

TERRITORIAL COOPERATION
OPERATIONAL PROGRAM
(Interreg V Caribbean)
EVALUATION PLAN

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations	3
INTRODUCTION	5
SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION.....	7
1.1 Program Background.....	7
1.2 Regulatory Framework	15
SECTION 2: OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, ANALYSIS OF AVAILABLE DATA AND COORDINATION	17
2.1 Objectives and Main Characteristics	17
2.2 Scope.....	18
2.3 Analysis of Available Data.....	19
2.4 Coordination Mechanisms	20
SECTION 3: EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	22
3.1 Program Partners' Involvement in the Evaluation Process.....	22
3.2 Description of the Evaluation Process.....	24
3.3 Partner Participation.....	25
3.4 Evaluation Expertise and Tools	25
3.5 Strategy for Ensuring Use and Communication of Evaluation Results.....	26
3.6 Timetable, Budget and Training	27
3.7 Managing Quality of the Evaluation Process	30
SECTION 4. TIMELINE FOR EVALUATION ACTIVITIES	32
4.1 Definition of Basic Elements	32
4.2. Evaluation summary sheets.....	34

List of Abbreviations

ACS	Association of Caribbean States
AFD	Agence française de développement (French development agency)
CARICOM	The Caribbean Community
CARIFORUM	The Caribbean Forum
CARPHA	The Caribbean Public Health Agency
CEDA	Caribbean Export Development Agency
CGCT	Code général des collectivités territoriales (French general code for territorial collectivities)
CIRAD	Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement (French Agricultural Research Centre for International Development)
DATAR	Délégation interministérielle à l'aménagement du territoire et à l'attractivité régionale (interministerial delegation of land planning and regional attractiveness)
DSM	Demand-side Management
DST	Direction de la surveillance du territoire
EDF	European Development Fund
EESC	European Economic and Social Committee
ERDF	European Regional Development Fund
ESF	European Social Fund
ETC	European Territorial Cooperation
EPA	Economic Partnership Agreements, between the European Union and the African, Caribbean and Pacific - ACP countries
HDI	Human Development Index
IEDOM	Institut d'émission des départements d'outre-mer (French issuing institution of the overseas departments)
IFREMER	Institut français de recherche pour l'exploitation de la mer (French Research Institute for Exploitation of the Sea)
ILO	International Labour Organization
INRA	Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (French National Institute for Agricultural Research)
INSEE	Institut National de la Statistique et Etudes Economiques (The National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies)
INSERM	Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale (French National Institute of Health and Medical Research)
IRD	Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (French National Research Institute for Sustainable Development)
JS	Joint Secretary
OCT	Overseas countries and territories
OECS	Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States
ONF	Office national des forêts (French National Forest Office)
PCET	Plan climat Énergie Territorial (French Territorial Energy Climate Plan)
RAE	Rapport Annuel d'Évaluation - Annual evaluation report
RDTI	Recherche, Développement, Technologie & Innovation 3 (Research, Development, Technology & Innovation)
S3	Stratégie de Spécialisation intelligente (Smart Specialization Strategy)
SEAS	Surveillance de l'Environnement Amazonien Assistée par Satellite (satellite-assisted surveillance of the Amazonian environment)

SICA	Sistema de la Integración Centroamericana (Central American Integration System)
SIECA	Secretaría de Integración Económica Centroamericana (Secretariat for Central American Economic Integration)
SRCAE	Schéma régional climat air énergie (French regional climate air energy scheme)
TFEU	The Treaty on the Functioning of European Union
UAG	University of the French West Indies and Guiana
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme

INTRODUCTION

The European Union's *Europe 2020* strategy is grounded in performance-driven use of European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIFs). Additionally, review of the performance of 2014-2020 programs must be directly based on outputs and results obtained, and must consider both the programs' cost and the effectiveness of expenditures, relative to the objectives defined for each European program.

Given this performance- and results-driven approach, program evaluation, and more precisely, program impact evaluation, represents an essential component of the 2014-2020 programming cycle.

Indeed, evaluation's importance is clearly manifested in the regulatory obligation of Managing Authorities to draft an evaluation plan at the beginning of programming that organizes the evaluations required by regulation (Articles 56 and 114 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013).

As such, evaluation is defined as the review of short- and long-term effects of policies on social groups or situations for which the policies were created, as well as on society as a whole. Evaluation is also the review of both current and future costs relative to any identified benefits. Requiring observation, measurement, analysis and the interpretation of information and data, these reviews are used to assess policies' design, implementation, achievements, results and impact.

The ultimate purpose of such evaluation is to allow public-policy makers and executors, beneficiaries and the public to gauge the value of outputs resulting from intervention, and even to address both the shortcomings observed during policy implementation and the measures adopted to address them.

As such, evaluations that will be carried out are important tools that contribute to:

- improving program direction and management, through the use of implementation evaluations and the creation of measures for monitoring indicators;
- assessing the effects and results of funded projects and of the program in the cooperation area;
- laying the groundwork for the next programming period by using the results of these evaluations to improve management procedures and implementation, as well as to the funded cooperation operations.

Evaluation is therefore clearly complementary to project monitoring, which is but one step in the management cycle of project execution. The ultimate purpose of evaluation is to keep all project actors informed, to measure progress of project activities and to gauge whether expected results and objectives have been achieved.

Moreover, performance must be evaluated throughout programming, and in three ways:

- 1. Monitoring the system of program indicators**, by tracking and regular reporting on their progress (scoreboard for financial indicators, progress on outputs and results), especially by the Monitoring Committee.
- 2. Reviewing performance benchmarks**, by tracking progress and corrections made in order to achieve the stated performance objectives;
- 3. Ongoing monitoring of program activities**, using a monitoring scoreboard.

4. **Reviewing the performance of programs**, through impact evaluations, which can identify whether expected changes occurred. This approach presumes constant and broad attention to performance at every stage of the programming cycle, from planning to implementation, from monitoring to evaluation, and through communications with partners.

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Program Background

The Territorial Cooperation Program 2014-2020 Interreg, approved by the European Commission decision No. C(2105) 8540 final of December 1, 2015 and cofinanced by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) with €64,292 905 has had significant changes, relevant in terms of the evaluation process, results and impacts. These changes relate to the strategic approach selected, that is, an approach to cooperation that is integrated and multi-themed, encouraging the development of structural projects relative to the introduction of new significant priorities. These priorities are related to the promotion of harmonious development within the Caribbean area within three interdependent dimensions: economic growth and job creation, sustainable development, and the union of peoples.

It is important to note that the operational program 2014-2020 Interreg Caribbean includes two different components (cross-border and transnational). Some axes of the operational program are common to both components (increasing SME competitiveness, improving natural risk management, strengthening environmental protection and development, improving healthcare solutions) and some are specific to one or the other (development of renewable energy sources for the cross-border component, and improving educational infrastructure for the transnational component).

For the axes that are common to both components,

- the operational program selected the same indicators (same labels, same definitions): in fact, despite the different cooperation spaces, the actions supported by projects and the expected outputs are the same;
- the operational program defined different target values: in fact, the financial models are different and the support allocated for an axis is different for the cross-border and transnational components.

The operational program has thus set priorities based on the analysis of the context, territorial needs and the results from the 2007-2013 programming. These priorities are reiterated below and are matched with the relevant *Europe 2020* strategy objective.

Smart growth

- Increase territories' economic diversification through knowledge transfer and marketing innovative products
- Create an environment that fosters business between territories in the area

Sustainable growth

- Increase the capacity of territories to respond to natural disasters
- Improve protections and development of the Caribbean's natural heritage by establishing joint strategies and tools
- Increase the attractiveness of the cooperation territory to tourists through development of natural and cultural heritage
- Boost territories' capacities to respond to emerging diseases and other health risks

- Increase the share of renewables in the energy mix to encourage greater energy independence in the Eastern Caribbean territories
- Reduce energy consumption in public buildings in the Eastern Caribbean

Inclusive growth

- Increase mastery and reciprocal use of language in the Caribbean
- Increase educational and professional mobility within the Caribbean

The strategy of the 2014-2020 Caribbean Operational program and the selected axes also fully contribute to the cross-cutting principles of *Europe 2020*, including sustainable development, equal opportunity and non-discrimination, and equality between men and women.

To nourish this ambition and within each of its axes, the operational program will therefore prioritize structural programs, bringing on board leading decisionmakers within the cooperation area, with tangible effects for the territory and its inhabitants.

Additionally, for all of these themes the 2014-2020 Caribbean Program will focus especially not only on the relevance of projects, but also the added value of strengthening regional cooperation (cross-border or transnational) of projects.

The 2014-2020 Interreg Caribbean program has been allocated €64,292,905 from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). This amount is divided into two components, with €41,129,656 being allocated to the cross-border component of the operational program and €23,163,249 being allocated to the transnational component.

These funds are divided as follows based on the program's defined objectives.

Table 1. Overview of the cooperation program investment strategy

Priority axes	ERDF support (in EUR)	Share of total EU support (in %) granted to the cooperation program (by Fund)			TO	IP	Specific objectives matched to investment priorities	Result indicators matched to the specific objective
		ERDF ¹	ENPI ² (if applicable)	IPA ³ (if applicable)				
Axis 1 - Increase competitiveness of Caribbean businesses, which are engines for economic growth and job creation, in a sustainable and inclusive manner (cross-border)	€7,453,000	100%			TO3	IP3d	SO1 – Increase territories’ economic diversification through knowledge transfer and marketing innovative products	Number of cooperation agreements between innovative groups within the Caribbean (unit: number)
						IP3d	SO2 - Create an environment that fosters business between territories in the area	Volume of trade between French departments in the Americas (DFA) and Caribbean nations (unit: €)
Axis 2 - Increase competitiveness of Caribbean businesses, which are engines for economic growth and job creation, in a sustainable and inclusive manner (transnational)	€4,361,600 TN	100%			TO3	IP3d	SO3 - Increase territories’ economic diversification through knowledge transfer and marketing innovative products	Number of cooperation agreements between innovative groups within the Caribbean (unit: number)

¹ European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)

² European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI)

³ Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA)

Table 1. Overview of the cooperation program investment strategy

Priority axes	ERDF support (in EUR)	Share of total EU support (in %) granted to the cooperation program (by Fund)			TO	IP	Specific objectives matched to investment priorities	Result indicators matched to the specific objective
		ERDF ¹	ENPI ² (if applicable)	IPA ³ (if applicable)				
						IP3d	SO4 - Create an environment that fosters business between territories in the area	Volume of trade between French departments in the Americas (DFA) and Caribbean nations (unit: €)
Axis 3 – Build the capacity to respond to natural disasters (cross-border)	€8,631,000 (cross-border)	100%			TO5	IP5b	SO5 - Increase the capacity of territories to respond to natural disasters	Caribbean territories' capacity to respond to natural disasters (unit: score on a scale of 1 to 5 based on an electronic survey)
Axis 4 - Build the capacity to respond to natural disasters (transnational)	€5,452,000	100%			TO5	IP5b	SO6 - Increase the capacity of territories to respond to natural disasters	Caribbean territories' capacity to respond to natural disasters (unit: score on a scale of 1 to 5 based on an electronic survey)
Axis 5 - Protect and develop the natural and cultural heritage of the Caribbean (cross-border)	€9,042,000	100%			TO6	IP6b	SO7 – Improve protections and development of the Caribbean's natural heritage by establishing joint strategies and tools	Number of transnational / cross-border initiatives to protect biodiversity (unit: number)
						IP6d	SO8 - Increase the attractiveness of the	Number of Caribbean tourist sites awarded a quality label (unit: number)

