, performance assessment, advancement, and other staff management aspects of the project. In providing an answer to the evaluation question, the experts should consider as much as possible the following factors:
- The quality of the HR policy of the project (covering staff recruitment, appraisal, promotion and disciplinary aspects);
- The existence and quality of training programmes and associated courses for new staff;
- The existence and quality of professional growth/coaching and career development programmes for existing staff (all ages and all levels);

- The numbers and quality (qualifications and experience) of scientific staff engaged in the preparation and implementation of the project; not to forget the supervisory role of senior staff vis-à-vis junior researchs and in particular PhD students
- The workload of project staff and the extent to which key staff are engaged on project-specific work i.e. full-time, half-time, quarter-time engagement etc. Is this sufficient to ensure the project's proper functioning?

3. ***Financial / legal management: To what extent are the financial and legal aspects of the project being properly managed?***

The evaluators in this section should consider *inter-alia* the following factors:

- The quality of budget management i.e. is the budget being managed properly? Is there adequate supervision of its usage?
- The incomes and resources generated by the project for re-investment. Do these exist? Is there a strategy for their usage? If they do exist, are they being used in line with the provisions of the TA?

4. ***Interaction with users: How successful has the beneficiary been in establishing cooperation with the application sphere?***

The evaluators should assess how the project has been able to generate results and how these are being used in the application sphere. It may be the case that the project has not yet produced significant numbers of results, and that cooperation with users is still in the early stages of development. In these cases the evaluators should (a) look at what has been achieved to date and the extent to which this corresponds with obligations laid out in the TA and (b) assess the prospects for developing cooperation with the application sphere, based on the evidence currently available. In specific terms, the evaluators should consider as many of the following elements:

- Actual or planned use of research results from individual research programmes by (end) users.
- Fulfilment of indicators (contract numbers and volumes, renting of equipment, etc.)
- Successes and difficulties in technology transfer;

- Policy towards use of IPR and know- how management and its implementation and use
- General cooperation with users and strategy for the expansion of contract cooperation (linked to section 1 'management of key stakeholder relations')
- Motivation system for employees for generation and commercial use of R&D results
- Business policy of the beneficiary, including pricing of services and income generation (with reference to section 3 as appropriate)

5. *Infrastructure: Is the project infrastructure and equipment in place, functioning and being utilised properly?*

The evaluators should, within the given time constraints, assess the physical infrastructure for the implementation of the project i.e. the project site, its facilities and equipment, its functionality etc. Here, the evaluators should consider the following:

- The actual state of the site i.e. is it up to modern standards? Is it on schedule? What is the general impression from the site visit?
- Equipment purchased or ordered i.e. whether the equipment corresponds to the specifications laid out in the TA; whether it has been delivered on time or is delayed (and the implications for the project overall); whether it remains relevant to the needs of the research community or is in danger of becoming obsolete.
- The actual functioning of the equipment, and the purposes for which the equipment is being used i.e. does it work? is it being used for own R&D? Is it being used for teaching? Is it being rented out to industry for commercial purposes? Is it being shared with other centres? (with appropriate reference to sections 3 and 4)

6. *Research programme: What is the quality of the research programme?*

The evaluators should check whether the beneficiary's research programme corresponds to the following factors. However, they are <u>not</u> expected to provide a detailed analysis of it. This section should contain a concise assessment of the following:

- Does the research programme of project as it is now fulfil the general objectives laid out in the TA?
- Do the (actual) research activities correspond to the (planned) objectives,

outputs/milestones/results and indicators of individual research programmes?

- Does the project have the expected international dimension? (scientific cooperation, mutual mobility, mainly for PA I)

7. *Other issues: Other issues relevant to the operational performance of the project*

In this section the evaluators should raise any other issues that they have identified in the course of their assessment that they consider important to the efficient and effective functioning of the project which has not been covered within the scope of the previous 6 sections.

Component II: Assessment of future performance

This part of the report provides the evaluators with an opportunity to provide their own assessments of how the project is likely to deliver on its planned outputs and results, and whether it is likely to prove sustainable in the long term.

