# Deloitte.

Ongoing evaluation of implementation of the Operational Programme Research, Development and Education

Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports
Progress Report 01

Executive Summary

January 2017

**Final version** 





### **Executive summary**



Factual progress partially corresponds with the anticipated state of implementation of OP RDE to a given date.

The output and result indicators, defined in the programme document, did not achieve any progress until 30 June 2016. Commitments by projects were made in only 18 out of 78 programme indicators in this period. The calls available in MS2014+ covered a total of 68 announced programme indicators. A total of 10 programme indicators, especially from PA3, were not addressed by calls for a given date.



Real values of indicators (output and outcome) were at zero value at the end of the reported period (30 June 2016). Therefore, the actual contribution of the projects to the improvement of Czech Education and Research and Development can not be evaluated yet.

Due to zero values of output and result indicators, this Progress report cannot assess the factual progress of OP RDE reached by implementation of projects. In respect to situation described, the evaluator decided to make predictions for target values and milestones based on the available data – target values of indicators in announced calls and target values of indicators that are obligatory for applicants and recipients of financial aid from OR RDE.



Achievement of target and milestone values of some indicators might be at risk.

Current level of potential of indicators to reach target values is considered sufficient in most cases. The risk of not-achieving target value has been identified for the following indicators:

Table 1 Executive summary - the risk of not-achieving target values

PA / IP	Indicator	Description of the risks of non-achievement
PA1 IP1	Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions	A new analysis of absorption capacity was carried out, that estimates the opportunity to meet the indicator value at 35. The call 02_16_026 also addresses this indicator. Other calls are not planned. If the Ministry does not plan to announce other calls, it is reasonable to reduce the target value of the indicator from 200 to 35.
PA1 IP1	Number of students who use the newly built, expanded or modernized infrastructure for research -focused curricula	The target value of the indicator was based on inaccurate assumptions. After clarification of these assumptions, it is proposed to reduce the target value of the indicator to 1 800. Likewise, it is also necessary to reduce the target value of the indicator in the call 02_16_017.
PA2 IP1	Total number of participants	This indicator counts also persons reported in indicators of supported persons in case the length of their support becomes more than





PA/IP	Indicator	Description of the risks of non-achievement		
		insignificant. MEYS is currently reviewing assumptions and calculation of values for individual indicators of supported persons. Following the revision we recommend to revise also target value of this indicator. In response to an undertaken review it is expected a necessity to reduce the target value (including milestones) of the indicator.		

Based on relatively high coverage of target values of indicators by calls (higher than 50 %) the risk of over-achieving target values was identified at the following indicators:

Table 2 Executive summary - the risk of over-achieving target values

PA / IP	Indicator	Coverage of target values by announced and planned calls
PA1 IP1	Number of newly built, expanded or modernised research infrastructures, and centres of excellence	83 %
PA1 IP1	Number of new products modernizing strategic management systems in research organisations	83 %
PA2 IP1	Number of new or modernized research-oriented study programs accredited also in a foreign language	267 %
PA2 IP1	Number of new tools for R&D&I support at regional level	N/A*
PA2 IP2	Proportion of students with special needs to the total number of students	188 %
PA2 IP1	Proportion of study programmes taught in a foreign language	90 %
PA3 IP3	Number of products in system projects	1 780 %
PA3 IP3	Number of organizations affected by systemic interventions	831 %
PA3 IP2	Number of organizations affected by systemic interventions	273 %
PA3 IP3	Number of supported products	238 %
PA3 IP2	Number of products in system projects	216 %
PA3 IP1	Number of supported co-operations	100 %
PA3 IP1	Number of organizations affected by systemic interventions	88 %
PA3 IP1	Number of products in system projects	70 %
PA3 IP3	Number of educators applying newly acquired competencies in practice	59 %

<sup>\*</sup>MEYS revises the interpretation of the indicator, which might be a duplicate of the indicator 5 43 01.