Table 1. Overview of the cooperation program investment strategy

Priority axes	ERDF support (in EUR)	Share of total EU support (in %) granted to the cooperation program (by Fund)			TO	IP	Specific objectives matched to investment priorities	Result indicators matched to the specific objective
		ERDF ¹	ENPI ² (if applicable)	IPA ³ (if applicable)				
							cooperation territory to tourists through development of natural and cultural heritage	
Axis 6 - Protect and develop the natural and cultural heritage of the Caribbean (transnational)	€5,452,000	100%			TO6	IP6b	SO9 - Improve protections and development of the Caribbean's natural heritage by establishing joint strategies and tools	Number of transnational / cross-border initiatives to protect biodiversity (unit: number)
						IP6d	SO10 - Increase the attractiveness of the cooperation territory to tourists through development of natural and cultural heritage	Number of Caribbean tourist sites awarded a quality label (unit: number)
Axis 7 - Develop a joint Caribbean-wide response to common public health issues (cross-border)	€5,795,000	100%			TO9	IP9a	SO11 - Boost territories' capacities to respond to emerging diseases and other health risks	Caribbean territories' capacities to respond to health risks (unit: score on a scale of 1 to 5 based on an electronic survey)

Table 1. Overview of the cooperation program investment strategy

Priority axes	ERDF support (in EUR)	Share of total EU support (in %) granted to the cooperation program (by Fund)			TO	IP	Specific objectives matched to investment priorities	Result indicators matched to the specific objective
		ERDF ¹	ENPI ² (if applicable)	IPA ³ (if applicable)				
Axis 8 - Develop a joint Caribbean-wide response to common public health issues (transnational)	€3,271,200	100%			TO9	IP9a	SO12 - Boost territories' capacities to respond to emerging diseases and other health risks	Caribbean territories' capacities to respond to health risks (unit: score on a scale of 1 to 5 based on an electronic survey)
Axis 9 - Support the development of renewable energy sources in the Eastern Caribbean (cross-border)	€7,795,100	100%			TO4	IP4a	SO13 - Increase the share of renewables in the energy mix to encourage greater energy independence in the Eastern Caribbean territories	Number of cross-border initiatives to increase renewable energy production in the Caribbean area (unit: number)
						IP4c	SO14 - Reduce energy consumption in public buildings in the Eastern Caribbean	Number of territories and countries that adopt thermal regulations comparable to France's Thermal, Acoustic and Ventilation Regulations for the Overseas Departments (DOM RTAA) (unit: number)
Axis 10 - Build human capital (transnational)	€3,271,200	100%			TO10	IP10a	SO15 - Increase mastery and reciprocal use of language in the Caribbean	Number of students enrolled in language courses in Caribbean universities (unit: number)

Table 1. Overview of the cooperation program investment strategy

Priority axes	ERDF support (in EUR)	Share of total EU support (in %) granted to the cooperation program (by Fund)			TO	IP	Specific objectives matched to investment priorities	Result indicators matched to the specific objective
		ERDF ¹	ENPI ² (if applicable)	IPA ³ (if applicable)				
						IP10a	SO16 - Increase educational and professional mobility within the Caribbean	Number of international cooperation agreements with the Caribbean signed by Caribbean universities and regional professional training institutions
Axis 11 - Technical assistance (cross-border)	€2,413,456	100%				IP10a	SO17 - Ensure optimal implementation of the program and projects	Average processing time for payment
Axis 12 - Technical assistance (transnational)	€1,355,249	100%				IP10a	SO18 - Ensure optimal implementation of the program and projects	Average processing time for payment

1.2 Regulatory Framework

This plan was drafted in accordance with the following regulatory framework:

- **Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013** of the European Parliament and of the Council of December 17, 2013 setting out provisions common to the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the European Social Fund (ESF), the Cohesion Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF), setting out general provisions applicable to the ERDF, the ESF, the Cohesion Fund, and the EMFF, and especially point 54 of the Preamble and Articles 56 (Evaluation during the programming period), 110 (the Monitoring Committee's responsibilities) and 114 (Evaluation)
- **Regulation (EU) No. 1299/2013** of the European Parliament and of the Council of December 17, 2013 setting out specific provisions relative to the contribution of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) to further European territorial cooperation, and especially point 26 of the Preamble on the responsibility of the Managing Authorities in carrying out evaluations and Article 14 which describes the criteria for drafting the implementation reports
- **Commission delegated regulation (EU) No. 240/2014** of January 7, 2014 relative to the European code of conduct on partnership under the European Structural Investment Funds (ESIF), and especially Article 16, on the involvement of partners in program evaluation

This plan was also drafted based on the guidelines contained in the documents *Guidance Document on Evaluation Plans, Terms of Reference for Impact Evaluations Guidance on Quality Management of External Evaluations*, published by the European Commission Directorate General of Regional and Urban Policy, and the Directorate General of Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion in February 2015, as well as on information detailed in *Guidance Document on Monitoring and Evaluation European Cohesion Fund, European Regional Development Fund Concepts and Recommendations* published by the European Commission Directorate General of Regional and Urban Policy, in March 2014.

Given this regulatory framework and the specific context of the program, such as the area of operation, the following evaluations will be carried out:

Regulatory Evaluations:

Evaluations	Regulation	Provisions provided in the Evaluation Plan	Deadline
Ex-ante evaluation and strategic environmental evaluation	Article 55 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013	Not applicable	Conducted on January 12, 2015 and January 19, 2015, respectively
Yearly evaluation of progress of evaluation plan implementation, follow-up to evaluation results, involvement of partners in program evaluation	Article 14.4 of Regulation (EU) No. 1299/2013	Carried out internally on a yearly basis, by introducing results and responses to preceding evaluations.	May 31 of each year, except 2017 and 2019
Evaluation of objectives / results for the 2017 annual report	Article 50.4 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013	Given how early the program is being implemented, this evaluation will be carried out internally.	June 30, 2017

Evaluation of objectives/results for the 2019 annual report, the final report, and the performance benchmark	Article 50.5 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013	Included in this report: results from 2018 evaluations, and from 2019 impact evaluations.	June 30, 2019
Evaluation of the manner in which ERDF contributed to the objectives of each priority	Article 56.3 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013	Two impact evaluations will be carried out for each priority.	2019; and one update in 2021.
Evaluation of Communications Strategy (at least once during the programming period)	Annex XII. Point 4.g) of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013	Two communications strategy evaluations—associated with undermentioned implementation evaluations—will be carried out.	2018 and update in 2020.
Evaluation designed to determine program effectiveness, efficiency and impact	Article 56.3 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013	Two impact evaluations will be carried out, and will assess the program’s effectiveness, efficiency and impact.	2019 and update in 2021.
Report summarizing the conclusions of evaluations carried out	Article 114.2 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013	Integration of abovementioned evaluation results.	December 31, 2022
Ex-post evaluation (European Commission with Member States)	Article 57 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013	Not applicable	Not applicable

Optional evaluations:

In order to improve program direction, operation and results, additional evaluations will be carried out during the programming period.

Implementation evaluations will thereby evaluate the effectiveness of the program’s management and monitoring procedures as defined and as implemented by the managing authorities.

A thematic evaluation will address the strength of partnership. This evaluation is aligned with the conclusions of evaluations carried out during the 2007-2013 period, with the objectives of the territorial cooperation program defined in the partnership agreement signed between France and the European Commission, and with the program’s development strategy. The evaluation seeks to assess the involvement and participation of EU and non-EU partners in the program, the strength of the cooperation relationship created and the effects of the program in terms of integration of European community territories in their region.

A final evaluation will address the evaluation process itself and will serve to review the responses to the results of evaluation, and to review the effects this process had on program direction and operation.

SECTION 2: OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, ANALYSIS OF AVAILABLE DATA AND COORDINATION

2.1 Objectives and Main Characteristics

The Evaluation Plan for the 2014-2020 Interreg V Caribbean Territorial Cooperation Program describes the conditions and methods for organizing and carrying out evaluation during the 2014-2022 period, based on the definition of objectives undertaken to obtain new information.

This activity is undertaken with the following objectives:

- **Strategic Objective:** Evaluate and improve effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the operational program

Adapting the strategy to the needs the European Union's outermost regions in the Caribbean as well as to non-EU countries participating in the program.

Promoting and improving regional cooperation in the Caribbean cooperation area.

- **Operational Objective:** Grant program Authorities a flexible and effective tool that can improve the quality, effectiveness and consistency of the program's strategy

Streamlining the execution of actions by identifying problems during the implementation phase and identifying better alternatives.

- **Informative Objective:** Recognize the results of the program and its contribution to the objectives of the European Union, and share this information with beneficiaries, potential beneficiaries and the entire population

Promoting the participation of the program's actors in the evaluation procedure.

Producing and analyzing appropriate and reliable information that provides a faithful image of the operational program's execution to its Authorities, but also to other actors participating in the implementation phase, as well as the general population.

This Plan therefore defines the entire process of evaluating effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the program for the entire period of validity, in a manner consistent with and proportional to its financial allocation, and taking into consideration the expected changes and the desired realization of objectives established under this performance framework.

The composition of this Plan should be considered open-ended, especially in regards to the second half of the programming period, so as to allow for possible modifications and/or additions that may prove necessary at a later time. This means that the indications provided in this document should be considered as guidelines and may be subject to more detail at a later stage, or, if necessary, to revisions intended to improve the plan's capacity to provide elements that are useful for the proper and efficient management of the program.

Moreover, documents relative to each evaluation timetable implementation, conditions and methods, sources of information and questions are included in the annex to this evaluation plan.

2.2 Scope

This Evaluation Plan covers only the 2014-2020 Caribbean Cooperation Program area, co-financed by European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) within the objective of European territorial cooperation (ETC).

The program's area includes:

1/ Territories eligible for the “Caribbean area” trans-national cooperation component

- French regions (at NUTS3 level of the nomenclature for European regions)
- Guadeloupe / Saint Martin
- Martinique
- French Guiana

Other territories (States and Overseas Countries and Territories), “listed for information only”

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| • Antigua and Barbuda | • Guyana |
| • Anguilla | • Honduras |
| • Bonaire | • Haiti |
| • Curacao | • Jamaica |
| • Sint Maarten | • Saint Kitts and Nevis |
| • Saba | • Cayman Islands |
| • Sint Eustatius | • Saint Lucia |
| • Saint-Barthélemy | • Montserrat |
| • Aruba | • Mexico |
| • Barbados | • Nicaragua |
| • Bermuda | • Panama |
| • Bahamas | • Puerto Rico |
| • Belize | • Suriname |
| • Colombia | • El Salvador |
| • Costa Rica | • Turks and Caicos islands |
| • Cuba | • Trinidad and Tobago |
| • Dominica | • Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| • Dominican Republic | • Venezuela |
| • Grenada | • British Virgin Islands |
| • Guatemala | • Brazil (Amapa, Para, Amazonas and Roraima) |

2/ Territories eligible for the cross-border cooperation component “Martinique-Guadeloupe-Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS)”

French regions (at NUTS3 level of the nomenclature for European regions)

- Guadeloupe
- Martinique

OECS States and territories

- Antigua and Barbuda
- Anguilla
- Dominica
- Grenada
- Montserrat
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
- British Virgin Islands

This Plan will remain in effect until 2022. At that time, the program's authorities must, in accordance with Article 114, paragraph 2, of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013, submit a report before December 31st that presents all the evaluations carried out during the programming period, the main results achieved, and provide commentary for the main elements derived from the evaluations.

2.3 Analysis of Available Data

The evaluation is carried out in a coordinated manner, drawing upon lessons from past evaluations and best practices relative to the active participation of different Public Administrations in the development of successive programs. The evaluation also draws upon data collected during the preparation of the 2014-2020 Interreg Caribbean Program, that is:

- Essential diagnostic elements for regions, as they are presented in the territorial strategic diagnostics of the program's French regions, and in the summary of the Directorate of Regional Surveillance of the overseas regions of the Ministry of Overseas. Other analysis documents, such as the AFD's Caribbean Regional Intervention Framework or the Université de Caen's Atlas Caraïbe, have contributed to the analysis of the various elements;
- Lessons learned from the previous programming based on mid-program evaluation finalized in November 2012 by the Technopolis Group, the 2012 Program Execution Annual Report and an interview with the program Joint Secretary;
- Feedback from program partners gathered:
 - during individual interviews conducted with regional actors;
 - during a work meeting via videoconference held on October, 25 2013, with representatives from the regions of Guadeloupe and Martinique, the overseas collectivity of Saint-Martin and Technopolis;
 - during an initial steering committee of the November 7, 2013 mission in Guadeloupe, with representatives from the four French collectivities, the OECS and the Regional General Directorate;
 - during specific thematic interviews conducted in the region in December 2013 and January 2014 with the qualified technical/thematic services in the four French territories of the operational program (Technical services of the Regional Councils and deconcentrated services of the State, and other agencies such as ADEME, socio-economic partners; see list in annex);

- during steering committees organized on February 7, 2014, May 28, 2014, and September 12, 2014 in Guadeloupe and Martinique;

- for the cross-border component, during consultations carried out in Saint Lucia in the spring of 2014 between the contracting authority support, the Region of Martinique, and the OECS;

- Consideration of the added value of cross-border/transnational cooperation to respond to identified development challenges, the relevance of public action at the level of the area of cooperation, and the suitability of the program's financial capacity;
- Alignment with needs, challenges, strategies of international organizations in the Caribbean that are program partners (ACS-AEC, OECS and CARICOM/CARIFORUM) and compliance with strategies of the French overseas departments and regions and other international organizations active in the Caribbean such as The United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).