8. *How likely is the project to deliver its planned outputs and results?*

Given that the project may be still in the early stages of operation, it may be the case that only a few outputs or results are currently observable. In such a case, the evaluators will be expected to draw on their own experience and provide a balanced and measured assessment of the how they see the project developing over time and judge the extent to which the planned outputs and results are likely to be delivered.

They should identify the potential bottlenecks or barriers to their delivery, both within the project itself (the internal environment) and outside it (the external environment). Conversely, the evaluators should, where appropriate, highlight examples of good practice which are contributing to positive prospects for the delivery of results and the achievement of the project objectives (impact).

9. *What are the prospects for the sustainability of the project?*

In this section the evaluators are being asked to look into the future and give an assessment of the project's sustainability. They should offer a balanced judgement on the prospects for

the project being sustainable once funding from the OP RDI is concluded and the factors that will define the project's ultimate fate. They should also outline what they consider will be needed to ensure its long term sustainability.

Component III: Recommendations

In this final section the evaluators should provide a series of recommendations relating to the current and future performance of the project. These recommendation should be as practicable as possible and be based on the findings of the evaluation assessment. They should not be retrospective i.e. what should have been done better at some point in the past. They should also clearly identify the body responsible for their implementation and state a timeframe for their fulfilment. These will form the basis of the de-briefing that will conclude the evaluation exercise. For obvious reasons the structure outlined above should be used for the presentation of recommendations.

Annex 3: Template and associated Guidance notes for completion of the self-assessment report

Operational Programme Research and Development for Innovations

Interim Evaluation of Projects Supported under Priority Axes 1 and 2

Beneficiary Self-Assessment Report Template

Name of Project:
Name of report author(s):
Date:

Introduction

Thank you for taking the time to complete the self-assessment report for your project. The template you have before you provides you with guidance for completing the self-assessment report. It aims to ensure that the report is as comprehensive as possible and covers all key points in the necessary detail. Once completed, report will serve as one of the main source documents for the evaluation itself.

You are therefore encouraged to provide information that corresponds as closely as possible with the requirements stated in the template - in effect, the template serves as a checklist

for you to follow and we would ask you to use it as such. Should you be unable to provide information related to any point in the template, please say so and also state why it is not available.

In the event that the requirements of this template are unclear to you, or you need any further information on it, please don't hesitate to contact the Evaluation Unit at the Managing Authority for the OP RDI (contacts on the website).

Section 1 - Management of the Project

Guidance notes:

This section should not exceed 8 pages in length.

The author is encouraged to provide (where appropriate) information on any changes that have occurred in the course of the project's evolution, the reasons for these changes and the impact that they have had on its performance.

1.1 Overview of executive management arrangements

Specific information required:

- An up-to-date organigramme of the project;
- Supporting information on the executive management structure of project;
- The list of staff members dedicated to the project's delivery and their distribution throughout the organisation over time;
- Indicate multiple roles.

1.2 Supervisory level management arrangements

Please provide details of the bodies charged with the overall governance of the project e.g. supervisory board(s), advisory boards.

Specific information required in relation to these boards

- List of boards members, their background and qualifications;
- Their rights and duties and activities to date;
- Indicate multiple roles.

1.3 Senior management of the project

Please provide the following:

- Names and positions of senior management staff, their qualifications and experience;
- Senior management activities in the project to date;
- Indicate multiple roles.

1.4 Risk management

Please state the following:

- The identified risks to the success of the project;
- The measures in place to reduce/manage them should they materialise;
- Any risks encountered to date and the measures taken to address them;
- Impacts from risks encountered to date.

1.5 Relations with Key Stakeholders

Please state:

- The project's key stakeholders (both internal i.e. within your mother institution, and external);
- The structures/staff in place to manage relations with them;
- Relations with key stakeholders so far.

1.6 Additional analysis

The author is requested to provide the following additional information relevant to the project's management:

- A short comprehensive assessment of challenges or problems that have occurred in this area, and how the beneficiary has dealt with them;
- An outline of key future tasks/challenges expected in the next one to three years.

Section 2 - Human Resources

Guidance notes:

This section should not exceed 6 pages in length.