The over-achievement of the target value of indicator can be expected after the revision of the interpretation that MEYS proposes.

Based on the analysis it was proposed to remove the result indicator called Number of organizations affected by systemic interventions, because PA2 OP RDE interventions do not aim at system change.

## The risk of not-achieving milestone values of following output indicators has been identified:

Table 3 Executive summary - the risk of failure to meet the milestone values in 2018

PA	Indicator
PA1	Number of newly built, expanded or modernised research infrastructures and centers of excellence
PA2	Total number of participants
PA2	Acquired information sources
PA3	Total number of participants

Some indicators with inaccurate target and milestone values (ERDF PA1, and ERDF, and ESF PA2, and PA3 indicators) have been identified. It is recommended to negotiate setting of their new values with the European Commission. Values should be based on more accurate and





updated information, alternatively it is advised to carry out other measures such as acceleration of project approvals or announcement of additional calls addressing indicator values.



Financial progress partly corresponds to the anticipated state of implementation of the OP RDE reference date and especially to the fact that implementation of most projects has not started until 30 June 2016.

Calls 02\_16\_022 and 02\_16\_023 from PA3 show relatively low drawing rates, which may have an impact on achievement of financial milestones. Financial performance levels in fund perspective are shown in table below.

Table 4 Financial performance in funds perspective

Tubic + I mandic	i periormanee i	iii iulius perspective		
Priority axis	Fund	Share of allocation of calls to the allocation of OP RDE	Share of financial resources under commitments to allocation of OP RDE	Share of financial resources paid to the allocation of OP RDE.
PA1	ERDF	81,93 %	7,78 %	1,82 %
PA2	ERDF	68,81 %	0,00 %	0,00 %
	ESF	55,06 %	0,00 %	0,00 %
	ERDF+ESF	62,59 %	0,00 %	0,00 %
PA3	ESF	44,83 %	5,38 %	0,63 %
PA4	ERDF	37,23 %	25,81 %	1,27 %
Total	ERDF	75,41 %	6,71 %	1,27 %
	ESF	47,78 %	3,82 %	0,45 %
	ERDF+ESF	63,06 %	5,42 %	0,90 %



Various factors that might have a severe negative impact on effective program implementation were identified.

Below are shown the identified factors that might have a negative impact on progress of programme implementation. Factors are distributed along the thermometer – red represents the most severe, yellow represents moderate and green represents the least serious impacts.



#### Picture 1 Factors having an impact on the status of programme implementation

Lack of functionality of MS2014+ including Portal IS KP14+

Setting of target and milestone value for selected indicators does not correpond with current state of OP RDE implementation

MEYS is not perceived as a partner that methodologically helps implementers with preparation of LAP / RAP projects

Delay in implementation of projects as well as payment requests

Delay in evaluation of calls with high financial allocation

Low awareness about potential benefits and positive impacts of LAP / RAP for partners in the area

On the side of MA: The system does not allow representatives of MA or external evaluators to create their own exports from the system. It is always necessary to fill in a request to supplier that assures creation of exports. Other problems were identified in MEYS risk analysis.

On the side of recipients: MS2014+ users negatively rated working with IS

On the side of recipients: MS2014+ users negatively rated working with IS KP14+ according to the questionnaire. From the perspective of beneficiaries, system works slowly and unreliably, that might even consequently cause missing deadlines (e.g. reimbursement of deposits).

Some indicators suffer from the risk of not-achieving/ over-achieving target and milestone values. Therefore it is necessary to implement measures in order to harmonize the current state with anticipated state of OP RDE implementation.

According to implementers, MEYS does not provide a sufficient methodological, information and assistance support to implementers of LAP and RAP projects.

The risk of not-achieving the milestone values in particular PA, and especially in PA2.

Negative impact on the draw of subprojects, which may even cause a shift of implementation date and thus the subsequent submission and reimbursement of payment requests.

Partners in the area (projects LAP / RAP), are not sufficiently informed about potential benefits and positive impacts that their involvement in creation of LAP / RAP projects might bring. This may cause a lower interest in cooperation of partners in the area. The risk was perceived by respondents of questionnaires as "no risk" up to "rather low risk".

MEYS is aware of the problems and is constantly working on their elimination.

It is possible to start negotiations with the EC in order to change target and milestones values (alternatively to announce other calls to achieve required values).

It is necessary to analyze the communication mechanisms and methodology of projects S-RAP and SMP.

#### Suggestions:

- Increase in allocation of relevant calls.
- Announcement of new calls (with potential of fast drawing).

Increase in personnel capacity to evaluation of calls (especially calls with higher than 200 % of excess of financial requests compared to the allocation of calls).

Monitoring of progress and real impact of projects realization (LAP / RAP).



In respect to implementation level it is not yet possible to identify specific SO with the risk of under-drawing of financial resources. In general, there is a risk for not-achieving financial target values for 2018 in PA2 in both Funds (ESF and ERDF) and also not-achieving values of financial indicators in performance framework.



System of detection of the absorption capacity of potential applicants is functional. Moreover, in most calls there is a significant excess of the required financial resources compared to the allocation of calls.

The following set of recommendations was created based on analysis findings. The recommendations are distributed along the thermometer according to the importance – green colour represents the least important recommendations up to red colour as the most important recommendations.



#### Picture 2 Recommendations based on findings

To announce calls/extend calls allocation in PA1, PA2 and PA3, in order to meet the milestone values of performance framework in the relevant PA and to reach the target values of indicators

Based on analysis, a moderate risk was found in achieving target value for indicator of the performance framework. There were also found partial risks in achieving target values of indicators. One approach to address those risks is to immediately announce calls and increase financial allocation of the relevant calls (and possibly accelerate the process of evaluation applications - fast shift of projects towards a implementation phase) in order to meet the required target and milestone values.

To continue to eliminate risk factor according to planned procedures of MEYS

MEYS is aware of the risk of functionality lack of MS2014+, including a Portal IS KP14+. The risk is regularly monitored (most recently in the Annual Report on risk management in OP RDE for between 1 January 2016 – 30 June 2016). MEYS is constantly working on elimination of risk factors.

To start negotiations with the European Commission about a change of target and milestone values of indicators Necessary changes in target and milestone values setting were identified in ERDF indicators in PA1 and ESF indicators in PA2. To change milestone and target value of risky indicator in PA3 it is necessary to revise the absorption capacity of the calls planned and to determine the exact value of milestone and target values of indicator.

To eliminate delays in evaluations of calls with high excess financial allocation

Strengthening personnel capacity to evaluate these calls, especially calls with higher than 200% of the excess of financial requests compared to the allocation of calls.

To make detailed analysis of communication mechanisms and procedures of MEYS (including procedural and personnel audit) and the revision of methodologies

The aim of this analysis is to identify weaknesses and bottlenecks of communication process and methodological assistance of project implementers of OP RDE. Subsequently, MEYS should implement specific corrective measures to improve communication process and methodological support for LAP / RAP project implementers. The analysis should primarily focus on activities undertaken projects S-RAP and SMP. We note that, for example, problems associated with suboptimal functionality of MS2014+ (the project implementers point it out) are actively investigated by MEYS.

To monitor progress and impact of the factual implementation of LAP / RAP projects We propose to monitor the progress of LAP / RAP projects implementation (e.g. regular analysis of project risks based on project monitoring reports, possibly via surveys within ongoing evaluation). If the risk of non-cooperation of partners in the area raised and threatened the quality of the implemented projects, we consider appropriate to conduct / intensify promotional activities of MEYS/ NIE or other relevant institutions to increase partners' interest in cooperation on the projects in the area.

#### Disclaimer:

orta

E E

This document is English translation of original document in Czech. In case of discrepancy between the Czech original text and the English translation, the Czech text shall prevail.

