

Achievements and findings from the “EUSAIR Monitoring and Evaluation Project”

2nd Macro-regional Capacity Building Event
15 December, 2022, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Victoria Chorafa , LKN ANALYSIS Ltd



EUSAIR PARTICULARITIES & MAIN SHORTCOMINGS

Particularities

**It is a strategy,
not a programme**

**It does not have
institutionalized
authorities**

**It does not have
committed funds**

Main shortcomings

**Not clear and
operational links with
EU policies**

**Action Plan with
extensive list of
indicative actions and
projects, but no
prioritization/focus**



CHALLENGES FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF A MACRO – REGIONAL STRATEGY (MRS)

Need to establish a sound and consistent methodological framework

Need to define the different levels of monitoring and the actors involved

Need for a single monitoring system, able to capture the specificities of each Pillar

Need to identify concrete transnational activities and projects that serve the Strategy

Need to provide quantitative and qualitative information to the EUSAIR governance and stakeholders



STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE CURRENT MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM IN DIFFERENT PILLARS OF EUSAIR (1/3)

CURRENT MONITORING SYSTEM

- EUSAIR monitoring at Pillar level → TSGs supported by the Facility Point Project Partners and Monitoring and Evaluation experts
- Based on the identification of EUSAIR “relevant projects” by the M&E experts rather than the TSG’s project generation process
- Annual monitoring reports per Pillar produced by the M&E experts / EUSAIR synthetic monitoring report
- Significant deviations in relation to the structure, content, focus, and depth of the analysis in each Pillar



STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE CURRENT MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM IN DIFFERENT PILLARS OF EUSAIR (2/3)

STRENGTHS

- Effort to establish a clear and uniform process for Pillar and EUSAIR monitoring
- Despite its weaknesses, the current monitoring system can serve as a basis for the 2021-2027 period and contribute to the ongoing discussion for M&E of MRS
- Sets of indicators have been prepared for three Pillars (1,3,4). For Pillar 2 the proposed indicators used for monitoring purposes take into consideration the operating processes adopted by TSG2



STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE CURRENT MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM IN DIFFERENT PILLARS OF EUSAIR (3/3)

WEAKNESSES		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Despite the effort to use common guidelines for monitoring indicators in each Pillar, this has not yet been achieved- Uneven indicators in each Pillar- Pillar monitoring experts were appointed in different time periods- Gaps in the completeness of information	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Different approach followed by TSG/Pillar 2 (focus on governance and operational aspects regarding the operation of the TSG)-The development of the monitoring system relies on the availability of data and the perspective of each Pillar	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-MAs of ETC programmes, with few exceptions, have not responded to the monitoring experts' requests for the provision of detailed data and indicators on relevant projects-Data quality differentiates between EU and IPA countries where less volume of funding instruments is recorded-The monitoring system does not capture the added value of the Strategy



ENSURING COHERENCE FOR THE PROPOSED MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM OF EUSAIR

- The selection of indicators should be linked to an Intervention Logic / Theory of Change
- The indicator system should be based on the Common Indicators of ESIF programmes, with a common methodology followed by all Pillars and aligned with clear strategy objectives. This will also enable a better link with the different financial sources.



***Thank you very much
for your attention!***