The author is encouraged to provide (where appropriate) information on any changes that have occurred in the course of the project's evolution, the reasons for these changes and the impact that they have had on its performance.

2.1 General Human Resources Policy

Please state the policy and the status of its implementation of the project in the following areas:

- staff recruitment;
- appraisal of staff performance;
- promotion;
- disciplinary policy.

2.2 Project workforce

Please provide the following information:

- The numbers of scientific staff engaged in the project, their qualifications and experience (both planned as stated in the TA and actual);
- The workload of project staff and the extent to which staff are engaged on project-specific work i.e. x% full time equivalent engagement etc. (this could be presented in the form of a table).

2.3 Training and professional development

Please provide the following information:

- Training programmes and associated courses for new staff;
- Professional growth/coaching and career development for all existing (as well as planned) staff.

EUROPEAN UNION
INVESTING IN YOUR FUTURE

OP Research and
Development for Innovation

2.4   Additional analysis

The author is requested to provide the following additional information relevant to the area of Human Resources:

- A short comprehensive assessment of challenges or problems that have occurred in this area, and how the beneficiary has dealt with them and to which result;
- An outline of future tasks/challenges expected in the next one to three years.

Section 3 - Financial

Guidance notes:

This section should not exceed 5 pages in length.

3.1   Total budget description (all figures in CZK and EUR)

Please provide the following information by years:

- Overall project budget;
- Individual budget categories i.e. construction, equipment, salaries, material, services, non-eligible costs;
- Any significant changes or deviations in the budget (overall and/or individual categories) and the reasons behind them.

3.2   Financial separation of the beneficiary from its mother institution(s)

- Please briefly describe how this is assured, including the distribution of institutional finances.

3.3   Generated income

Please provide a brief overview of the following issues:

- Income planned vs. achieved by type of income, explanation of deviations (if any);
- Highlights to date, future prospects for income (see also section 3.4);
- Policy/strategy for the re-investment of incomes and resources

3.4 Additional analysis

Please provide the following additional information relevant to the area of project finance:

- A short assessment of challenges or problems that have occurred in this area, and how the beneficiary has dealt with them and to which result;
- An outline of future tasks/challenges expected in the next one to three years (e.g. prospects for income generation).

Section 4 - Research programme

Guidance note:

This section should be no longer than 6 pages in length.

4.1 Progress to date

Please outline – in summary form – the following aspects of your project's research programme:

- Planned objectives, outputs/milestones, results and indicators of individual research programmes funded under the project;
- The extent to which the above have been achieved including reasons for non-achievement (if relevant);
- A brief description of the international dimension of research of the Centre. This includes;
- scientific cooperation
- mutual mobility

4.2 Additional analysis

The author is requested to provide the following additional information;

- A short assessment of challenges or problems that have occurred in this area, and how the beneficiary has dealt with them and to which result;
- An outline of future tasks/challenges expected in the next one to three years (e.g. expansion of research programme).

Section 5 - Interaction with application sphere/users

Guidance notes:
This section should be no longer than 6 pages in length.

It may be the case that your project has not yet produced significant results, and that interaction with users is still in the early stages of development. In these cases the beneficiary should outline (a) what has been achieved, (b) the extent to which this corresponds with obligations laid out in the project's Technical Annex (TA) and (c) expected results in the short to medium term (6 – 12 months from the time of the preparation of this report).

The author should provide an overview of the following issues:

5.1 Planned and actual results
- Planned versus actual use of research results from individual research programmes by users;
- Planned and achieved levels of indicators e.g. contract numbers and volumes, renting of equipment etc.

5.2 Technology transfer & Intellectual Property Rights
- Technology transfer strategy;
- Policy towards use of IPR and know-how management;
- Successes and difficulties to date.

5.4 Business policy/strategy
- Existing policy for cooperation with users;
- Pricing of services and income generation;
- Strategy for the development of contract cooperation.

5.5 **Additional analysis**

The author is requested to provide the following additional information;
- A short assessment of challenges or problems that have occurred in this area, and how the beneficiary has dealt with them and to which result;
- An outline of future tasks/challenges expected in the next one to three years (e.g. expansion of research programme).