The main "recommendations" resulting from the ongoing evaluation process for previous programming mainly addressed the following:

- strengthening involvement of extra-Community partners, notably to encourage projects with greater structural focus and to improve co-financing;
- improving conditions for transferring Interreg subsidies to project initiators;
- strengthening the program's overall communication, notably by focusing the message on the value of projects;
- maintaining the sole European territorial cooperation program in the French Caribbean (associating the three overseas French departments and regions) which may identify within the Regional Union for Cooperation and Initiatives of the Antilles and French Guiana (URAG) a useful framework for cooperation;
- implementing regular dialogue with non-EU countries during the preparation and execution phases of the future program;
- improving the promotion and development of the economic aspect of the INTERREG program;
- instituting a more strategic procedure for directing programs that can ensure programming aligned with program objectives;
- strengthening development of and support for project initiators.

These elements were taken into consideration during the drafting of this plan. Specifically, the results of evaluations carried out during the 2007-2013 period will be considered during review of the results of evaluations carried out during the 2014-2020 period, in order to provide greater perspective on the progress of the program's managing authorities.

2.4 Coordination Mechanisms

The Caribbean area has several European territorial cooperation programs, such as: the Interreg Caribbean program, Interreg Amazonia-French Guianan Plateau program, and the Interreg Saint-

Martin – Sint-Maarten program. Given this context and the breadth of the Interreg Caribbean cooperation area, coordination between the different programs is desired.

In terms of evaluation, the inclusion of territorial representatives in the Evaluation Coordination Group will provide a forum for exchange with the managing authorities of the other abovementioned programs on their methods of evaluation and the results of those evaluation. This will encourage dissemination and sharing of information, good practices and evaluation results between these European programs, and provide a broad view of the impact of these cooperation programs in the area.

Because the managing authority of the Interreg Caribbean program is also the managing authority of an ERDF-ESF regional operational program, exchanges on evaluation may also take place between the managing authorities of these programs.

SECTION 3: EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

3.1 Program Partners' Involvement in the Evaluation Process

The evaluation is carried out in a coordinated manner, drawing upon lessons from past experiences and best practices relative to the active participation of different Public Administrations in the development of successive Programs.

In the specific case of the Interreg Caribbean Territorial Cooperation Program, this translates into close collaboration between the European Commission and the Management Authority. The **European Commission**, through the Evaluation Unit of Directorate General of Regional Policy, carries out three prioritized functions: providing guidelines on how evaluations are carried out, evaluating Programs at its own initiative, and creating an ex-post evaluation and a summary report of the ex-post evaluation (Articles 56 and 57 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013).

The main responsibility of the evaluation process, beginning with drafting this plan, falls to the Managing Authority. In accordance with Article 110, paragraph 1, letter b), of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013, an important role is nevertheless attributed to the Program Monitoring Committee, which is tasked not only with examining and approving the Plan (paragraph 2, letter c of the abovementioned Article 110), but also commenting on the progress made in implementing the Plan and the follow-up of evaluation activities.

The Managing Authority of the operational program, is responsible for the following tasks (Article 56 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013):

The Managing Authority is responsible for the coordination and the implementation of the evaluation process; it also ensures evaluation is managed successfully, from the planning phase up to the communication phase and the monitoring of pertinent data and the recommendations issued by the evaluators.

Specifically, the Managing Authority will be responsible for the following tasks:

- drafting this Evaluation Plan of the 2014-2020 Interreg V Caribbean Territorial Cooperation Operational Program, with the Joint Secretary;
- ensuring compliance with the provisions of the Plan by verifying there is sufficient capacity for implementing the Evaluation Plan.
- monitoring, with the Joint Secretary, updates to strategic indicators;
- overseeing evaluations carried out by the Joint Secretary and external evaluators, and approving their results;
- following-up on evaluation results and drafting proposals for changes to program management, implementation or evaluation, with the Joint Secretary and program partners;
- disseminating results, evaluations, with the Joint Secretary.

The Joint Secretary, delegated by the Managing Authority, is responsible for the operational tasks of evaluation coordinated by the Managing Authority. As such, the Joint Secretary is responsible for (Article 54 of Regulation (UE) No. 1303/2013):

- providing the necessary resources to successfully conduct evaluation and ensuring there is sufficient capacity for implementing the Evaluation Plan. An agent of the Joint Secretary will, for this purpose, be tasked with monitoring indicators and scoreboards, regularly extracting data from the SYNERGIE

database for monitoring indicator values (financial and communication indicators, indicators relative to projects), with external evaluators recruited through the public procurement process, the managing authority and partners.

This agent may participate in training, conferences and programs related to evaluation and monitoring of cooperation programs (preferably those organized by INTERACT ENPI and the European Commission). The related expenditures are covered by the Technical Assistance budget;

- defining and initiating procedures resulting in the production and collection of data needed for carrying out evaluations (essentially, productivity, results and communication indicators.);
- carrying out coordination tasks with the other programs, in accordance with recommendations from the European Commission, in the event of joint evaluation or sharing of experiences.

Finally, the Joint Secretary will support beneficiaries when they are asked to provide quantitative and qualitative information related to the execution of co-financed operations or projects, and the results obtained, the difficulties encountered and measures adopted to address those difficulties (Article 54.2 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013).

The Monitoring Committee

In accordance with abovementioned Article 110, paragraphs 1b and 2c of the General Regulations, the Monitoring Committee is responsible for reviewing and approving the Evaluation Plan, overseeing progress of related activities, and monitoring pertinent data obtained during evaluations and recorded in the annual Reports presented in 2017 and 2019 (in accordance with Article 14, paragraph 4a of Regulation (EU) No. 1299/2013).

Generally, the Monitoring Committee will verify implementation of the Evaluation Plan, and more specifically, the implementation of evaluation activities on a yearly basis, as also described in Implementing Regulation 207/2015 for which Annex X provides a model for annual Reports for European territorial cooperation purposes, including a specific point on summarizing all evaluations made available during the previous financial year.

Based on experience from 2007-2013 programming, the Monitoring Committee will provide support and guidance for the entire evaluation process. As such, the Committee may, including through the intermediary of the Evaluation Coordination Group mentioned in the following paragraph, offer suggestions on evaluation activities to be implemented to better gauge the program's effectiveness, efficiency and impact.

Within the Monitoring Committee is the **Evaluation Coordination Group**, whose main function is to supervise the entire evaluation process, by assisting the Monitoring Committee in carrying out its tasks, whether those tasks relate to institutional, technical or procedural responsibilities.

More specifically, the Evaluation Coordination Group will carry out the following functions:

- coordinate all activities related to program evaluation, ensuring integration and collaboration between internal and external subjects based on general information and timelines described in this document;
- act as point of contact with the external evaluator and examine the evaluation reports drafted by the external evaluator;
- propose to the Monitoring Committee the evaluation themes and the various evaluation questions related to the program's objectives.

The Evaluation Coordination Group is composed of the following members:

- 1 representative for each of the 4 regional territories;
- 1 representative for each of the non-EU regional organizations;
- representatives of program management authorities (Managing Authority/Joint Secretary).

The Evaluation Coordination Group is presided by the Managing Authority, which, with support from the Joint Secretary, is responsible for the following activities:

- conveying to the Monitoring Committee the results of the Evaluation Coordination Group as well following-up on recommendations and proposals made by the Group;
- convening Evaluation Coordination Group meetings and defining the provisional agenda;
- coordinating and ensuring smooth operation of the Evaluation Coordination Group;
- communicating and disseminating the information and documents to members of the Evaluation Coordination Group.

The Joint Secretary drafts the minutes for Group meetings and, after approval by the Monitoring Committee, sends them to the members of the Evaluation Coordination Group and to the Monitoring Committee.

3.2 Description of the Evaluation Process

The program's evaluation process is formalized by this document, which provides guidance on objectives and methodology for ongoing evaluation and changes to evaluation over time. The evaluation process itself (described in section 2.3) is based on ex-ante evaluation, which draws upon pertinent data collected during 2007-2013 evaluations and lessons learned from related experiences.

As stated in the previous paragraph, the plan's implementation anticipates evaluations at both the operational and strategic level. Operational evaluations address the program's implementation process, structures, capacity to achieve its specific objectives (notably through a strong link between actions and expected results) conditions and level of use of available resources. Strategic evaluations address the program's contribution to achieving the objectives of *Europe 2020*, the EU's growth strategy, including those elements resulting from effectiveness evaluation.

In accordance with the European Commission's standard practices and guidance on methods, the evaluations that assess the program implementation process, the conditions and the levels of use of available resources, and program results, will all be consolidated into implementation evaluation reports, whereas evaluations assessing the cooperation program's contribution to the *Europe 2020* objectives of smart, sustainable, and inclusive growth will be consolidated into the impact evaluation reports.

The different types of evaluation may be of a general or cross-disciplinary nature and will address, in this case, the program overall, or may be based on a theme and will address specific areas (e.g. axes, priorities, objectives) and/or processes (e.g. communications, cross-disciplinary principles, indicators) in depth.

Thus, the following thematic evaluations may be carried out:

- evaluation of the effectiveness of implementation and the impact of the program's communication strategy;
- evaluation of the strength of the partnership (involvement of partners in program implementation, strengthening of integration of cooperation area).

Section 4 following provides broad guidelines and additional information on the evaluation process (e.g. what evaluations to be carried out using which methods) as well as a timeline for the evaluation activities, which are organized to provide before the end of 2018 elements useful for improving the program, renewing strategy and updating, if necessary, financial tables.

3.3 Partner Participation

Partner participation in the evaluation process will be ensured directly by the presence of the Evaluation Coordination Group (described in section 3.1), which will monitor evaluation activities, and their results, which may, in turn, inform proposals on how to improve program management. The Evaluation Coordination Group will also contribute to drafting specifications and selecting the external evaluator.

Beneficiaries' and stakeholders' participation in evaluation activities will be assessed through highly participatory methods such as interviews, questionnaires, discussion groups, etc.. This will provide useful information for the implementation and impact evaluations.

The role of partners in program implementation, and more specifically in program monitoring and evaluation, is described in detail in the Annual Reports (published in 2017 and 2019) and the Final Report, in accordance with the provisions of Article 50, paragraph 4 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013 and Article 14, paragraph 4 of Regulation (EU) No. 1299/2013.

The territories' regional points of contacts will likewise contribute alongside stakeholders to evaluation activities and will participate concretely in sharing evaluation results.

3.4 Evaluation Expertise and Tools

Program evaluation will mainly be carried out by an external evaluator whose functional independence will be ensured by the program's entities (in accordance with Article 54, paragraph 3 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013). The evaluator will be selected through public procurement; the specifications for the call for proposals will detail the contractual activities and deliverables. Candidates will be judged based on the technical quality of their proposals as well as the confirmed experience of the members of the evaluation group.

The evaluators will receive relevant elements, program documents as well as any other information needed or useful to evaluation activities.

Among the provided information, the monitoring data is especially important. The effective availability of monitoring data comprises a special regulatory obligation for the Managing Authority (paragraph 2 of the abovementioned Article 54 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013). As such, the Managing Authority (with support from the Joint Secretary and external entities selected through public procurement procedures) will consequently provide the data collected via the Monitoring System, of which the most functional will inform financial, result and output indicators, as well as any other data provided by the Program Management System that is pertinent to implementation and impact evaluations.

To ensure the quality of data, the standardized interpretation of results, and the use of appropriate definitions for each indicator, the Managing Authority (with support from the Joint Secretary and external entities selected through public procurement) defines, within the document *Note on methods for*

defining result indicators, the important phases for gathering the information necessary for on-going quantification of indicators by beneficiaries and for ensuring that indicators are consistent with the program's structure (investment priorities, specific objectives and actions).

The procedure described in the document also draws upon certain summaries, presented in table form, which helps beneficiaries navigate the different categories of indicators while simplifying the logical framework in which these indicators are organized.

More specifically, the document provides specific details for **result indicators**, such as their codes and dimensions (unit of measurement, initial value at year of reference, end value in 2023, source and frequency), by matching them to specific corresponding program objectives, so as to ensure consistency between actions and expected results.

In contrast, for program **output indicators**, which are pertinent at the level of each project/operation and which are regularly supplied with figures from the monitoring system, the document provides their standard dimensions (unit of measurement and end value in 2023) but also highlights the existing relationship between the different indicators, common and specific, and the actions and the specific objectives of the program, which are designed to comply with the rationale of the various axes and investment priorities of the cooperation program.

The document also identifies the procedures for assessing the result and output indicators, at times defining the audit trail of tasks for the various subjects affected by the implementation of program actions, from the beneficiaries to the Managing Authority.

Other elements for guiding beneficiaries appear in the Program Manuals, the Application Form, and the Guide for Project Initiators.

Finally, the specifications anticipate regular exchanges between the Managing Authority, the Joint Secretary, and evaluators so as to provide subjects tasked with evaluation any and all information relevant to program implementation.

3.5 Strategy for Ensuring Use and Communication of Evaluation Results

Required by regulations, the dissemination of evaluation results is an important tool for communicating program results. Dissemination methods will vary depending on the targeted audience to ensure effective communication.

The results and the relevant data obtained during evaluation are indispensable tools for guiding both program implementation and future programming for the program's entities.

The evaluation reports, milestones in the evaluation process, will be regularly submitted to the Monitoring Committee. On that occasion, the reports will be presented and discussed among program partners and economic and social representatives of program partners. Specifically, the Managing Authority will present to the Monitoring Committee any recommendations for redirecting the program and those related to monitoring measures.

Once the reports have been reviewed by the Monitoring Committee, all the evaluation reports will be sent to the European Commission via SFC2014, the European Union's system for fund management. These reports must include an executive summary detailing the main results and conclusions of each evaluation question, as well as a brief description of data and methods used.

The program's annual implementation reports will include summaries of evaluation activities carried out during the reference financial year and will also detail the conditions of the related results report from the program implementation process.

Additionally, the dissemination of evaluation results to the public and to program stakeholders will be ensured through the publication of reports on the program’s website. Evaluation results will also be disseminated through annual implementation reports and the final implementation report.

The following table presents the dissemination actions taken:

Target group	Action	Media and Means of Communication
General public	Dissemination of implementation reports and summary of their content and evaluations (Article 50.9 of Regulation No. 1303/2013)	Program website
	Information on the program’s main results and supported projects	Website, social networks, events organized by the program, brochures, newsletter
Program partners - Monitoring Committee, Evaluation Coordination Group	Approval of Evaluation Plan	Written consultation of partners
	Dissemination of implementation reports and summary of their content and of evaluations	Submitted to partners for approval
	Dissemination of evaluation conclusions and recommendations	Committee discussions, discussions between partners within the Evaluation Coordination Group
Project Initiators	Publication of the program evaluation plan	Program website
	Information on requirements regarding the provision of indicators	Implementation document (DOMO), project initiator guide
	Dissemination of main conclusions and recommendations from evaluations	Technical meetings, newsletter
	Information on the main results of the program and supported projects	Website, social networks, events organized by the program, brochures, newsletter

3.6 Timetable, Budget and Training

Table 3 below presents the timetable for the evaluation process and describes how the evaluation outputs and activities are matched to the execution requirements of the program’s official activity of reporting to the European Commission, based on provisions of Article 50 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013 and Article 14 of Regulation (EU) No. 1299/2013 relative to European Territorial Cooperation (ETC).

The implementation reports must include a summary of the main pertinent data extracted from evaluations, which have become available during the period preceding the year the report is drafted, as well as a description of each evaluation element affecting program objectives and the measures adopted as a result.

More specifically, the reports to be presented in 2017 and 2019 must include, in addition to information on the progress of achieving program objectives (also including any changes to result

indicator values) elements that establish the progress of the Evaluation Plan and the actions undertaken following evaluation.

Moreover, the 2019 Implementation Report must provide information on the program's contribution to *Europe 2020*, the European Union's growth strategy.

In accordance with the provisions of Article 114, paragraph 2 of the General Regulations, the Managing Authority must also submit a report to the European Commission before December 31, 2022 summarizing the main pertinent data obtained from evaluation and gathered through the evaluation process, as well as the program's main outputs and results.

The program's resources set aside for creating the Evaluation Plan are detailed as follows:

External Resources:

- an estimated budget of 350 000 Euros sourced from the Program's Technical Assistance Funds will be allocated to the contracting of external evaluators who will carry out the activities detailed in the Evaluation Plan. Below, the composition of this budget:

Internal resources:

An agent of the Joint Secretary will be responsible for regularly updating the program's results and performance indicators. The agent will also be responsible for regularly extracting data from SYNERGIE in order to track projects' progress.

The Managing Authority will, with the Joint Secretary and the Evaluation Coordination Group, define the specifications for the evaluators, ensure monitoring of evaluation indicators and results, and propose modifications of program implementation and management procedures and program structure in response to evaluation conclusions.

The members of the Evaluation Coordination Group are also equally involved in evaluation activities, especially the monitoring of evaluation results and the suggestion of modifications.

These stakeholders may participate in training and benchmarking events conducted by the INTERACT Program, as well as any training initiatives implemented by national coordination bodies of European Territorial Cooperation programs.

The costs of these resources are covered by the technical assistance fund for human resources and related resources for the implementation of program functions.

The estimated cost for the training of the 5 concerned stakeholders is 5 000€.

Table 3. Evaluation Timetable for the 2014-2020 Caribbean Interregional Cooperation Programs

No., deadline, purpose and technique	DEADLINE	EVALUATION TYPE	PURPOSE
1	February 28, 2018	Implementation	Effectiveness/efficiency of the candidate presentation and selection processes, including approved projects' compliance with

			<p>cross-cutting principles (Articles 7 and 8 of Regulation 1303/2013)</p> <p>Effectiveness of governance for the new cooperation space, especially regarding the level of stakeholder participation in decision making</p> <p>Operations of program management structures and implementation level, in terms of Management and Control System procedures</p> <p>Effectiveness, in terms of the program's capacity to achieve the expected results, especially targeted values for performance and efficiency (financial dimensions of the cooperation program)</p> <p>Effectiveness of the communication strategy</p> <p><i>a.</i> Information and communication with citizens</p> <p><i>b.</i> Communication and dialog with beneficiaries</p> <p><i>c.</i> Implementation of the process to derive benefit from program results, including synergy with other programs including mainstream operational programs</p>
2	March 31, 2019	Impact	Program contribution to the EU's strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, for each program IP
3	February 28, 2020	Implementation (update)	<p>Efficiency/effectiveness of program implementation, in terms of Management and Control System procedures</p> <p>Compliance of approved projects with cross-cutting principles (Articles 7 and 8 of Regulation 1303/2013)</p> <p>Efficiency/effectiveness of program implementation, in terms of Management and Control System procedures</p> <p>Effectiveness, in terms of the program's capacity to achieve the expected results, especially final and efficiency target values</p> <p>Efficiency of the governance</p>

			<p>system for the cooperation space</p> <p>Effectiveness of the communication strategy</p> <p>a. Information and communication with citizens</p> <p>b. Communication and dialog with beneficiaries</p> <p>c. Implementation of the process to derive benefit from program results, including synergy with other programs including mainstream operational programs</p>
5	3/31/21	Impact (update)	Program contribution to the EU's strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, for each program IP
6	March 31, 2022	Summary report	Summary of evaluations performed and main program results

3.7 Managing Quality of the Evaluation Process

Having quality information is a requirement for the evaluation process. To ensure the reliability and availability of data, the program's authorities have identified the following objectives:

- To have reliable information relative to monitoring of projects:

Projects are the very basis of the program and the evaluation process. Additionally, the Joint Secretary's agents have the mission to monitor the smooth implementation of operations and to provide support to project initiators in completing procedures. Simultaneously, the agents will give special attention to data collected for indicators when information on expenditures are forwarded by coordinators. The coordinator also has the obligation, upon the completion of his/her project, to send all data related to indicators defined in the agreement. Possible on-site visits will ensure the accuracy of information provided.

- To ensure monitoring of program indicators:

An agent of the Joint Secretary will be responsible, in coordination with the Managing Authority, for monitoring and regularly updating program indicators. Specifically, implementation indicators will be updated annually in order to integrate the data in the annual implementation report. Result indicators will be updated in 2017, 2019 and 2022 in order to integrate them into the implementation reports.

Regular extractions will also be carried out from SYNERGIE in order to analyze the indicator data. The program's financial indicators (timeline and consumption rate of the model, especially), will be reviewed in depth by the program's authorities, in order to evaluate the effectiveness of management procedures.

- To conduct evaluative investigations:

In order to guarantee the quality and the objectivity of information, as well as ensuring a functional separation between evaluator and the program's authorities, implementation and impact evaluation tasks will be externalized.

External evaluators will be recruited via a public procurement procedure. The external evaluator services will be defined jointly by the managing staff and the program partners based on this plan's context. The documents will define the contractual services' purpose, characteristics, the conditions for execution (including performance criteria and the allocated resources). It is important to describe in detail the evaluation activities and deliverables, providing general description of evaluation questions that will be addressed and defining data to be used. The documents will require the evaluator to:

- assemble a task force with the appropriate structure and number of members with clearly defined roles, responsibilities and skills;
- create a work plan for carrying out the evaluation activities, detailing all activities to be executed. This will include an evaluation proposal indicating methods and tools, timetable for evaluation activities, preliminary schedule for meetings with the Managing Authority/Joint Secretary, proposal for a table of contents for each evaluation report required, the conditions for collaboration with the Managing Authority for carrying out activities for disseminating results provided for by this Plan in order to ensure the use and communication of evaluation results.

Indeed, the Managing Authority and the Joint Secretary's evaluation referent will be the primary points of contact for the external evaluator, with whom regular in-person or virtual meetings are anticipated so as to assess evaluation progress. The Managing Authority/Joint Secretary will carefully verify that evaluator's deliverables comply with the conditions set out in the public procurement documents and will carry out the necessary reviews to ensure compliance.

Public procurement documents will clearly set out the conditions and criteria that will be used to evaluate proposals, which will be used mainly to evaluate the quality of the proposals and the evaluator's competencies. The Managing Authority will ensure a transparent selection process, in full compliance with public procurement rules set at the European, national and local levels.

As previously indicated, all evaluation reports must be submitted to the Monitoring Committee. The Monitoring Committee will then review these documents. If necessary, evaluators may be asked to present the report at specific times.

SECTION 4. TIMELINE FOR EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

4.1 Definition of Basic Elements

The purpose of this section is to detail the approach, methods, time periods, and allocated resources of the evaluation process, for which the main steps have already been described in the previous sections.

As previously highlighted, the intermediate evaluation described in this Evaluation Plan represents a key moment in the program's evaluation cycle. Its importance owes to the fact that elements drawn from ex-ante evaluation will serve as points of reference for the ex post evaluation that will be carried out at a later time by the European Commission. More importantly, evaluation is an integral part of successfully managing the program. Indeed, the main purpose of evaluation, as previously explained in the 2014-2020 Regulations on European Structural and Investment Funds, is to “defend” structural and cohesion policies, to provide a transparent report of program implementation and of the results attained/attainable relative to clearly defined and, at times, ambitious objectives within the context of structural and environmental constraints of the territories involved in programs.

Evaluation's growing importance—and the growing formal recognition of its importance—results from the need to reproduce (through reports, research, analysis, and in-depth review) program implementation objectives, deadlines and conditions throughout program execution. This information is used to inform and improve public policy and to discuss the conditions, purpose and limitations of this evaluation.

Based on these conditions, the objective of the evaluation described in this Plan consists of assessing the program's effectiveness, efficiency and impact, especially as related to the following capacities:

- the capacity to use available resources, through on-going assessment of the financial performance of the project, action, objective, investment priority, axe and program, in terms of the allocated resources at the outset as well as the financial requirements identified during monitoring (measure of effectiveness);
- the capacity to achieve the expected results, through detailed assessment drawn from the individual project and contributing to a broader program view, in particular by highlighting specific objectives, or cluster of objectives grouped, for example, by common end-goal, which constitutes the programming unit to which are associated result indicators (measure of effectiveness);
- the capacity to contribute to achieving objectives of *Europe 2020*, the European Union's growth strategy (measure of impact).

This objective will be pursued, within the framework of this Plan, through evaluations of the following general or cross-disciplinary categories when the evaluations relate to the program as a whole, or thematically when the evaluations relate to specific areas (e.g. axes, priorities, objectives) and/or specific processes (e.g. communication, cross-disciplinary principles, indicators, etc.):

- 1. Implementation evaluations**, operational in nature and relating to the implementation process, the conditions of use of resources and assessment of whether expected results were achieved.

This especially involves assessing the process itself, but also how resources are used, the results achieved, the program's operation and especially the adequacy of management structures, the process of selecting funded operations, and the level of implementation relative to expected results. This evaluation will address aspects related to process and procedures, including whether those of approved projects are in line with cross-cutting principles. The evaluation will

also address the effectiveness of program governance, and especially relative to the participation of stakeholders in the decision-making process. It will devote special attention to the adequacy of operation of various structures and related procedures (especially as it relates to the system of management and control), to how resources are used, to the capacity to achieve expected results (and above all, the performance benchmark values), to governance, and to the program's level of integration with other European Union instruments, as well as to the communications strategy.

This evaluation will provide the opportunity to assess the program's effectiveness (program results in terms of outputs and results relative to objectives) and efficiency (relationship between results achieved and the resources used).

2. **Impact evaluations**, strategic in nature, and essential for ongoing assessment of the cooperation program's capacity to contribute to the program's own objectives to the EU's *Europe 2020* objectives of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.

The numerous definitions of "impact evaluation" all emphasize a common objective: to study the actual, and not the assumed, relationship between cause and effect. It is necessary to indicate that what is of interest is not so much defining, more or less rigorously, the impact evaluation from a scientific point of view, but rather the difficulty within current policies to answer the questions "What did intervention achieve?" "Based on clear pertinent data, can we attribute certain changes to the policy (Who? To what extent?) compared with what would have occurred without intervention?" In this context, the impact evaluation addresses the program's contribution to the European Union's *Europe 2020* strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.

The objective will therefore first be to evaluate the effects of implementing the program within the territories and their contribution to *Europe 2020*, while excluding as much as possible the influence of other factors such as economic or social changes, policy changes, the effects of other programs co-financed by EU funds, etc.

In terms of method, it is important to keep in mind that an impact evaluation carried out during the on-going cooperation program, which is what is anticipated here, inevitably has limitations in terms of measuring effects within a context that has yet to be defined/settled.

3. The abovementioned evaluations will be supplemented by a final deliverable: the **Summary Report**, whose purpose is to provide a general overview of evaluation activities carried out and the program's main results.

This report has a dual objective: to present a framework for summarizing evaluations carried out and for ensuring compliance with Plan content (in addition to the objective of stimulating reflection on the role of evaluation and its contribution to the program's management) and, based on pertinent data drawn from the evaluations, highlight, even in a critical manner, the main results obtained by the program itself, relative to the procedural and contextual constraints observed.

All the evaluations mentioned in the Evaluation Plan, including those that have not been expressly described, are designed to assess the cooperation program's effective capacity to strengthen active networks for collaborating on the program's key themes of intervention. Strengthening these networks thus becomes a decisive element in improving cooperation and therefore an ineluctable element when evaluating the program's effectiveness and above all, its impact.

Simultaneously to these external evaluations, follow-up will be carried out by the program's managers to ensure continuity of the evaluation process. Thus, given how early programming is being implemented, an evaluation of program operation and impact will be carried out internally in order to meet the requirement of drafting an intermediate implementation report for 2017. The agent responsible for evaluation for the Joint Secretary will also carry out regular updates to program indicators. Finally, follow-up to conclusions of evaluations completed previously will be carried out by

managers in order to ensure the effectiveness of the evaluation process and to continuously improve the program's operation and impact.

These various elements will be integrated in the annual program implementation reports.

The timetable for evaluations is a key element in the evaluation plan. Indeed, the moment selected for undertaking each evaluation determines the relevance and usefulness of results that are produced. In order to maximize the impact of evaluation, the following timetable has been chosen for evaluations:

EVALUATION	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Intermediate implementation evaluation				I					
Implementation					E				
Impact						E			
Intermediate implementation evaluation						I			
Implementation – Update							E		
Impact – Update								E	
Final report									E

I = Internal E = External

The summary sheets below provide the main reference documents for organizing the evaluation process, describing: the number and type of evaluations to be carried out, the evaluation purpose, the timelines for delivery, the approaches and techniques for collecting and analyzing information, and estimated resources for each evaluation type (4.2.)

4.2. Evaluation summary sheets

2017 intermediate implementation report	
Purpose	As part of drafting the 2017 intermediate implementation report, an evaluation will first be carried out on program implementation and initial results.
Rationale	This evaluation is mandated by regulations, as it is a prerequisite for drafting the intermediate implementation report described in Article 50.4 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013. The scope of this evaluation will take into account the earliness of program implementation. Carrying out implementation evaluation early in programming provides the opportunity to take corrective action and obtain results.

Evaluation method	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> internal <input type="checkbox"/> external
Evaluation period	2014-2017
Evaluation deadline	March 2017

Budget (for information only)	€65,000
-------------------------------	---------

Objectives	Specifications	Evaluation questions
Effectiveness / efficiency of the candidate presentation and selection processes	Evaluation of the candidate presentation and selection processes	<p>1. To what extent does the cooperation program establish efficient/effective procedures for presenting and selecting candidates in terms of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> effectiveness of implementation instruments (Number of pre-projects submitted? Rate of rejection of pre-projects? Number of projects accepted versus number of projects presented)? time to review proposals (compared to the average time during the 2007/2013 operational program)? candidate coverage by axis/objective? coverage of demand in the territories affected by the program (number of candidates and territorial distribution of project initiators)? <p>How does the operational program and defined procedures get partners involved in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> defining the call for expression of interest? disseminating information? selecting candidates?
Operations of program management structures and implementation level, in terms of Management and Control System procedures.	Evaluation of the process based on an analysis of the structures compared to specific processes and certain management and control system procedures, including for organizational fit (<i>efficiency</i>)	<p>Are the established program management structures and procedures appropriate/effective in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> human resources and Managing Authority / Joint Secretary organization? administrative capacity for operational program management?

	<i>including intervention areas of the regional program for implementation)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • introduction of innovation (e.g., online forms, cost simplification)? • measures to reduce administrative tasks for beneficiaries? • audit system? • support services for beneficiaries? • monitoring system (e.g. guidelines for defining and using indicators)?
Effectiveness of the program's financial tracking system	Evaluation assessing the program's financial data.	<p>Have the authorities introduced tools and procedures that enable effective tracking of the program's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planned amounts? • certified amounts? • amounts paid? • certification and payment periods? <p>and determines whether target expenditure values are feasible?</p>
Effectiveness, in terms of the program's capacity to achieve the expected results, especially target values from the performance and efficiency framework	<p>Evaluation that will initially focus on the financial aspects of the program as a whole (efficiency).</p> <p>The evaluation of physical indicators will look at analyses that, on the basis of projects accepted for funding and through projections, provide measures on the credibility of the fixed target values by suggesting elements for conformity if applicable.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How are commitments distributed by axis in comparison to the financial plan? How are certified expenditures distributed? Can target expenditure values be realized? 2. What does the analysis of output indicators show in terms of expected results achieved / achievable?
Effectiveness of governance in the cooperation space	Evaluation of the governance system's capacity to enable stakeholders' participation and the qualitative improvement of non-EU territory participation in implementing activities.	<p>Do the forms of governance established by the cooperation program help foster:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stakeholder participation in making decisions? • qualitative improvement in territories' participation in implementing activities? • distribution of funded projects throughout the cooperation area?
Effectiveness of the communications strategy	Evaluation of the completion level of Strategy objectives by assessing the communication instruments and coverage, and the principal communication actions and audience, especially comprehension level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the cooperation program activate information and communications mechanisms to improve citizen participation? • Is communication with beneficiaries smooth and constant? • What initial assessment can be made relative to obtaining communication indicators?

Principal information sources	
Document analysis	Cooperation program, description of management and control system, manuals, public procurement documents, program indicators
Data analysis	Information system; Reports on physical, financial and procedural monitoring
Surveys and interviews	Managing Authority referents; Stakeholders

Data requirements	Have chart for tracking indicators and performance
	Determine possible flaws in measures

Approach or method used	<u>Qualitative Approach</u> : To assess the indicator performance and relevance relative to contrasting axes; to undertake an initial assessment of the program's effectiveness and financial monitoring; to evaluate the significance and relevance of the initial communications operations; to address the effectiveness of partner participation.
-------------------------	---

Evaluation results diffusion
Monitoring committee, Website, Beneficiaries

Implementation evaluation n°1	
Purpose	This evaluation will address aspects related to process and procedures, including whether those of approved projects are in line with cross-cutting principles. The evaluation will also address the effectiveness of program governance, and especially relative to participation of stakeholders in the decision-making process. Finally, it will address the effectiveness of the communications strategy.
Rationale	Completing this evaluation in 2018 will provide an initial assessment of the program's progress, operation and governance as well as the communications activities that are directed at the general public and recipients. This will provide the opportunity to define best practices and correct ineffective procedures so as to improve program direction and to increase effectiveness and results. This evaluation will also be the opportunity to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the program's management and implementation procedures defined by the authorities, in accordance with the wishes of the European Commission.

Evaluation method	<input type="checkbox"/> internal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> external
Evaluation period	2014-2017
Evaluation deadline	February 2018

Budget (for information only)	65 000 €
-------------------------------	----------

Objectives	Specifications	Evaluation questions
Effectiveness / efficiency of the candidate presentation and selection processes, including compliance of approved projects with cross-cutting principles (Arts. 7 and 8 of Reg. 1303/2013).	Evaluation of the candidate presentation and selection processes – by defining criteria relative to selection period [efficiency] and coverage by candidate axis / objective [effectiveness] - by reinforcing the manner in which the bid selection criteria used articulate the broad principles.	1. To what extent does the cooperation program establish efficient/effective procedures for presenting and selecting candidates in terms of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> effectiveness of implementation instruments (Number of pre-projects submitted? Rate of rejection of pre-projects? Number of projects accepted versus number of projects presented)? Effectiveness of the call for expression of interest relative to the quality of applications and whether partner needs were met? time to review proposals (compared to the average time during the 2007/2013 operational program)? candidate coverage by axis/objective? coverage of request over territories affected by the program (Number of applications and distribution by beneficiary territory)? creating a work plan for carrying out the evaluation activities, detailing all activities to be executed. diversity of project initiators (status, type of structure, size, location)?

		<p>2. How does the operational program and defined procedures get partners involved in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • defining the call for expression of interest? • disseminating information? • selecting candidates? <p>3. To what extent does the candidate presentation and selection procedures take into account the principles described in Articles 7 and 8 of Regulation No. 1303/2013?</p>
<p>Operations of program management structures and implementation level, in terms of Management and Control System procedures.</p>	<p>Evaluation of the process based on an analysis of the structures compared to specific processes and certain management and control system procedures, including for organizational fit (<i>efficiency including intervention areas of the regional program for implementation</i>)</p>	<p>Are the established program management structures and procedures appropriate/effective in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • human resources and Managing Authority / Joint Secretary organization? • administrative capacity for operational program management? • introduction of innovation (e.g., online forms, cost simplification)? • measures to reduce administrative tasks for beneficiaries? • audit system? • support services for beneficiaries? • monitoring system (e.g. guidelines for defining and using indicators)?
<p>Effectiveness, in terms of the program's capacity to achieve the expected results, especially target values from the performance and efficiency framework (financial dimensions of the cooperation program)</p>	<p>Evaluation that will initially focus on the financial aspects of the program as a whole (efficiency).</p> <p>The evaluation of physical indicators will look at analyses that, on the basis of projects accepted for funding and through projections, provide measures on the credibility of the fixed target values by suggesting elements for conformity if applicable.</p>	<p>1. How are commitments distributed by axis in comparison to the financial plan? How are certified expenditures distributed? Can target expenditure values be realized? How effective is the payment and certification process relative to deadlines?</p> <p>Are the means allocated to financial tracking proportional to the objectives of effective financial management? In terms of financial and human resources (number of full time equivalents? competencies?)</p> <p>2. What does the analysis of output indicators show in terms of expected results achieved / achievable?</p> <p>Are the means allocated to monitoring indicators and achieving target and intermediate values proportional to the stated objectives? In terms of financial and human resources (number of full time equivalents? competencies?)</p>
<p>Program integration with other instruments</p>	<p>Evaluation to report on the connection of the cooperation program with other EU</p>	<p>How does the program coordinate with other EU instruments and what are the results, especially with:</p>

	financial instruments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDF? • MAINSTREAM OPERATIONAL PROGRAMS? • CFR?
Effectiveness of governance in the cooperation space	Evaluation of the governance system's capacity to resolve problems that arose during the 2007-2013 cooperation program in terms of the level of stakeholder participation and the qualitative improvement of non-EU territory participation in implementing activities.	<p>Do the forms of governance established by the cooperation program help foster:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stakeholders participation in making decisions? • qualitative improvement in territories' participation in implementing activities? • distribution of funded projects throughout the cooperation area? • qualitative improvement in participation of project initiators located in non-EU countries in implementing activities for funded projects?
<p>Effectiveness of the communications strategy:</p> <p>A. Information and communication with citizens</p> <p>B. Communication and dialog with beneficiaries</p>	Evaluation of the completion level of Strategy objectives by assessing the communication instruments and coverage, and the principal communication actions and audience, especially comprehension level.	<p>1. Did the cooperation program activate information and communications mechanisms to improve citizen information? How effective are these measures in terms of the visibility of funded projects? In terms of program visibility? Did these actions lead to greater program ownership by citizens within the cooperation area?</p> <p>2. Is communication with beneficiaries smooth and constant? Were the communications instruments that were defined deemed suitable, effective and sufficient to achieve their objectives relative to the participation of beneficiaries? How did actions carried out strengthen the program's visibility among beneficiaries? Program ownership by the beneficiaries? Were the tools defined and the information conveyed effective and proportional to assist the beneficiary or the potential beneficiary in the process?</p>

Principal information sources	
Document analysis	Cooperation program, description of management and control system, manuals, public procurement documents, program indicators
Data analysis	Information system; Reports on physical, financial and procedural monitoring
Survey and interview	Managing Authority referents; Stakeholders; Beneficiaries; Citizen.
Discussion groups	Managing Authority referents, Stakeholders Reports on project selection and implementation

Data requirements	Have chart for tracking indicators and performance
	Determine the possible deficiencies through discussions with managers, by conducting consistency controls relative to project funds

	and outputs
--	-------------

Approach or method used	<p><u>Qualitative Approach:</u> To assess the relevance of indicators, modeling of trajectory for achieving targets, the completion and quality of inputting; to identify the contrasting axes, obstacles to achieving targeted indicators; to draft initial recommendations to improve program direction and management; to design the system for collecting 6-month indicators (conditions for monitoring, storing, sampling, etc.); to analyze the capacity of the indicator monitoring system to meet quality standards required by the European Commission, etc.</p> <p>The program’s system of indicators represent one of the most important sources of information for the implementation evaluation, and the program’s financial and output indicators that measure the actual, financial and procedural progress. Data analysis and interviews with program managers and partners will also be decisive.</p> <p>Evaluators may also assess the typical process that a project initiator must navigate, to gauge the clarity, relevance and effectiveness of defined procedures and tools.</p>
-------------------------	---

Evaluation results diffusion	
Monitoring committee, Website, Beneficiaries	

Impact evaluation n°1	
Purpose	This evaluation is designed to assess the progress of the program relative to the stated objectives, and to gauge the effects on the cooperation area.
Rationale	<p>Although the evaluation of program impact and objectives is mandated by regulations, carrying out two impact evaluations provides program authorities the possibility of assessing the program's effects but also of gauging progress while the program is still ongoing and identifying any possible deficiencies that require correction, in order to maximize the program's positive impact on the cooperation area.</p> <p>This evaluation will also be the occasion to assess the program's effectiveness and efficiency.</p> <p>These elements will be included in the 2019 intermediate implementation report.</p>

Evaluation method	<input type="checkbox"/> internal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> external
Evaluation period	2014-2018
Evaluation deadline	March 2019

Budget (for information only)	€80,000
-------------------------------	---------

Objectives	Evaluative questions
------------	----------------------

Axis 1 and 2	<p>- Support the economic diversification of the territories through knowledge transfer and the commercialization of innovative products;</p> <p>- Create a business climate that stimulates trade between the Caribbean territories</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the expected changes (strengthening of innovation activity in Caribbean enterprises and technology transfer between the research and business communities, development and commercialization of innovative solutions, creation of innovative enterprises, economic diversification of the territories; creation of a fertile business environment across the Caribbean region as well as more internationally oriented Caribbean enterprises, balanced economic growth across the region, growth that both creates wealth and employment) actually occur? 2. How did these changes come about? To what extent were these changes the result of program actions (axes 1 and 2)? Are there any instances of emulation? Were there any unexpected impacts? 3. What were the mechanisms that produced the observed effects? How did the program strengthen relationships and cooperation between partners from different territories? 4. Does the program's impact differ between sub-groups of beneficiaries? Does the program's impact differ between beneficiaries' locations? 5. Will the program's effects last over the long term or the medium term? Will the short-term effects be the same as the long-term effects? 6. Do the actions supported by the program complement the smart specialization strategies/with the area's Regional Plans for Internationalization of Business? If yes, what are the program's impacts on these plans?
Axis 3 and 4	<p>- Strengthen the capacity of Caribbean territories to manage risk and respond to natural disasters</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the expected changes (improved knowledge/understanding about the natural risks – and their aftereffects – confronting the cooperation area, as well as the introduction of joint risk management systems) actually occur? 2. How did these changes come about? To what extent were these changes the result of program actions (axes 3 and 4)? Are there any instances of emulation? Were there any unexpected impacts? 3. What were the mechanisms that produced the observed effects? How did the program strengthen relationships and cooperation between partners from different territories? 4. Does the program's impact differ between sub-groups of beneficiaries? Does the program's impact differ between beneficiaries' locations? 5. Will the program's effects last over the long term or the medium term? Will the short-term effects be the same as the long-term effects?

<p style="text-align: center;">Axis 5 and 6</p>	<p>- Better protect and capitalise on the Caribbean's natural heritage through joint strategies and policy instruments</p> <p>- Increase the touristic appeal of the cooperation area through the joint marketing of its natural and cultural heritage</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the expected changes (better protection of the environment, better use of the environment including sustainable resource use for economic development, developing and enhancing the shared sustainable tourism offer and exchanging innovative best practices, enhancing & showcasing the rich and diverse heritage to develop multi-destination tourism) actually occur? 2. How did these changes come about? To what extent were these changes the result of program actions (axes 5 and 6)? Are there any instances of emulation? Were there any unexpected impacts? 3. What were the mechanisms that produced the observed effects? How did the program strengthen relationships and cooperation between partners from different territories? 4. Does the program's impact differ between sub-groups of beneficiaries? Does the program's impact differ between beneficiaries' locations? 5. Will the program's effects last over the long term or the medium term? Will the short-term effects be the same as the long-term effects?
<p style="text-align: center;">Axis 7 and 8</p>	<p>- Increase territories' response capacities in relation to emerging diseases and health risks</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the expected changes (strengthened management of and response to disease and health risks in the Caribbean, and consequently, better protection of the general population vis-à-vis these risks, through a greater local knowledge on the medical & health challenges specific to the Caribbean and a tangible improvement in health & relevant social services in the Caribbean area through cooperation on the ground) actually occur? 2. How did these changes come about? To what extent were these changes the result of program actions (axes 7 and 8)? Are there any emulation phenomena? Were there any unexpected impacts? 3. What were the mechanisms that produced the observed effects? How did the program strengthen relationships and cooperation between partners of different territories? 4. Does the program's impact differ between sub-groups among beneficiaries? Does the program's impact differ between beneficiaries' locations? 5. Will the program's effects last over the long term or the medium term? Will the short-term effects be the same as the long-term effects?

Axis 9	<p>- Increase the share of renewable energies in the electricity mix with a view to a greater energy independence in the territories of the eastern Caribbean</p> <p>- Reduce energy consumption in public buildings in the eastern Caribbean</p>	<p>1. Did the expected changes (increase in the production capacity of geothermal energy in Dominica and in 5 out of 6 independent states of the OECS (excluding Antigua and Barbuda), as well as in Guadeloupe and Martinique, increase in the share of renewable energies in the electricity mix through joint actions across the whole range of renewable energy sources: solar photovoltaic and thermal, biomass, and wind.; joint development and transfer of building technologies/techniques and low-energy systems for public buildings and housing and especially in relation to air conditioning, lighting, including public lighting, improved local capabilities and capacity to roll out and use these technologies/techniques) actually occur?</p> <p>2. How did these changes come about? To what extent were these changes the result of program actions (axe 9)? Are there any instances of emulation? Were there any unexpected impacts?</p> <p>3. What were the mechanisms that produced the observed effects? How did the program strengthen relationships and cooperation between partners from different territories?</p> <p>4. Does the program's impact differ between sub-groups of beneficiaries? Does the program's impact differ between beneficiaries' locations?</p> <p>5. Will the program's effects last over the long term or the medium term? Will the short-term effects be the same as the long-term effects?</p>
--------	---	---

Axis 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve foreign language skills and foster their use in the Caribbean - Increase student and professional mobility in the Caribbean 	<p>1. Did the expected changes (improving language skills and increasing the use of foreign languages in the Caribbean, especially in specific areas (e.g. language teaching tailored to professional needs, such as in tourism, business, or law) and/or to specific publics (e.g. young professionals, businesses that export or innovative businesses with export potential, regional cooperation practitioners, the diplomatic community, etc.) for widening and deepening human, political, economic and social exchange and interaction in the Caribbean; increased student and professional mobility in the Caribbean, especially of young people, in order to provide the education and enhanced skills that the Caribbean economy needs to grow, to improve language skills and stimulate their practice, enhance mutual knowledge among present and future stakeholders and to foster the development of institutional and interpersonal links, which are the foundation for taking forward regional integration) actually occur?</p> <p>2. How did these changes come about? To what extent were these changes the result of program actions (axe 10)? Are there any instances of emulation? Were there any unexpected impacts?</p> <p>3. What were the mechanisms that produced the observed effects? How did the program strengthen relationships and cooperation between partners from different territories?</p> <p>4. Does the program's impact differ between sub-groups of beneficiaries? Does the program's impact differ between beneficiaries' locations?</p> <p>5. Will the program's effects last over the long term or the medium term? Will the short-term effects be the same as the long-term effects?</p> <p>6. Was there any coordination with the ERASMUS+ program? If yes, what were the mechanisms? What were the effects?</p>
---------	--	--

Principal information sources	
Document analysis	Cooperation program, description of management and control system, manuals, public procurement documents, program indicators
Data analysis	Information system; Reports on physical, financial and procedural monitoring
Survey and interview	Managing Authority referents; Stakeholders; Beneficiaries; Citizen.
Targeted discussion groups	Managing Authority referents, Stakeholders Reports on project selection and implementation
Case studies	Managing Authority referents, Stakeholders Reports on project selection and implementation

Data requirements	Effectiveness and reliability of indicators inputted
	Collect complementary data from statistics entities to assess impact of operational program
	Involve beneficiaries and managers in the direction of work

	(interviews, discussion groups, etc.)
	Proceed with case studies when necessary

Approach or method used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Measure of effectiveness, efficiency and impact of intervention by comparing the actual and expected values - Evaluation of the relevance of the rationale for intervention, of the operational program organization and indicators defined - Measure of results achieved and progress made relative to the program's objectives - This impact evaluation may be carried out, relative to available information, based on comparability of data and evaluation objectives, by integrating elements from the three approaches below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contrafactual: comparing beneficiaries and control groups • Theoretical: reviewing the reasons and the functioning of actions through objectively measurable data • Qualitative: assessing change through qualitative methods, such as interviews
-------------------------	---

Evaluation results diffusion
Monitoring committee, Website, Beneficiaries

2019 intermediate implementation report	
Purpose	As part of drafting the 2019 intermediate implementation report, an evaluation will first be carried out on program implementation and initial results.
Rationale	This evaluation is mandated by regulations, as it is a prerequisite for drafting the intermediate implementation report described in Article 50.5 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013. The scope of this evaluation will take into account the earliness of program implementation.

Evaluation method	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> internal <input type="checkbox"/> external
Evaluation period	2014-2018
Evaluation deadline	June 2019

Budget (for information only)	€ 65,000
-------------------------------	----------

Objectives	Specifications	Evaluative questions
Effectiveness / efficiency of the candidate presentation and selection processes	Evaluation of the candidate presentation and selection processes	<p>1. To what extent does the cooperation program establish efficient/effective procedures for presenting and selecting candidates in terms of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> effectiveness of implementation instruments (Number of pre-projects submitted? Rate of rejection of pre-projects? Number of projects accepted versus number of projects presented)? time to review proposals (compared to the average time during the 2007/2013 operational program)? candidate coverage by axis/objective? coverage of demand in the territories affected by the program (number of candidates and territorial distribution of project initiators)? <p>How does the operational program and defined procedures get partners involved in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> defining the call for expression of interest? disseminating information? selecting candidates?
Operations of program management structures and implementation level, in terms of Management and Control System procedures.	Evaluation of the process based on an analysis of the structures compared to specific processes and certain management and control system procedures, including for organizational fit (<i>efficiency including intervention areas of the regional program for</i>	<p>Are the established program management structures and procedures appropriate/effective in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> human resources and Managing Authority / Joint Secretary organization? administrative capacity for operational program management? introduction of innovation (e.g., online forms, cost simplification)?

	<i>implementation)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • measures to reduce administrative tasks for beneficiaries? • audit system? • support services for beneficiaries? • monitoring system (e.g. guidelines for defining and using indicators)?
Efficiency of the program's financial tracking system	Evaluation assessing the program's financial data.	<p>Have the authorities introduced tools and procedures that enable effective tracking of the program's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planned amounts? • certified amounts? • amounts paid? • certification and payment periods? <p>and determines whether target expenditure values are feasible?</p>
Effectiveness, in terms of the program's capacity to achieve the expected results, especially target values from the performance and efficiency framework	The evaluation of physical indicators will look at analyses that, on the basis of projects accepted for funding and through projections, provide measures on the credibility of the fixed target values by suggesting elements for conformity if applicable.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How are commitments distributed by axis in comparison to the financial plan? How are certified expenditures distributed? Can target expenditure values be realized? 2. What does the analysis of output indicators show in terms of expected results achieved / achievable?
Effectiveness of governance in the cooperation space	Evaluation of the governance system's capacity to enable stakeholders' participation and the qualitative improvement of non-EU territory participation in implementing activities.	<p>Do the forms of governance established by the cooperation program help foster:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stakeholder participation in making decisions? • qualitative improvement in territories' participation in implementing activities? • distribution of funded projects throughout the cooperation area?
Effectiveness of the communications strategy	Evaluation of the completion level of Strategy objectives by assessing the communication instruments and coverage, and the principal communication actions and audience, especially comprehension level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the cooperation program activate information and communications mechanisms to improve citizen participation? • Is communication with beneficiaries smooth and constant? • What initial assessment can be made relative to obtaining communication indicators?

Principal information sources	
Document analysis	Cooperation program, description of management and control system, manuals, public procurement documents, program indicators
Data analysis	Information system; Reports on physical, financial and procedural monitoring
Surveys and interviews	Managing Authority referents; Stakeholders

Data requirements	Have chart for tracking indicators and performance
	Determine possible flaws in measures

Approach or method used	<u>Qualitative Approach</u> : To assess the indicator performance and relevance relative to contrasting axes; to undertake an initial assessment of the program's effectiveness and financial monitoring; to evaluate the significance and relevance of the initial communications operations; to address the effectiveness of partner participation.
-------------------------	---

Evaluation results diffusion	
Monitoring committee, Website, Beneficiaries	

Implementation evaluation n°2 – update	
Purpose	This evaluation will address aspects related to process and procedures, including whether those of approved projects are in line with cross-cutting principles. The evaluation will also address the effectiveness of program governance, and especially relative to participation of stakeholders in the decision-making process. Finally, it will address the effectiveness of the communication strategy.
Rationale	Carrying out this evaluation in 2020 provides the opportunity for assessing the program's management and implementation procedures and to apply lessons learned from evaluations to preparation for 2021-2027 programming. This evaluation will thereby provide a broad view on the program's direction by the managing authorities. The evaluation will provide the possibility of applying lessons learned to the preparation of management procedures for new programming.

Evaluation method	<input type="checkbox"/> internal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> external
Evaluation period	2014-2020
Evaluation deadline	February 2020

Budget (for information only)	€65,000
-------------------------------	---------

Objectives	Specifications	Evaluative questions
Effectiveness / efficiency of the candidate presentation and selection processes, including compliance of approved projects with cross-cutting principles (Arts. 7 and 8 of Reg. 1303/2013).	Evaluation of the candidate presentation and selection processes – by defining criteria relative to selection period [efficiency] and coverage by candidate axis / objective [effectiveness] - by reinforcing the manner in which the bid selection criteria used articulate the broad principles.	<p>1. To what extent does the cooperation program establish efficient/effective procedures for presenting and selecting candidates in terms of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> effectiveness of implementation instruments (Number of pre-projects submitted? Rate of rejection of pre-projects? Number of projects accepted versus number of projects presented)? Effectiveness of the call for expression of interest relative to the quality of applications and whether partner needs were met? time to review proposals (compared to the average time during the 2007/2013 operational program)? candidate coverage by axis/objective? coverage of demand in the territories affected by the program (number of candidates and territorial distribution of project initiators)? diversity of project initiators (status, type of structure, size, location)? coexistence of submission procedures under the call for expression of interest/in real time <p>2. How does the operational program and defined</p>

		<p>procedures get partners involved in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • defining the call for expression of interest? • disseminating information? • selecting candidates? <p>3. To what extent does the candidate presentation and selection procedures take into account the principles described in Articles 7 and 8 of Regulation No. 1303/2013?</p>
<p>Operations of program management structures and implementation level, in terms of Management and Control System procedures.</p>	<p>Evaluation of the process based on an analysis of the structures compared to specific processes and certain management and control system procedures, including for organizational fit (<i>efficiency including intervention areas of the regional program for implementation</i>)</p>	<p>Are the established program management structures and procedures appropriate/effective in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • human resources and Managing Authority / Joint Secretary organization? • administrative capacity for operational program management? • introduction of innovation (e.g., online forms, cost simplification)? • measures to reduce administrative tasks for beneficiaries? • audit system? • support services for beneficiaries? • monitoring system (e.g. guidelines for defining and using indicators)?
<p>Effectiveness, in terms of the program's capacity to achieve the expected results, especially target values from the performance and efficiency framework (financial dimensions of the cooperation program)</p>	<p>Evaluation that will initially focus on the financial aspects of the program as a whole (efficiency).</p> <p>The evaluation of physical indicators will look at analyses that, on the basis of projects accepted for funding and through projections, provide measures on the credibility of the fixed target values by suggesting elements for conformity if applicable.</p>	<p>1. How are commitments distributed by axis in comparison to the financial plan? How are certified expenditures distributed? Can target expenditure values be realized? How effective is the payment and certification process relative to deadlines?</p> <p>Are the means allocated to financial tracking proportional to the objectives of effective financial management? In terms of financial and human resources (number of full time equivalents? competencies?)</p> <p>2. What does the analysis of output indicators show in terms of expected results achieved / achievable?</p> <p>Are the means allocated to monitoring indicators and achieving target and intermediate values proportional to the stated objectives? In terms of financial and human resources (number of full time equivalents? competencies?)</p>
<p>Program integration with other instruments</p>	<p>Evaluation to report on the connection of the cooperation program with other EU financial instruments.</p>	<p>How does the program coordinate with other EU instruments and what are the results, especially with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDF?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MAINSTREAM OPERATIONAL PROGRAMS? • CFR?
Effectiveness of governance in the cooperation space	Evaluation of the governance system's capacity to resolve problems that arose during the 2007-2013 cooperation program in terms of the level of stakeholder participation and the qualitative improvement of non-EU territory participation in implementing activities.	<p>Do the forms of governance established by the cooperation program help foster:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stakeholders participation in making decisions? • qualitative improvement in territories' participation in implementing activities? • distribution of projects throughout the cooperation area? • qualitative improvement in participation of project initiators located in non-EU countries in implementing activities for funded projects?
<p>Effectiveness of the communications strategy:</p> <p>A. Information and communication with citizens</p> <p>B. Communication and dialog with beneficiaries</p>	Evaluation of the completion level of Strategy objectives by assessing the communication instruments and coverage, and the principal communication actions and audience, especially comprehension level.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the cooperation program activate information and communications mechanisms to improve citizen information? How effective are these measures in terms of the visibility of funded projects? In terms of program visibility? Did these actions lead to greater program ownership by citizens within the cooperation area? 2. Is communication with beneficiaries smooth and constant? Were the communications instruments that were defined deemed suitable, effective and sufficient to achieve their objectives relative to the participation of beneficiaries? How did actions carried out strengthen the program's visibility among beneficiaries? Program ownership by the beneficiaries? Were the tools defined and the information conveyed effective and proportional to assist the beneficiary or the potential beneficiary in the process? 3. Are past experiences systematically integrated into future action relative to cooperation program activities, and does that process benefit from synergies with other programs? Was the reapplication of these past experiences efficient? 4. Were the objectives set out in the communications strategy achieved? What actions, communications and information tools make up best practices? What are the main conclusions that should be taken into consideration for the new programming period?

Principal information sources	
Document analysis	Cooperation program, description of management and control system, manuals, public procurement documents, program indicators

Data analysis	Information system; Reports on physical, financial and procedural monitoring
Survey and interview	Managing Authority referents; Stakeholders; Beneficiaries; Citizen.
Discussion groups	Managing Authority referents, Stakeholders Reports on project selection and implementation

Data requirements	Have chart for tracking indicators and performance
	Determine the possible deficiencies through discussions with managers, by conducting consistency controls relative to project funds and outputs

Approach or method used	<p><u>Qualitative Approach:</u> To assess the relevance of indicators, modeling of trajectory for achieving targets, the completion and quality of inputting; to identify the contrasting axes, obstacles to achieving targeted indicators; to draft initial recommendations to improve program direction and management; to design the system for collecting 6-month indicators (conditions for monitoring, storing, sampling, etc.); to analyze the capacity of the indicator monitoring system to meet quality standards required by the European Commission, etc.</p> <p>The program's system of indicators represent one of the most important sources of information for the implementation evaluation, and the program's financial and output indicators that measure the actual, financial and procedural progress. Data analysis and interviews with program managers and partners will also be decisive.</p> <p>Evaluators may also assess the typical process that a project initiator must navigate, to gauge the clarity, relevance and effectiveness of defined procedures and tools.</p>
-------------------------	---

Evaluation results diffusion
Monitoring committee, Website, Beneficiaries

Impact evaluation n°2 – update	
Purpose	This evaluation is intended to recreate and evaluate the program's contribution, to assess the effects.
Rationale	

Evaluation method	<input type="checkbox"/> internal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> external
Evaluation period	2014-2020
Evaluation deadline	February 2021

Budget (for information only)	€80,000
-------------------------------	---------

Objective	Evaluative questions
<p>Axis 1 and 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support the economic diversification of the territories through knowledge transfer and the commercialization of innovative products; - Create a business climate that stimulates trade between the Caribbean territories 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the expected changes (strengthening of innovation activity in Caribbean enterprises and technology transfer between the research and business communities, development and commercialization of innovative solutions, creation of innovative enterprises, economic diversification of the territories; creation of a fertile business environment across the Caribbean region as well as more internationally oriented Caribbean enterprises, balanced economic growth across the region, growth that both creates wealth and employment) actually occur? 2. How did these changes come about? To what extent were these changes the result of program actions (axes 1 and 2)? Are there any instances of emulation? Were there any unexpected impacts? 3. What were the mechanisms that produced the observed effects? How did the program strengthen relationships and cooperation between partners from different territories? 4. Does the program's impact differ between sub-groups of beneficiaries? Does the program's impact differ between beneficiaries' locations? 5. Will the program's effects last over the long term or the medium term? Will the short-term effects be the same as the long-term effects? 6. Do the actions supported by the program complement the smart specialization strategies/with the area's Regional Plans for Internationalization of Business? If yes, what are the program's impacts on these plans? 7. Were the resources devoted to achieving objectives (monitoring procedures, human resources, etc.) proportional and effective relative to stated objectives?

<p style="text-align: center;">Axis 3 and 4</p>	<p>- Strengthen the capacity of Caribbean territories to manage risk and respond to natural disasters</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the expected changes (improved knowledge/understanding about the natural risks – and their aftereffects – confronting the cooperation area, as well as the introduction of joint risk management systems) actually occur? 2. How did these changes come about? To what extent were these changes the result of program actions (axes 3 and 4)? Are there any instances of emulation? Were there any unexpected impacts? 3. What were the mechanisms that produced the observed effects? How did the program strengthen relationships and cooperation between partners from different territories? 4. Does the program’s impact differ between sub-groups of beneficiaries? Does the program’s impact differ between beneficiaries’ locations? 5. Will the program’s effects last over the long term or the medium term? Will the short-term effects be the same as the long-term effects? 6. Were the resources devoted to achieving objectives (monitoring procedures, human resources, etc.) proportional and effective relative to stated objectives?
<p style="text-align: center;">Axis 5 and 6</p>	<p>- Better protect and capitalise on the Caribbean’s natural heritage through joint strategies and policy instruments</p> <p>- Increase the touristic appeal of the cooperation area through the joint marketing of its natural and cultural heritage</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the expected changes (better protection of the environment, better use of the environment including sustainable resource use for economic development, developing and enhancing the shared sustainable tourism offer and exchanging innovative best practices, enhancing & showcasing the rich and diverse heritage to develop multi-destination tourism) actually occur? 2. How did these changes come about? To what extent were these changes the result of program actions (axes 5 and 6)? Are there any instances of emulation? Were there any unexpected impacts? 3. What were the mechanisms that produced the observed effects? How did the program strengthen relationships and cooperation between partners from different territories? 4. Does the program’s impact differ between sub-groups of beneficiaries? Does the program’s impact differ between beneficiaries’ locations? 5. Will the program’s effects last over the long term or the medium term? Will the short-term effects be the same as the long-term effects? 6. Were the resources devoted to achieving objectives (monitoring procedures, human resources, etc.) proportional and effective relative to stated objectives?

<p style="text-align: center;">Axis 7 and 8</p>	<p>- Increase territories' response capacities in relation to emerging diseases and health risks</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the expected changes (strengthened management of and response to disease and health risks in the Caribbean, and consequently, better protection of the general population vis-à-vis these risks, through a greater local knowledge on the medical & health challenges specific to the Caribbean and a tangible improvement in health & relevant social services in the Caribbean area through cooperation on the ground) actually occur? 2. How did these changes come about? To what extent were these changes the result of program actions (axes 7 and 8)? Are there any instances of emulation? Were there any unexpected impacts? 3. What were the mechanisms that produced the observed effects? How did the program strengthen relationships and cooperation between partners from different territories? 4. Does the program's impact differ between sub-groups of beneficiaries? Does the program's impact differ between beneficiaries' locations? 5. Will the program's effects last over the long term or the medium term? Will the short-term effects be the same as the long-term effects? 6. Were the resources devoted to achieving objectives (monitoring procedures, human resources, etc.) proportional and effective relative to stated objectives?
---	--	---

Axis 9	<p>- Increase the share of renewable energies in the electricity mix with a view to a greater energy independence in the territories of the eastern Caribbean</p> <p>- Reduce energy consumption in public buildings in the eastern Caribbean</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the expected changes (increase in the production capacity of geothermal energy in Dominica and in 5 out of 6 independent states of the OECS (excluding Antigua and Barbuda), as well as in Guadeloupe and Martinique, increase in the share of renewable energies in the electricity mix through joint actions across the whole range of renewable energy sources: solar photovoltaic and thermal, biomass, and wind.; joint development and transfer of building technologies/techniques and low-energy systems for public buildings and housing and especially in relation to air conditioning, lighting, including public lighting, improved local capabilities and capacity to roll out and use these technologies/techniques) actually occur? 2. How did these changes come about? To what extent were these changes the result of program actions (axe 9)? Are there any instances of emulation? Were there any unexpected impacts? 3. What were the mechanisms that produced the observed effects? How did the program strengthen relationships and cooperation between partners from different territories? 4. Does the program's impact differ between sub-groups of beneficiaries? Does the program's impact differ between beneficiaries' locations? 5. Will the program's effects last over the long term or the medium term? Will the short-term effects be the same as the long-term effects? 6. Were the resources devoted to achieving objectives (monitoring procedures, human resources, etc.) proportional and effective relative to stated objectives?
--------	---	--

Axis 10	<p>- Improve foreign language skills and foster their use in the Caribbean</p> <p>- Increase student and professional mobility in the Caribbean</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the expected changes (improving language skills and increasing the use of foreign languages in the Caribbean, especially in specific areas (e.g. language teaching tailored to professional needs, such as in tourism, business, or law) and/or to specific publics (e.g. young professionals, businesses that export or innovative businesses with export potential, regional cooperation practitioners, the diplomatic community, etc.) for widening and deepening human, political, economic and social exchange and interaction in the Caribbean; increased student and professional mobility in the Caribbean, especially of young people, in order to provide the education and enhanced skills that the Caribbean economy needs to grow, to improve language skills and stimulate their practice, enhance mutual knowledge among present and future stakeholders and to foster the development of institutional and interpersonal links, which are the foundation for taking forward regional integration) actually occur? 2. How did these changes come about? To what extent were these changes the result of program actions (axe 10)? Are there any instances of emulation? Were there any unexpected impacts? 3. What were the mechanisms that produced the observed effects? How did the program strengthen relationships and cooperation between partners from different territories? 4. Does the program's impact differ between sub-groups of beneficiaries? Does the program's impact differ between beneficiaries' locations? 5. Will the program's effects last over the long term or the medium term? Will the short-term effects be the same as the long-term effects? 6. Was there any coordination with the ERASMUS+ program? If yes, what were the mechanisms? What were the effects? 7. Were the resources devoted to achieving objectives (monitoring procedures, human resources, etc.) proportional and effective relative to stated objectives?
---------	---	---

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Partnership</u></p> <p>Evaluation measuring the involvement of both EU and non-EU partners in the program's direction and operation, the effectiveness of procedures implemented to this effect. It will also strategically address the program's impact on the development of long-lasting cooperation relationships between territories in the area, and the degree of integration of EU territories in their cooperation area.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Were the procedures that were defined during program management and the measures implemented to strengthen partners' involvement effective and proportional to this objective? Did the extent and quality of partners' participation differ depending on the program component (transnational/cross-border)? 2. Did partner participation in program operation translate into greater program ownership by these partners? By the citizens of the partner territories? By the beneficiaries and potential beneficiaries of the partner territories? Did it improve the distribution of projects across the cooperation space? 3. Did participation by partners in the program strengthen cooperation and develop long-lasting links between the territories and the cooperation area? Between EU regions? Between EU and non-EU territories? Did participation by partners strengthen integration of EU territories in their geographical area?
---	--

Principal information sources	
Document analysis	Cooperation program, description of management and control system, manuals, public procurement documents, program indicators
Data analysis	Information system; Reports on physical, financial and procedural monitoring
Survey and interview	Managing Authority referents; Stakeholders; Beneficiaries; Citizen.
Targeted discussion groups	Managing Authority referents, Stakeholders Reports on project selection and implementation
Case studies	Managing Authority referents, Stakeholders Reports on project selection and implementation

Data requirements	Effectiveness and reliability of indicators inputted
	Collect complementary data from statistics entities to assess impact of operational program
	Involve beneficiaries and managers in the direction of work (interviews, discussion groups, etc.)
	Proceed with case studies when necessary

Approach or method used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Measure of effectiveness, efficiency and impact of intervention by comparing the actual and expected values - Evaluation of the relevance of the rationale for intervention, of the operational program organization and indicators defined - Measure of results achieved and progress made relative to the program's objectives - This impact evaluation may be carried out, relative to available information, based on comparability of data and evaluation objectives, by integrating elements from the three approaches below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contrafactual: comparing beneficiaries and control groups • Theoretical: reviewing the reasons and the functioning of actions through objectively measurable data • Qualitative: assessing change through qualitative methods, such as interviews
-------------------------	---

Evaluation results diffusion
Monitoring committee, Website, Beneficiaries

Final report on evaluations	
Purpose	This report presents a final assessment of evaluation activities over the 2014-2020 period.
Rationale	This final report is mandated by regulation, described in article 114.2 of Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013. It will present the results of evaluations carried out during the programming period, and the main results and outputs of the program. The evaluation described in this sheet assesses the evaluation process on the program's direction, operation and effects.

Evaluation method	<input type="checkbox"/> internal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> external
Evaluation period	2014-2021
Report deadline	December 31, 2022

Budget (for information only)	€60,000
-------------------------------	---------

Evaluation purpose	Specifications	Evaluation questions
Summary of the evaluation process and main conclusions of evaluations	Evaluation measuring the effects of the evaluation process on program functioning	1.1. What were the evaluation's main contributions to management of the cooperation program? 1.2. What were the most useful evaluation activities, and why? 1.3. Was the evaluation plan broadly followed?

Information sources	
Document analysis	Operational program, description of the management and control system, manuals, output and result indicators, results from evaluations carried out on programming and the measures taken to ensure their monitoring
Data analysis	Information system, reports on physical, financial and procedural monitoring
Surveys and interviews	Managing Authority referents; Stakeholders; Beneficiaries
Discussion groups	Managing Authority referents; Stakeholders; Reports on project selection and implementation.

Data requirements	Have chart for tracking indicators and performance
	Determine the possible deficiencies through discussions with managers, by conducting consistency controls relative to project funds and outputs

Approach or method used	<u>Qualitative Approach</u> : Analysis of all of the program's documentation (both procedural and descriptive) produced under program implementation, as well as evaluation reports. In addition to the analysis of documents, it will be possible, for the broad application and reuse of data, to also use during this phase data on the program's financial, physical, and procedural progress, and any
-------------------------	---

	<p>statistical calculations produced under the monitoring system.</p> <p>If necessary, the available information may also be combined with or investigated further through individual or group interviews on specific themes of interest to the Managing Authority, or to the operational program stakeholders.</p>
--	---

Evaluation results diffusion	
Monitoring committee, Website, Beneficiaries	