Section 6 - Infrastructure and equipment

Guidance note:

This section should be no longer than 4 pages in length.

The beneficiary should report on the following:

6.1 **Buildings**
- Planned construction work;
- Its status (completed, partly completed, etc.);
- Its current usage.

6.2 **Equipment**
- Planned equipment (as stated in the TA) versus what was actually purchased;
- Its status (ordered, purchased, installed, functioning, commissioned), as compared against requirements in the TA, reasons for deviation from plan (if relevant).

6.3 **Use of equipment and facilities**
- For the beneficiary's own R&D;
- By students or for teaching purposes;
- The extent to which it is being rented out to industry/other centres for commercial purposes.

6.4 **Additional analysis**

The author is requested to provide the following additional information;

- A short assessment of challenges or problems that have occurred in this area, and how the beneficiary has dealt with them and to which result;
- An outline of future tasks/challenges expected in the next one to three years (e.g. challenges to making the facilities fully operational, plans for their future usage).

Section 7 - Other comments, concerns, issues

Guidance note:

Here the beneficiary should briefly outline any other key issues not covered in the other six sections that he/she feels should be looked at by the evaluation team.

As this evaluation exercise is mainly aiming at providing feedback and support, the beneficiary is encouraged to feel free to raise issues and ask questions in order to gain the benefit of the evaluation team's specialist insights.

This section should be no longer than four pages in length.

Annex 4: Declaration of Impartiality and Confidentiality of the Expert Evaluators of projects supported under the Priority Axes 1 and 2 OP RDI

1) I herewith represent that

   a) I am not aware of any connection between myself and organisations implementing projects funded from the OP RDI ('beneficiary institutions'), nor am I aware of any facts that would or could influence my execution of the role of evaluator when evaluating projects of these beneficiary institutions. (A connection to a beneficiary institution shall be understood to mean any family, working, business or similar relationship that could jeopardise evaluator independence in the evaluation process);

   b) I have in no way participated in the preparation or implementation of any of the projects that I shall be evaluating, nor do I have a personal interest in its/their execution.

   c) I acknowledge that if any reason should arise leading to my loss of impartiality while performing a task / evaluation, I will be obliged immediately to report this fact to the OP RDI Managing Authority.

2) I further pledge that while performing the work of an evaluator, and after this work is completed, I will maintain confidentiality with respect to all facts and information disclosed to me in connection with the evaluation of projects and that I will neither intentionally nor unintentionally provide to third parties confidential information that I have obtained in connection with the OP RDI project evaluation process.

   I acknowledge that confidential information primarily comprises information not generally available from other sources, information on assessed entities, projects etc. not generally available from public sources or information that representatives of the Ministry of Schools, Youth and Sport or representatives of the assessed entities identify as confidential.

   I further pledge to conduct myself in accordance with the OP RDI Code of Ethics.

   I acknowledge that any breach of the provisions of this declaration could give rise to entitlement to compensation of damage. I acknowledge that such damage may

EUROPEAN UNION

INVESTING IN YOUR FUTURE

OP Research and
Development for Innovation

YOUTH AND SPORTS

include damage to the reputation of the Ministry of Schools, Youth and Sport.

In ……………………………… on ………………..

……………………….……… ………. ....

Name of evaluator Signature

Annex 5: The OP RDI Code of Ethics

Validity

The OP RDI Code of Ethics (the "Code") is the basic ethical standard governing the presentation of the Operational Programme Research and Development for Innovation (the "OP RDI") and the conduct of this programme's in-house and outside implementation structure staff in their dealings with the public and each other.

The Code stipulates and describes principles for OP RDI implementation team member ("Member" or "Members") conduct and behaviour and pertains to:

- ➢ employees of the Ministry of Schools, Youth and Sport, as the OP RDI Managing Authority;
- ➢ employees of the Ministry of Schools, Youth and Sport working on OP RDI implementation;
- ➢ outside staff involved in the OP RDI (e.g. members of working groups, external evaluators etc.);
- ➢ members of the OP RDI Monitoring Committee.

The OP RDI implementation team Member understands his/her activity in the context of OP RDI implementation and operation (henceforth the "activity") as a service aimed at fulfilling the objectives and aims of the European Fund for Regional Development as one of the available tools for promoting the policy of European Community cohesion, for which it bears responsibility, and, in addition to fulfilling the obligations arising from European Community and Czech legal regulations, is therefore voluntarily governed by the following common provisions of this Code.

General Principles

1. The Code provisions are considered to be part of the set of binding documents in accordance with which the Member is obliged to act and which the Member is obliged to respect.

2. In performing their obligations, Members are governed by the principles of the legality, quality, effectiveness and ethics of work, in particular through adherence to the principles of fairness and equality.
3. The OP RDI Managing Authority contributes to the application of these principles and thereby to an effective OP RDI implementation process by creating a challenging work environment and giving preference to cooperation, fairness and the promotion of ethical work practices.

Principles of Legality

4. When performing his/her work, the Member is governed by the Constitution, statutes and other legal regulations of the Czech Republic, including decrees, directives and regulations governing the OP RDI implementation process.
5. The Member shall also do whatever is required in order to act in compliance with the provisions of the Code.
6. The Member is obliged to refrain from conduct that would jeopardise the credibility of the OP RDI implementation process.
7. The Member effects decisions in his/her power and related to the OP RDI implementation process impartially and for no consideration, while adhering to the principle of integrity and incorruptibility in dealings both with the public, i.e. persons and institutions outside the implementation structure, and other Members.
8. The Member shall address all matters connected with OP RDI implementation in an objective manner. He/She shall not wilfully act to the detriment or benefit of any natural persons or corporate entities or group of persons.
9. Should the Member become aware of fraudulent or corrupt behaviour associated with the OP RDI implementation process, he/she is obliged immediately to report such conduct to the OP RDI Managing Authority.

Principle of Quality and Effectiveness

10. The Member shall work in the interest of OP RDI implementation at the highest professional level, which he/she is obligated though continuing studies to upgrade and broaden on an on-going basis. The Member is obliged to refrain from conduct that would jeopardise the credibility of the OP RDI implementation process.
11. The Member shall be obliged effectively and economically to manage and utilise human capital, financial resources and equipment entrusted to him/her and to use them exclusively in the performance of activity connected with OP RDI execution.

Principle of Ethical Work and Fairness

12. The Member is obliged to work in the interest of OP RDI implementation responsibly,

honestly, conscientiously and in compliance with the mission and objective of this operational programme.

13. The Member shall perform the work with the utmost propriety, understanding, willingness and adherence to the general rules of ethical communication.

14. In respect of the public, in particular OP RDI support applicants or recipients, as well as staff of other implementation structure sections, the Member shall act in an obliging and polite manner and with the highest degree of understanding.

15. The Member shall perform all activities and generally conduct himself/herself in accordance with the principle of fairness and with no regard for gender, ethnicity or social origin, sexual orientation, nationality, material circumstances, state of health, age, citizenship, family status or creed and religion.

Principle of Quality and Effectiveness

16. The Member shall provide the implementation team with necessary information concerning his/her activity without undue delay solely in the scope of his/her position and the competencies arising therefrom.
17. The Member shall handle information obtained in the performance of his/her role with the requisite discretion. He/She is obliged to maintain (or to endeavour to maintain) confidentiality with respect to business, economic or personal information concerning other natural persons or corporate entities that is disclosed within the OP RDI implementation process.
18. The Member is obliged to refrain from conveying information acquired in the performance of his/her work obligations, where this could negatively impact the process of treating support applicants and recipients in a transparent, fair and non-discriminatory manner.
19. The Member shall not intentionally mislead the public by disseminating deceptive or unverified information, and shall not make untruthful or misleading representations or deliberately withhold relevant information.

Conflict of Interest and Reporting of Interest

20. The Member shall refrain from conduct that would lead to a conflict between the public interest and his/her personal interest.
21. The Member shall not use information associated with his/her activity performed while implementing and running the OP RDI for personal benefit or the benefit of other persons.
22. Should the Member have a personal interest in a project on which he/she is to serve as a Member, he/she shall report this fact to the OP RDI Managing Authority or his/her superior before discussion of the given matter commences.
23. In cases of conflict of interest in which the Member is the submitter or drafter of a project or took part in the drafting of the project, or is closely tied to the submitter or drafter by a family, emotional, economic or political relationship, this Member shall not participate in further discussion or assessment of the project or in voting on it.

Gifts and Benefits

24. The Member shall not request or accept gifts, favours, or any other benefits that could influence decision-making or prejudice his/her impartiality.
25. The Member shall not allow himself/herself to be placed in a position in connection with his/her activity in which he/she is bound to return a demonstrated favour or which leaves him/her open to the undue influence of other persons.
26. A Member shall neither offer nor provide any benefit in any way connected with his/her activity.
27. A Member shall not in the performance of his/her work undertake or suggest the undertaking of any acts that could benefit him/her in his/her future personal or professional life.

Notification of Impermissible Activity and Control

28. Should a Member learn of damage caused by the negligent, fraudulent or corrupt behaviour of another Member or any person outside the implementation structure, which could violate the transparency, fairness and principle of non-discrimination of

EUROPEAN UNION

INVESTING IN YOUR FUTURE

OP Research and Development for Innovation

2007-13

the OP RDI implementation process, he/she shall immediately report this fact to the OP RDI Managing Authority or control or audit section.

29. The OP RDI Managing Authority shall investigate any suspected violation of Code of Ethics provisions at the suggestion of a Member or private citizen. The resultant findings are reported to the OP RDI Monitoring Committee and the documents are archived. In the event of an affirmative finding, it shall proceed pursuant to the valid legislation and ensure that the implementation process is corrected and continues without undue interruption.

30. The Member acknowledges that in the event of a finding of gross violation of the Code, the OP RDI Managing Authority and control mechanisms may sanction this violation as a breach of obligation of the Member connected with his/her team position.

31. The Member acknowledges that a violation of the Code can cast doubt on the entire course of OP RDI implementation, which may result in the non-allocation or suspension of a contribution from the European Fund for Regional Development.

Effectiveness

The Code was discussed and approved at the 14 May 2009 meeting of the OP RDI Monitoring Committee.

On this day the Code becomes valid and any changes or additions thereto are subject to a decision of the OP RDI Monitoring Committee.

EUROPEAN UNION

INVESTING IN YOUR FUTURE

OP Research and Development for Innovation

Annex 6: Document destruction

I acknowledge that materials containing confidential information were conveyed to me during the evaluation of projects for priority axis 1 and/or 2 of Operational Programme Research and Development for Innovation (OP RDI). I therefore represent that by no later than 1 day after the end of evaluation, I shall destroy the materials conveyed or provided by the OP RDI Managing Authority (OP RDI MA) pertaining to this evaluation (including all copies that I made for my own use).

In ……………………………… on ………………..

………………………..…………..……..   ....

Name of evaluator   Signature

For the OP RDI MA

……………………………………   …………………………………………

Name   Signature

Annex 7: Self Assessment Report - Quality Assurance Document

Project Title:

A. Overall Assessment

Rating	Comments
1 – Satisfactory; forward to evaluators without changes or requests for additional information	

1 – Satisfactory; forward to evaluators without changes or requests for additional information
2 –Adequate; forward to evaluators. Contains some discrepancies that may require additional information dependent on feedback from other assessors or evaluation team (state what may be required in the comments section)
3 – Inadequate; cannot be forwarded to evaluators in current state. Clarification on key points or additional information to be provided by beneficiary before provision of report to evaluation team (state points to be clarified or additional information to be submitted)
4 – Unacceptable; Report cannot be used in current state. Return to beneficiaries for re-drafting (state principal shortcomings)

B. Points for action

C. Comments to individual sections of the report (in line with the SAR template)

Section 1 - Management of the Project
Comments
For action

Section 2 - Human Resources
Comments
For action:

Section 3 - Financial and legal

Comments
For action

Section 4 - Research programme

Comments
For action:

Section 5 - Interaction with application sphere/ users

Comments

For action:

Section 6 - Infrastructure and equipment

Comments:

For action:

Section 7 – Other issues

Comments

Name of Assessor(s):

Date: