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# SUMMARY

The object of ex ante evaluation is the draft Regional Operational Programme for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship 2014-2020 (ROP K-PV, Programme). The draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 is understood as the documents drafted in the course of contract delivery, from developing an initial concept/outline of the document, to the initial draft and to subsequent versions of the draft Programme.

The research was divided into 3 modules:

1. Evaluation of Programme internal accuracy and consistency
2. Evaluation of Programme external accuracy and consistency
3. Evaluation of Programme implementation system

Mainly desk research methods were applied: literature review and a review of research and evaluation results used for all evaluation modules. In addition, the methodology included quantitative (interwievs), qualitative (CAWI) and expert methods (Delphi research).

The draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 provides a diagnosis of challenges, needs and potentials of the sectors covered by the Programme. The diagnosis covered all issues that are significant from the point of view of focusing public intervention adequately. The ex ante evaluation revealed it was justified to take up intervention in individual Investment Priorities (IP) within the scope of the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020. As to priority axes (PA), the proposed measures are adequate and the majority of them largely responds to the diagnosed problems and socio-economic challenges of the region. There are, however, several areas that require modification.

In PA 5 it is recommended to increase allocations to projects related to development of small-scale water retention forms (due to the significant needs of the region in this area). Also a new type of intervention should be added: equipping emergency service personnel with systems for monitoring and warning against natural disasters (Programme does not provide this type of support, despite an identified need).

In PA 3 it is recommended to shift the allocation from IP 3.4 Supporting the capacity of SMEs to engage in a process of economic growth and innovation (not to duplicate the support from the national level) to IP 3.3 Supporting the capacity of SMEs to participate in the processes of growth and innovation (to prevent dispersal of support under the PA).

In PA 8 it is recommended to reduce the allocation for IP 8.10 Active and healthy ageing due to low sustainability of prevention and rehabilitation programmes, for which the sustainability is ended up with the programming period.

The selection of measures under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 ensures addressing the problems and challenges indicated in the diagnosis directly and indirectly. No gaps in the implementation of individual challenges and problems have been found. Yet, there were some inaccuracies in formulating references to diagnosed deficits and needs in individual intervention areas. In a few cases, the diagnosis included a detailed description of phenomena and challenges to which the planned intervention types do not refer, directly or indirectly. There are also intervention areas whose reference to the socio-economic diagnosis of the region is not well documented.

The assumed socio-economic theories and the results of empirical studies carried out to-date confirm that there is a cause and effect relationship between the identified socio-economic problems in the regions and the proposed intervention types. In several cases, the proposed changes related mainly to indicators.

Programme objectives are complementary with the assumptions and guidelines prepared at the EU and national level. The results of the analysis show that the Programme does not significantly diverge from strategic documents in this respect. There is no separate subchapter discussing the issue of external cohesion, i.e. cohesion with the most important European strategic documents and national and regional documents. The Programme should include a separate table summary presenting the links between the PAs and the objectives and flagship initiatives of the Europe 2020 strategy.

Specific objectives for individual IPs contribute to achievement of the Programme objective. The direction of changes has been defined correctly, it is consistent with the diagnosed trends. Yet, the objectives have been formulated with some inconsistencies, as some of the objectives fail to reflect the effects of measures but the processes that are supposed to lead to the effects. It is also recommended to change the main objective of the Programme, to further emphasize the orientation program to improve the quality of life of residents. Recommended meaning is: *To make Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship a competitive and innovative European region and to improve the quality of life of its inhabitants.*

The financial allocation proposed by the Programme does not comply with the rules of thematic concentration formulated according to MID arrangements.

The draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 presents a list of strategic output and result indicators (ERDF) and long-term result indicators (ESF), although not for all axes. In the majority of cases, the indicators have been selected correctly and they comply with MID recommendations. Yet, not all basis and target values of these indicators have been defined. The selection and values of milestones are also missing.

It is recommended to complete the target or basis values for output and strategic result indicators and data sources. It is also necessary to define interim objectives (2018), final objectives (2023) and KES for all axis for performance framework.

The draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 describes the monitoring, reporting and evaluation process insufficiently, inconsistently with the requirements of the ministerial template. The report presents a number of specific recommendations in this regard.

Individual priority axes present descriptions of planned use of financial instruments (FI). In this respect, the overall opinion on ROP K-PV 2014-2020 is positive. No incompliances with the MID Guidelines or national and EU law have been identified.

It is correct that the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 includes a description of the integrated approach to territorial development, considering the content and objectives of the Programme and the draft Partnership Agreement; it also says how the approach would contribute to achieving specific objectives of the Programme and expected Programme results.

However the references to ITI and CLLD are very general and repeat well-known information gathered at the national level; they reflect the regional specificity only to a very small degree. The rules of supporting CLLD and ITI, taking into account the specific conditions of the region, should be developed and included in ROP K-PV 2014-2020. Moreover provisions on territorial policy need to be modified so as to implement the territorial approach in the majority, and not in the selected IPs.

It is correct that the Programme includes the chapter focused on reducing the administrative burden on beneficiaries. The proposed provisions of the *Template*... have been used. It is also correct that it provides basic information on major entities involved in ROP K-PV 2014-2020 implementation and their tasks.

In connection with the planned changes to the structure of the implementation of the new program (aggregation of tasks in OMKPV without implementing institutions), the report of the ex-ante evaluation shows the strengths and weaknesses of the new system and the opportunities and risks that are associated with it. The key element is to optimize employment in MA and adapt the organizational structure to the new conditions. In the context of the new perspective it is particularly appropriate due to the fact that in parallel with the implementation of the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 the process of closing the perspective 2007-2013 will be conducted.

The draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 features a chapter devoted to including horizontal rules in the Programme. The application of these rules at different stages of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 implementation, i.e. in planned measures, in the process of Programme preparation, at the stage of implementation, including project evaluation and in the framework of promotion and information activities, was defined correctly. Nonetheless, in the case of some horizontal rules the descriptions are not complete and require supplementing.

# INTRODUCTION

## Justification of the evaluation

The obligation to carry out an ex ante evaluation of the Operational Programme results from the proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund covered by the Common Strategic Framework and laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 (General Regulation).

The scope and general principles of ex ante evaluation of operational programmes under the cohesion policy in 2014-2020 have been defined in Article 48 of the proposal for the General Regulation of 6 October 2011.

The European Commission (EC) specified the provisions of the Regulation in the document entitled *Programming Period 2014-2020. Monitoring and Evaluation of European Cohesion Policy. Guidance document on ex-ante evaluation. European Regional Development Fund. European Social Fund. Cohesion Fund*.

In addition, the methodology of ex ante evaluation of operational programmes in Poland has been described in the document entitled *Recommendations* *for Ex Ante Evaluation of Operational Programmes for 2014-2020* drafted by the Ministry of Regional Development (MRD).

## Object of the evaluation

The object of ex ante evaluation is the draft **Regional Operational Programme for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship 2014-2020** (ROP K-PV, Programme). The draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 is understood as the documents drafted in the course of contract delivery, from developing an initial concept/outline of the document, to the initial draft and to subsequent versions of the draft Programme.

## Purpose of the evaluation

The main purpose of the ex ante evaluation was to assess the intervention logic assumed under the draft Programme. The ex ante evaluation yielded answers to questions from two basic areas:

1. Whether the public interventions planned under the Programme are justified from the socio-economic point of view;
2. Whether the interventions would contribute to achieving the planned development objectives, fulfilling the diagnosed needs and solving socio-economic problems.

Ex ante evaluation is closely linked with the programming process. The main product consists in conclusions and recommendations which offer proposals for changes to the draft Programme. The report defines a hierarchy of the recommendations using the following colours:

* Recommendations of high importance,
* Recommendations of medium importance,
* Recommendations of low importance.

The ex ante evaluation has been carried out according to the following intervention evaluation logic:

**Figure 1. Study modules of ex ante evaluation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020**

*Source: DDSC.*

This report is the main product of the evaluation. It will serve as a justification for the decision of the strategic Managing Authority during negotiations on the draft Programme with the Commission.

# SUMMARY OF EVALUATION METHODS

The object of the ex ante evaluation was primarily the change theory applied under the draft Programme and the intervention logic designed on its basis. Mainly desk research methods were applied: literature review and a review of research and evaluation results used for all evaluation modules. In addition, the methodology included quantitative, qualitative and expert methods:[[1]](#footnote-1)

* Workshops with the participation of evaluation team members and employees of the Office of the Marshal of Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship (OMKPV) responsible for preparing the draft ROP K-PV 2014-202 and representatives of thematic trams/groups at the OMKPV (relevant primarily for modules I and III),
* In-depth interviews (relevant primarily for module I and for evaluating the administrative capacity and burden in module III) with the representatives of:
  + Domain experts from fields that coincide with areas of intervention under the Programme,
  + The institution responsible for ROP K-PV 2007-2013 management and implementation – Department of EU Fund and Project Management and Department of Regional Operational Programme Implementation of OMKPV,
  + OP HC Intermediate Body (IB) in the regional component in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship – Department of Social Affairs, Division of European Social Fund Management of OMKPV,
  + OP HC 2nd level Intermediate Body (II IB) in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship – Voivodeship Labour Office (VLO) and Regional Centre of Social Policy (RCSP),
  + Ministry of Regional Development,
* CAWI quantitative study covering potential institutional beneficiaries of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 and entrepreneurs (relevant primarily for module III),
* Meetings with experts in strategic environmental impact assessment,
* Delphi study (relevant primarily for modules I and III to evaluate indicators).

The data collected were analysed using tools such as: internal and external complementarity matrices, matrices of problem and measure adequacy under IP. The tools were used for expert analyses.

# GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME

The draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 provides a diagnosis of challenges, needs and potentials of the sectors covered by the Programme and a description of how the Programme would contribute to implementing Europe 2020 strategy.

The diagnosis covered all issues that are significant from the point of view of focusing public intervention adequately. The ex ante evaluation revealed it was justified to take up intervention in individual Investment Priorities (IP) within the scope of the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020. As to priority axes (PA), the proposed measures are adequate and the majority of them largely responds to the diagnosed problems and socio-economic challenges of the region.

The selection of measures under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 ensures addressing the problems and challenges indicated in the diagnosis directly and indirectly. No gaps in the implementation of individual challenges and problems have been found. Yet, there were some inaccuracies in formulating references to diagnosed deficits and needs in individual intervention areas. In a few cases, the diagnosis included a detailed description of phenomena and challenges to which the planned intervention types do not refer, directly or indirectly. There are also intervention areas whose reference to the socio-economic diagnosis of the region is not well documented.

The assumed socio-economic theories and the results of empirical studies carried out to-date confirm that there is a cause and effect relationship between the identified socio-economic problems in the regions and the proposed intervention types. In several cases, the proposed changes related mainly to indicators.

The diagnosis performed for the needs of the Programme does not provide a list and does not prioritise the identified socio-economic challenges and needs in the region. The current Operational programme template *2014-2020*[[2]](#footnote-2) (*Template*…) does not require these elements. It does not mean, however, that the problems have not been investigated adequately – references to these problems can be found across the diagnosis.

Programme objectives are complementary with the assumptions and guidelines prepared at the EU and national level. The results of the analysis show that the Programme does not significantly diverge from strategic documents in this respect.

RECOMMENDATION: An item on the relation between the Programme and other strategic documents should be added to Section 7.3 of the document. The item would in fact serve as an introduction/commentary to Appendix 2 (consistency of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 with strategic documents). The item could have the following title: *Relation of the Programme to other strategic documents*, and its content could possibly include the following ideas: *ROP K-PV 2014-2020 has been drafted according to a new paradigm of the development policy which places emphasis on integrated development activity instead of a sectoral approach; where territorial approach is employed and the regions are not treated as homogeneous; where the intervention area consists of functional units instead of administrative units and where development policy actors include not only the government and voivodeship authorities, but also local authorities, NGOs and enterprises. This approach to regional development also assumes that socio-economic modernisation may not take place solely through the top-down approach by measures financed from European funds, but also grassroots initiatives are necessary as well as regulatory changes that improve the quality of governance and the conditions of running a business. Although such changes, especially those which envisage amending the law and regulations, must remain in the competence of the government, local authorities must play a certain role here, including those responsible for ROP K-PV 2014-2020 implementation. Firstly, they must actively manage the very regional policy, not merely administer it, and ROP K-PV 2014-2020 must be implemented effectively and efficiently. Moreover, considering the flaws of the market which frequently result from bad regulation, Programme funds may be used to finance advisory services provided to entrepreneurs (business environment institutions) to enable them to handle the flaws successfully. In other words, Programme funds will supplement the actions taken in the framework of other development initiatives in the case of regulatory issues, particularly NRP, and in the framework of national operational programmes in the case of intervention measures. According to the logic of the National Development Strategy, particularly the emphasis it places on effective state, ROP K-PV 2014-2020 will contribute to improving the quality of functioning of institutions of voivodeship authorities as well as other institutions involved in its implementation in a broad sense through a number of measures, also under Technical Assistance. Many of Programme priorities and objectives will implement the recommendations of integrated strategies at the regional level, as well as general postulates that result from the Long-term National Development Strategy, such as avoiding the risk of Poland’s development drift. ROP K-PV 2014-2020 will also follow the principle of increasing the share of development expenditure in its total budget. A detailed description of the relation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 objectives/priorities with other strategic documents is provided in Appendix 2 to this report.*

In line with the *Template*..., the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 provides a justification for the selection of thematic objectives (TO) and investment priorities (IP), referring to the assumptions of major strategic documents at the EU, national and regional level.

Specific objectives for individual IPs contribute to achievement of the Programme objective. The direction of changes has been defined correctly, it is consistent with the diagnosed trends. Yet, the objectives have been formulated with some inconsistencies, as some of the objectives fail to reflect the effects of measures but the processes that are supposed to lead to the effects.

The financial allocation proposed by the Programme does not comply with the rules of thematic concentration resulting from the guidelines on minimum fund concentration levels in less developed regions (ring-fencing).

The draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 presents a list of strategic output and result indicators (ERDF) and long-term result indicators (ESF), although not for all axes. In the majority of cases, the indicators have been selected correctly and they comply with MID recommendations, i.e. for the majority of axes financed by the ERDF one or a maximum of two strategic result indicators have been defined using, where possible, Partnership Agreement indicators or their specifications. Yet, not all basis and target values of these indicators have been defined. The selection and values of milestones are also missing.

Individual priority axes present descriptions of planned use of financial instruments (FI). In this respect, the overall opinion on ROP K-PV 2014-2020 is positive. No incompliances with the MID Guidelines or national and EU law have been identified.

It is correct that the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 includes a description of the integrated approach to territorial development, considering the content and objectives of the Programme and the draft Partnership Agreement; it also says how the approach would contribute to achieving specific objectives of the Programme and expected Programme results.

As to the description of the institutional system, it is correct that it provides basic information on major entities involved in ROP K-PV 2014-2020 implementation and their tasks.

One of the chapters is devoted to measures focused on reducing the administrative burden on beneficiaries. The proposed provisions of the *Template*... have been used.

The draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 features a chapter devoted to including horizontal rules in the Programme. The application of these rules at different stages of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 implementation, i.e. in planned measures, in the process of Programme preparation, at the stage of implementation, including project evaluation and in the framework of promotion and information activities, was defined correctly. Nonetheless, in the case of some horizontal rules the descriptions are not complete and require supplementing.

All in all, the general opinion on the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 is positive, although some elements require supplementing. Subsequent chapters present the issues that require some changes in more detail.

# ASSESSMENT OF ADEQUANCY OF DRAFT ROP K-PV 2014-2020 TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHALLENGES AND NEEDS

Evaluation question A: Would a public intervention in the form of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 adequately respond to socio-economic challenges and needs diagnosed by recent strategic documents at the regional, national and European level?

## Grounds for public intervention in individual Programme priority axes

The grounds for public intervention in individual priority axes of the Programme are evaluated for:

1. Response to challenges resulting from favourable development trends thanks to which Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship gets closer to the European average;
2. Response to the needs resulting from deficits of national policies or from post-transformation development gaps. In these cases, intervention is justified by the risk of deeper deficits and greater development gaps between Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship and other regions of Europe due to absence of interventions co-financed from European funds;
3. Response to external risks related to global economic slowdown. Public intervention is justified when it may mitigate the negative consequences of economic slowdown, which may hinder favourable development trends in the region.

Considering that Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship ranks generally low in Poland in terms of development indicators in the framework of individual main priorities of the draft Partnership Agreement (increasing the competitiveness of the economy, improving social and territorial cohesion, improving effectiveness and efficiency of the state), public intervention under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 is justified by the need to respond to internal risks and the needs that result from development trends which cause the voivodeship to diverge from the European average.

The ex ante evaluation revealed **it is justified to take up intervention** under individual Investment Priorities (IP) within the scope of the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020.

The interventions to be implemented under **Priority Axis 1 Building innovation of the region through R&D activity of enterprises** respond to the problem of relatively low innovation of enterprises from the voivodeship, with particular emphasis on smart specialisation areas.

Measures to be implemented under Investment Priority 1.1 *Improvement of research and innovation (R&I) infrastructure and increasing the capacity to create excellence in the area of research and innovation, and supporting competence centres, especially those in the interest of Europe* will contribute to enhancing the links between the sector of enterprises with the sector of science (universities, research units). Financial support for regional research programmes and R&D projects will constitute real support for creating conditions for research and development of science (with focus on developing inventions to be patented and later implementations), strengthening the resources of universities and research institutions, and will contribute to an increase in the number of completed projects.

In turn, interventions under Investment Priority 1.2 *Promoting enterprise investment in research and innovation, links between entrepreneurs, R&D centres and universities, especially in the area of developing products and services, technology transfer* ... respond to the absence of systemic solutions for supporting the system of innovation and technology transfer, which directly results in a low number of implementations, patents and licences. On the other hand, it is frequently the case that plants from many branches of industry located in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship are national leaders, they generate a vast portion of total national output and frequently they are leaders also in innovation and technological development, as proven by high exports and/or active cooperation with global industrial concerns. It evidences high development potential of enterprises in the region. Therefore, it is fully justified to take actions aimed at developing cooperation between science circles and enterprises to be able to make full use of the region’s potential.

Evaluation of **Priority Axis 2 Digital region** shows the planned interventions are fully justified by the need to develop the endogenous potential of the region. Considering that in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship enterprises do not face the infrastructural barrier of lack of access to information and communication technologies (ICT), it can be claimed that poor ICT use by businesses results from their lacking so-called ‘digital competence. ’Improving digital competence under Investment Priority 2.2 *Development of products and services based on ICT, electronic trade and increasing demand for ICT* constitutes one of the basic elements of the strategy to create conditions for socio-economic development.[[3]](#footnote-3) Achieving the objective “Support for ICT introduction for running and developing economic activity” is also important from the point of view of building the information society, knowledge society and knowledge-based economy in Poland.

Interventions planned under Investment Priority 2.3 *Strengthening the use of information and communication technologies for e-government, e-learning, e-integration, e-culture and e-health* respond to the problem of low level of digitalisation of services. It means that application and use of e-government, e-health and e-education services is insufficient. It is highly probable that the relatively low level of ICT use by administration units, health care units and education units results from low level of ICT awareness of their personnel. These objectives match Poland’s effort to achieve the objectives of the European Digital Agenda, *Policy Paper for Poland’s Digital Development by 2020*and draft Regional Innovation Strategy for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship for 2014-2020 (RIS).

Digitalisation of public resources, primarily cultural, educational and scientific resources is complementary and logically coherent with investments in development of so-called digital competence which is a prerequisite for actual and effective use of digitalised public resources.

Interventions under **Priority Axis 3 Strengthening the competitiveness of the region’s economy** are key to supporting economic development during slowdown. According to the macroeconomic approach, the state should primarily support private investment activity in the form of inexpensive credit and tax reliefs. The planned measures match the lines of action proposed in the European Charter for Small Enterprises *Think small first.*[[4]](#footnote-4)According to the Charter, the situation of small business in the European Union can be improved by action to stimulate entrepreneurship. The logical relationship of the proposed actions with the diagnosed problems is based on the convergence theory.[[5]](#footnote-5) The EU regional policy, whose first objective emphasises convergence, supports poor regions via operational programmes which, in turn, promote innovation and R&D for entrepreneurs. It is very important as it prevents a situation where technology progress would take place only in rich regions. Support for international activity of the SME sector will also comply with the economic base theory. The basic assumption of the theory is that regional development is based on exports. The theory says that external demand for goods and services produced in a given region is the most important element stimulating economic growth. The planned measures will also comply with Harold Innes’ staple theory which explains long-term structural changes and the reasons behind economic growth. According to the staple theory, the road to regional development leads primarily through gradual specialisation of production, especially focus on a selected group of goods that may be the most competitive on external markets.[[6]](#footnote-6) Public authorities should support the process of specialisation and reduce transaction costs of production.

Interventions under Priority Axis 3 also respond to the diagnosed problem of difficult access to external capital for MSMEs on the market of commercial financial services. Planned measures comply with the endogenous growth theory which says that the pace of technology development is influenced by state policy (e.g. encouraging investment in research and development, or R&D), intense competition on the market and high development of the capital market, which promoted innovative forms of financing risky investments. SMEs do not have separate R&D divisions. Their research is short-term and based on the entrepreneur’s intuition. Development of products and technologies is usually focused on meeting the needs of customers, procurement and materials management. The response to the problem will consist in supporting measures of BEIs for entrepreneurs.

The measures planned under **Priority Axis 4 Energy efficiency and low-carbon economy in the region** respond to the need to make up for the region’s deficit in specific areas and to make use of natural resources of the voivodeship with a view to implementing horizontal policy of sustainable development. Energy from RES is to have a significant share in the energy balance of Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship. Therefore, support will be provided for tasks which are to result in an increase in the use of energy from RES.[[7]](#footnote-7) On the basis of experience from ROP K-PV 2007-2013, it can be concluded that the planned support would have a strong effect in the form of improvement of the condition of energy infrastructure (generation capacity based on conventional energy resources – mainly coal and gas[[8]](#footnote-8)) and of an increase in the use of innovative technologies. Despite considerable resources, RES fulfil only a fraction of energy needs of the voivodeship.[[9]](#footnote-9) The main driver of improvement in energy efficiency is usually the intention to reduce operating costs of enterprises, and thus to improve the efficiency of business as a whole, which in turn results directly in improved competitiveness. The relationship between the number of renovations to improve energy efficiency of buildings (in many cases also modernisations energy systems of buildings), including passive buildings, translates directly into a decline in primary energy use.[[10]](#footnote-10)

The primary justification for interventions under **Priority Axis 5 Adaptation to climate change** is the necessity to adjust in individual areas so to minimise the effects of climate change. The measures that respond to the problem of water deficit overlap with the measures that respond to the problem of insufficient retention. The planned interventions also respond to the need for measures that envisage streamlining the operation of the services responsible for citizen safety, *inter alia* by increasing the rescue capacity.

The measure planned under **Priority Axis 6 Environmentally-friendly region** directly responds to the diagnosed need for revitalisation of areas and spaces to increase their potential for socio-economic development. Strategic objective *Effective management* of the Development Strategy for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship (DSK-PV) emphasises the need for measures aimed at active nature protection, especially as regards animal species whose population decreases and which are at risk of extinction, increasing the surface area of habitats and restoration of inexistent habitats.

The interventions under **Priority Axis 7 Internal cohesion and external availability of the region** are justified by the endogenous potential of the region (centric road network, coordinated and coherent railway network, the region’s location on an important transit route and the potential of water transport). The interventions respond to the diagnosed deficits of potential accessibility of the region to bulk freight transport in transit traffic, also in water and intermodal transport, and deficits in adjustment of railway infrastructure to the needs of passenger transport. The increasing role of freight (and passengers) in transit corridors results in the need to decongest the internal regional road network for passengers by allowing fast access to higher order roads (motorways, express roads and national roads). Interventions under Investment Priority 7.4 *Development and rehabilitation of a comprehensive, modern and interoperable system of railway transport* are justified by the need to increase the capacity of road transport by transferring some regional passengers to railway transport, which requires investment in railway tracks and rolling stock. Interventions under Investment Priority 7.3 *Development of environmentally-friendly and low-carbon transport systems, including inland and sea transport, ports and multimodal links* are justified by the potential of the region’s waterways throughout Poland, which covers both bulk freight and passengers.

The interventions planned under **Priority Axis 8 Active in the labour market** directly respond to the diagnosed deficit which takes the form of diversified unemployment rates in subregions and in poviats within a subregion, with ageing population. They also respond to the problem of one of the highest unemployment rate in Poland. The planned measures are justified as they contribute to improving the situation of the unemployed, including long-term unemployed, on the labour market and to reducing the mismatch between supply and demand on local and subregional labour markets, in line with the search theory in the labour market by Alchian, Phelps and Halt (1992).

The projects under Investment Priority 8.5 *Ensuring access to employment to jobseekers and people professionally inactive people, including by local initiatives for employment and supporting mobility of employees* will result in optimisation of the flow of workforce within the subregion in line with the search theory in the labour market by E.S. Phelps and M. Friedman (1972). Using comprehensive tools that respond to barriers to stimulating labour force participation of people aged 50+ increases the employment effectiveness of this age group.[[11]](#footnote-11) The main barrier to taking up employment by women with small children is lack of territorial or financial accessibility of institutionalised forms of care.[[12]](#footnote-12) Measures aimed at enhancing the qualifications of employees will increase the adaptation capacity of the enterprise sector by boosting its competitiveness and efficiency. It should also be noted that in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship in 2000-2011 the number of economic operators increased by only 9%, whereas in as many as 12 regions of Poland the increase exceeded 15% and in the leading regions the figure was ca. 30%. The relatively low dynamics of establishing new companies in the region may result from low adaptability of enterprises on the one hand, and poor education level of personnel on the other hand. Moreover, the problems entrepreneurs have with maintaining their scale and scope of activity directly translate into lower number of jobs. From 2007 the voivodeship has seen a considerable increase in the number of people laid off fir reasons on the part of their employer. The interventions planned under Investment Priority 8.10 *Active and healthy ageing* respond to the need for extending labour force participation, which brings about positive effects for the labour market and the economy as a whole.[[13]](#footnote-13) Such measures can be undertaken primarily in the area of prevention and better access to medical services, which is reflected by the selection of interventions under the IP. The measures are complementary with other measures under other IPs of Priority Axis 8, and comply with the assumptions of the programme *Solidarity acrossgenerations*. *Measures aiming at increasing the economic activity of people over 50* and the *Government Programme for Senior Citizens Social Activity for 2012-2013.* Stimulating labour force participation of this age group results in a decrease in the number of people receiving social benefits, reduces the burden on the budget and contributes to creating added value.[[14]](#footnote-14)

The measures planned under **Priority Axis 9 Cohesive society** are justified by the threats resulting from slow pace of economic growth of the regions and from the stagnation trends on the labour market. It is necessary to intensify actions aimed at social activation and stimulating labour force participation of people at risk of social exclusion. The increasing number of people who receive benefits on grounds of disability, motherhood protection, having many children, homelessness, difficulties faced after release from prison and ageing of the population, with migration trends, result in projections of higher dynamics of social exclusion. Early diagnosis of the threat of social exclusion and early intervention in terms of preventing relative material deprivation or low labour intensity is a precondition of social inclusion. An early prevention system would increase the chance of social reintegration.[[15]](#footnote-15) Stimulating labour force participation of adult family members is a direct impulse for escaping relative poverty. This is the objective of comprehensive measures aimed at supporting both adult family members and children to prevent inherited unemployment. The measures planned under Investment Priority 9.7 *Facilitating access to affordable, sustainable and high quality services, including health care and social services of general interest* are the key condition of success of social reintegration programmes. According to the cultural geography theory (Andolina et al. 2005, Radcliffe 2006), lack of access to institutionalised or social forms of early intervention and support in areas particularly affected by social exclusion may be the reason behind ghettoisation and intensification of social pathologies.

The interventions under Investment Priority 9.8 *Supporting social economy and social enterprises* will respond to the potential of social economy in generating jobs for the socially excluded and in providing social services. According to the social economy theory (Sachs 2009) and the economic sociology theory (Granovetter 1985), the operating cycle of social economy enterprises can be divided into three phases: dependence on grants (public contracts), transformation towards different sources of financing and market orientation of operations with expansion of the enterprise. Support of the transition of enterprises from Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship to the transformation phase requires extensive action to enhance the competence and skills of their members to succeed on a competitive market. The support will be provided via measures aimed at popularising social economy and self-organisation.

The ex ante evaluation also shows that the measures planned under **Priority Axis 10 Innovative education** are justified mainly due to relatively high deficit of the region’s human capital in terms of qualifications and competences necessary to face up to the voivodeship’s development challenges. The measures under Investment Priority 10.1 *Reducing early school leaving and ensuring equal access to good quality elementary, primary and secondary education* are justified by unequal access to high quality educational institutions, mainly at the primary and secondary level. The disparity in educational achievements between students from Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship and the national average constitutes a weakness of the region under analysis in terms of its ability to create a knowledge society. It also means that the quality of jobs offered by its market will be lower, which translates directly into lower average income. Systemic solutions aimed at improvement of teachers’ qualifications on a regular basis are a precondition for improving the quality and efficiency of the entire education system. Popularisation of ICT-based teaching by supporting the use of ICT by teachers will create the basis for innovative education.

The measures under Investment Priority 10.3 *Improvement in accessibility and supporting lifelong learning, enhancing the skills and qualifications of employees and jobseekers, increasing the adjustment of education and training systems to the needs of the labour market* ... are justified by the insufficient and incoherent vocational education system in the voivodeship, which results in a mismatch between the vocational education system’s offer and the needs of the regional labour market. The vocational education system requires a transformation, mainly towards improving its efficiency and quality. In a long-term perspective, such cooperation could take the form of a dual vocational education system. The quality of continuous education of people aged 25-64 in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship from 2006 is well below the national average. Therefore, it is justified to take actions aimed at an increase in the number of people who take advantage of this form of education, which will contribute to increasing the general level of education, knowledge and skills, thus improving the situation on the labour market by reducing the rate of unemployment.

The measures under **Priority Axis 11 Cohesive society and competitive human resources** are justified by the need for infrastructural support for the interventions aimed at achieving the objectives of Priority Axes 8, 9 and 10. The grounds for infrastructural interventions are the diagnosed deficits in territorial accessibility of the infrastructure that allows achieving the objectives of innovative education, social economy and social services supporting the process of escaping social exclusion.

The four TOs envisaged under **Priority Axis 12 Territorial policy** are strategic from the point of view of achieving the other objectives of ROP K-PV 2014-2020. This is because the measures will contribute to, *inter alia*, sustainable development (e.g. in transport), improving the competitiveness of the voivodeship and to supporting the measures which are aimed at an increase in employability. The planned measures are to fulfil the identified socio-economic needs and contribute to solving the related problems. For Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship, the problems are significant barriers as they hamper economic and social development, and seriously hinder the implementation of sustainable development policy. The barriers include mainly low energy efficiency of buildings, insufficient activities in the area of low-carbon economy and water and sewage systems, nature protection and promotion, degraded urban areas, air pollution, high risk of poverty and exclusion and insufficiently developed educational and training infrastructure.

Under **Priority Axis 13 Territorial policy – Family friendly local development ESF**, two TOs have been assumed, i.e. combating poverty and social exclusion as well as development of education, which are strategic from the point of view of the other objectives of ROP K-PV 2014-2020. This is because the measures will contribute to, *inter alia*, improving the competitiveness of the voivodeship and to supporting the measures which are aimed at an increase in employment rates. They respond to barriers which materialise primarily as: low level of labour force participation of the socially excluded or people at risk of social exclusion, insufficient support for social economy entities (SEE), low quality of education at all levels, unequal access to pre-school education, mismatch between the education system and the needs of the regional labour market and insufficient measures to support lifelong learning.

**Priority Axis 14 Community-led local development** is to fulfil local needs and tackle development challenges. The main objective of the axis is increased activity of the society through grassroots initiatives. In addition, the CLLD territorial instrument will contribute to better concentration of support in areas defined as being at risk of social exclusion, with particular emphasis on long-term unemployment.

## Accuracy of interventions in the context of the socio-economic diagnosis

The accuracy of interventions in the context of the socio-economic diagnosis is determined by selection of investment priorities and planned sets of measures (intervention areas) under individual priority axes to tackle the diagnosed challenges and problems.

Matrix techniques were applied to determine that under the Priority Axis the proposed measures are adequate and the majority of them largely respond to the diagnosed problems and socio-economic challenges of the region.

The selection of measures under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 ensures addressing the problems and challenges defined in the diagnosis directly and indirectly. No gaps in tackling individual challenges and problems have been detected.

Yet, there were some inaccuracies in formulating references to diagnosed deficits and needs in individual intervention areas. In a few cases, the diagnosis included a detailed description of phenomena and challenges to which the planned intervention types do not refer, directly or indirectly. There are also intervention areas whose reference to the socio-economic diagnosis of the region is not well documented.

The table below presents the deficits, gaps and inconsistencies of individual priority axes of the Programme along with recommendations for changes.

**Table 1. List of deficits, gaps and inconsistencies of individual priority axes of the Programme with recommendations for changes**

| **Problem** | **Description/source** | **Does the diagnosis of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 address the problem?** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PA 1. Building innovation of the region through R&D activity of enterprises** | | |
| Poor links of the enterprise sector with the science sector and related absence of systemic solutions aimed at supporting the innovation and technology transfer system. | An important problem identified in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship consists in poor links of the enterprise sector with the science sector. A direct negative effect of the status quo is a low number of implementations, patents and licences in the private sector. An additional negative effect is a low number of clusters. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis justifies the problem to an insufficient extent.  **Justification:** ROP K-PV 2014-2020 mentions this topic only briefly, not providing specific figures, description of its dynamics, etc.  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis to address this problem; it is recommended to use relevant sources and information that have not been included in the diagnosis for the STOW analysis. |
| **PA 2. Digital region** | | |
| Low ICT use by enterprises, which manifests as low share of telework in the structure of employment and a low share of commercial transactions carried out using ICT (e-commerce). | Due to low ICT use by enterprises in the region, the significance of ICT in the process of goods and services production is low and its growth rate is poor.  Unsatisfactory degree of ICT use in daily operations of enterprises (e.g. receiving and placing orders on-line**[[16]](#footnote-16)**). Poor knowledge of digital solutions that streamline operations of enterprises, business cooperation and contacts with customers impairs competitiveness of enterprises on the market.  Underdevelopment in this area is a problem mainly because local enterprises fail to take advantage of an opportunity to boost their potential. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis describes/justifies the problem to an insufficient extent.  **Justification:** The description of PA 2 mentions the problem only briefly; no confirmation of its existence has been provided (data, study results, etc.).  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis with thematic data to substantiate the identified problem; data (e.g. from the CSO) should be presented at the regional level (the data given, if any, are national aggregates). |
| Relatively low digitisation rate of the economy and society, which manifests primarily in low level of development of e-education, e-health and e-government. | Insufficient (low) level of using e-services (e-government, e-health, e-education) by the Polish society, which results in low efficiency of public institutions, with their activity frequently being ineffective. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis describes/justifies the problem to an insufficient extent.  **Justification:** The description of PA 2 mentions the problem only briefly; no confirmation of its existence has been provided (data, study results, etc.).  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis with thematic data to substantiate the identified problem; data (e.g. from the CSO) should be presented at the regional level (the data given, if any, are national aggregates). |
| **PA 3. Strengthening the competitiveness of the economy of the region** | | |
| Difficulties faced by entrepreneurs in obtaining external capital. | *Analysis of support for entrepreneurship under Regional Operational Programme for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship 2007-2013*, Agrotec Polska sp. z o.o., May 2013. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all.  **Recommendation:** The diagnosis and the SWOT analysis should be supplemented with the description from page 151 of the 2013 Agrotec report. It mentions adaptability of entrepreneurs, including lack of knowledge on external sources of financing of operations. |
| Poor development of agri-food processing (with high agricultural output – disproportionately small food production). | Michna, W. ed. (2007) *Evaluation of the impact of food sector development on lines of modernisation of agricultural holdings in individual regions*, Institute of Agricultural and Food Economics; report entitled *Opportunities, threats and potential lines of development of rural areas in Poland at the regional level*, FAPA, Agrotec Polska sp. z o.o., Warsaw 2012. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis describes the problem to an insufficient extent.  **Justification:** The chapter on industry provides information on the food industry and the threat of insufficient use of its potential. There is no information on disproportionately low food production compared with agricultural output.  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis and the SWOT analysis. |
| Limited knowledge of entrepreneurs on support offered by BEIs. | Brussa A., Tarnawa A. (eds.), *Report on the condition of the SME sector in Poland*, Warsaw 2011, Toruńska Agencja Rozwoju Regionalnego S.A., *Operating model of business environment institutions that stimulates innovative cooperation of enterprises in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*.  *Analysis of support for entrepreneurship under Regional Operational Programme for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship 2007-2013*, Agrotec Polska sp. z o.o., May 2013. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all.  **Justification:** The diagnosis describes the benefits of support offered by BEIs, but it does not address the problem which consists in limited knowledge of entrepreneurs on support offered by BEIs.  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis and SWOT analysis with information from chapter „Using BEI offer by enterprises,” p. 33 from the *Operating model of business environment institutions that stimulates innovative cooperation of enterprises in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*. The source says that: only 8% of entrepreneurs used BEI, 46% declared they have never heard of BEI, 5% cooperated with BEIs occasionally, and 11% have seen BEI advertising. |
| Absence of a well worked out and permanent structure and practices of cooperation of R&D units with BEIs and the SME sector. | Brussa A., Tarnawa A. (eds.), Report on the condition of the SME sector in Poland, Warsaw 2011.  Toruńska Agencja Rozwoju Regionalnego S.A., *Operating model of business environment institutions that stimulates innovative cooperation of enterprises in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all.  **Justification:** The diagnosis describes the benefits of support offered by BEIs, but it does not address the practical problems with cooperation.  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis and SWOT analysis with information from chapter „Relationships between business environment institutions,” p. 22 from the *Operating model of business environment institutions that stimulates innovative cooperation of enterprises in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*.  The situation in terms of cooperation varies, entrepreneurs are aware BEIs exist, but cooperation has no consolidated form. |
| Small interest of companies in cooperation with other companies and BEIs. | Toruńska Agencja Rozwoju Regionalnego S.A., *Operating model of business environment institutions that stimulates innovative cooperation of enterprises in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all.  **Justification:** The benefits of cooperation have been described, but the problem of lack of interest has not been addressed.  **Recommendation:**It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis and SWOT analysis with information from chapters „Using BEI offer by enterprises,” p. 33 and “Innovation and cooperation of enterprises in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship” from the *Operating model of business environment institutions that stimulates innovative cooperation of enterprises in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*. Study results confirm that BEIs cooperate with each other to a limited extent. Only 8% of entrepreneurs have cooperated with BEIs, 20% with chambers of commerce and science and technology parks *in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*. In 2008-2010, 5.6% of industrial enterprises and 2.1% of service sector enterprises started cooperation in the field of innovative activity. |
| Unfavourable situation in terms of cluster development in the region. | Toruńska Agencja Rozwoju Regionalnego S.A., *Operating model of business environment institutions that stimulates innovative cooperation of enterprises in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*, 2010.  *Analysis of support for entrepreneurship under Regional Operational Programme for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship 2007-2013*, Agrotec Polska sp. z o.o., May 2013. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all.  **Justification:** ROP K-PV 2014-2020 provides only information on the need to develop cooperation with clusters, but their current situation on the market has not been described.  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis and SWOT analysis with information from the study by Toruńska Agencja Rozwoju Regionalnego S.A.  Cooperation in the framework of clusters is poor compared to Poland as a whole. The 2012 benchmarking exercise, based on recognisability in the media and strategy analysis, showed that only the Bydgoszcz Industrial Cluster is worth a mention. In 2011, Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship had the lowest percentage of industrial enterprises cooperating in clusters (6.5% against 12.4% nationwide, and 8.1% nationwide in 2010).  Apart from Dolnośląskie, Lubuskie and Opolskie Voivodeships, Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship is also the one with almost no service enterprises present in clusters (in 2010 only 4.8% of service enterprises participated in cluster initiatives). When all enterprises in the region are concerned, only 5.6% of industrial enterprises and 2% of service enterprises cooperated in the field of innovative activity. Of these, only 8% participated in clusters, which stands for 0.5% of enterprises in the region.[[17]](#footnote-17) |
| **PA 4. Energy efficiency and low-carbon economy in the region** | | |
| Absence of modern innovative energy generation technologies (including RES). | The Polish energy generation sector uses coal. The majority of energy is generated using hard coal and lignite. It is estimated that by 2015 electricity use in Poland would increase at least twofold, to over 7,000 kWh per person per year. Further economic development of Poland will require a radical energy saving programme and an increase in the capacity of new sources of energy, heat and electricity. It will be possible to obtain a considerable portion of the demand for energy, especially heat, from renewable sources. It will result in a vast reduction of pollutant emission.  According to CSO data, in 2011 Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship ranked fifth in terms of dust emission and eleventh in terms of the volume of gas released into the air – according to the CSO. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all.  **Justification:** The description of the voivodeship’s situation in terms of renewable energy generation consists only of a brief description of its position where energy generation from renewable sources as compared to other regions is concerned, with no mention of the diagnosed problems in this thematic area.  **Recommendation:** The diagnostic part should be supplemented with a description/analysis of problems related to RES in the voivodeship. |
| Energy loss and use by SMEs. | Despite actual improvement in energy efficiency of the economy, Poland is still characterised by excessive use of raw materials, materials and energy in generating gross national income, twice as high as in other EU countries.[[18]](#footnote-18) In the 2020 perspective, the technical potential for energy efficiency is 50%, while economically justified potential is even 25%.  Improvement of energy efficiency has many measurable benefits for the economy.  Energy efficiency, so-called ‘fourth fuel,’ is the most affordable[[19]](#footnote-19)and widely accepted[[20]](#footnote-20)way to reduce greenhouse gas emission. | **Conclusion:** One of the investment priorities is IP 4.2 Promoting energy efficiency and RES use in enterprises, but the problem to which this IP responds has not been described in the diagnosis.  **Justification:** Like in the previous case, it is an irregularity not to provide reference to the problems observed in the voivodeship which relate to this thematic area.  **Recommendation:** The diagnostic part should be supplemented with a description/analysis of problems related to RES in the voivodeship, especially as the planned actions (here: specific objective and IP) seem to respond directly to the problem. |
| Energy intensive public and housing sector. | On average, over 95% of buildings in the public and housing sector are older than 10 years (CSO data), and thus energy intensive, technically unadjusted to increasing prices, expensive to maintain, frequently harmful to the health of their inhabitants and unadjusted to modern housing standards. On average, the heat demand indicator (E) for buildings erected in Poland from 1984 ranged between 220 and 350 kWh/m2/year.  The technical reason behind such high values was poor thermal insulation of walls and bad quality, draughty windows. The economic reason was low energy prices and, on the other hand, high prices of insulation materials.  Room for improvement is the greatest in housing construction and public utility sectors.  Poland and other EU Member States will soon have to implement many new regulations on energy efficiency, such as the revised Directive 2010/31/EU on the energy performance of buildings which stipulates that from 31 December 2018 all new public buildings and from 31 December 2020 all new buildings would be nearly zero-energy buildings. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all.  **Justification:** The diagnosis does not address the problem even though IP 4.3 provides support for energy efficiency and use of renewable energy sources in public buildings and in the housing sector.  **Recommendation:** The diagnostic part should be supplemented with a description of current problems in the field of low-carbon economy and RES in the voivodeship. |
| **PA 5. Adaptation to climate change** | | |
| Insufficient equipment of emergency services. | *Status of flood control measures in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*, Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship Land Improvement and Water Infrastructure Board, Włocławek 2011. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all.  **Justification:** ROP K-PV 2014-2020 only provides information on the need to carry out measures to address the problem. Yet, the problem as such has not been defined.  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis and SWOT analysis with relevant fragments from the report.  The report provides information on the significance of emergency services to flood control. |
| **PA 6. Environmentally friendly region** | | |
| Increased pressure on natural resources and biodiversity. | *Environmental report on the “Development Strategy for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship by 2020,”*October 2013, Agrotec Polska sp. z o.o. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all.  **Justification:** The diagnosis only provides information on natural resources. It does not describe the condition of the resources, nor does it mention the problem of increased pressure on natural resources and biodiversity.  **Recommendation:** The threat is mentioned in the environmental report, so it is recommended to supplement the diagnosis with the information.  The problem has been presented in the chapter of the environmental report that covers threats – they will intensify if adequate actions are not taken. Failure to take actions to strengthen natural resources and biodiversity (recultivation, land restoration, restoring habitats, restitution of native plant and animal species, reconstruction of populations at risk of extinction) will result in greater pressure on these components of nature. |
| **PA 7. Internal cohesion and external accessibility of the region** | | |
| No gaps or inaccuracies. |  |  |
| **PA 8. Active on the labour market** | | |
| No gaps or inaccuracies. |  |  |
| **PA 9. Cohesive society** | | |
| No gaps or inaccuracies. |  |  |
| **PA 10. Innovative education** | | |
| No gaps or inaccuracies. |  |  |
| **PA 11. Cohesive society and competitive human resources – ERDF** | | |
| Insufficient educational infrastructure of general and vocational schools. | No description or statistical data. | **Recommendation**: It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis with shortages of didactic and educational infrastructure. |
| The need for expanding the infrastructure of existing social enterprises. | The main barrier to SEE are financial problems faced by over a half (57%) of entities. Other difficulties are mentioned much less frequently; they are: lack of people willing to cooperate (22%) and in 12% it is bureaucracy and unclear regulations.  Source: Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship Programme for Social Economy for 2013-2020 – draft. | **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis with a mention of the need for infrastructural support for SEE, for example in connection with the plans to entrust them with the tasks of the social services sector intended for support under Priority Axis 9. |
| **PA 12. Territorial policy – ERDF** | | |
| Low energy efficiency of public utility buildings and residential buildings and the associated problem of air pollution. | Measures to improve (raise) the energy efficiency of public utility buildings and residential buildings contribute to fulfilling the requirements of achieving the objectives of the climate and energy package specified for Poland. These measures are one of the ways to reduce energy consumption, expenditure on maintenance of buildings and air pollution. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all.  **Justification:** The diagnosis does not address the problem even though IP 4.3 provides support for energy efficiency and use of renewable energy sources in public buildings and in the housing sector.  **Recommendation:** The diagnostic part should be supplemented with a description of current problems in the field of low-carbon economy and RES in the voivodeship. |
| **PA 13. Territorial policy – Family-friendly local development – ESF** | | |
| No gaps or inaccuracies. |  |  |
| **PA 14. Community-led local development** | | |
| Concentration of negative socio-economic phenomena. | *Changes of gaps in socio-economic development of Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship in the first decade of the 21st century*, October 2012.  *Analysis of the developmental needs of Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship in the context of the new EU financial perspective 2014-2020*, IBS, October 2012. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis describes the problem to an insufficient extent.  **Justification:** The SWOT analysis addresses the problem and it results from an analysis of many other phenomena, but it has not been summed up unambiguously. Analysis of individual phenomena has been presented in division into subregions.  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis with information from the reports referred to in the previous column.  In the first report, socio-economic gaps have been presented using a multivariate analysis of the population (a.o. nursery care, unemployment), economy (a.o. entrepreneurship, remuneration level) and infrastructure (a.o. sewerage system, gas pipelines). It is recommended to include conclusions from the report in the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 diagnosis.  It is also recommended to supplement the diagnosis with information from the second report on page 113. All major cities in the voivodeship have been defined as centres with a strong concentration of negative socio-economic phenomena. It results from spatial degradation of city centres and old town regions as well as housing projects. The region ranks fourth in terms of the population of housing projects intended for revitalisation and fifth in Poland in terms of the number of post-industrial sites and the population of pre-war districts.  The region’s population is characterised by the highest percentage of people who are excluded and unemployed in Poland. The reason may the low entrepreneurship that does not generate jobs (p. 157). |
| One of the lowest levels of human and social capital in Poland. | *Quality of life, social capital, poverty and social exclusion in Poland*, CSO, Statistical Office in Łódź, Warsaw 2013.  *Analysis of the developmental needs of Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship in the context of the new EU financial perspective 2014-2020*, IBS, October 2012. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis describes the problem to an insufficient extent.  **Justification:** The SWOT analysis addresses the problem and it results from an analysis of many other phenomena, but it has not been summed up unambiguously.  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis with data on human and social capital.  Human capital elements:   * Health assessment (very good and good – 58%, Poland – 55%, neither good nor bad – 29%, Poland – 32%, very bad and bad – 13%, Poland – 13%), * Using the Internet (61%, Poland – 62%), * Individual skills indicator (very low or none – 35%, Poland – 30%, low – 10%, Poland – 12%, medium – 26%, Poland – 25%, high – 21%, Poland – 24%, very high – 8%, Poland – 9%).   Social capital elements:   * People who feel connected with their city/town/village – 92%, Poland – 92%, * People who feel connected with their close and far neighbours – 79%, Poland – 80%, * Indicator of involvement in a formal network – 23%, Poland – 24%, * Indicator of good neighbourly relations – 56%, Poland – 57%, social isolation indicator – 9%, Poland – 9%.   Page 7 of the second report: the region’s population is characterised by the lowest level of social capital in Poland. |
| Degradation of city and village space. | According to the *Assumptions for the National Urban Policy until 2020*, Warsaw, 20 July 2012, (p. 5), revitalisation activities should be conducted in a comprehensive manner, which means that integrated projects will be implemented that bring about environmental, economic, but above all social benefits. In order to prevent further degradation, projects are planned aimed at transforming and making use of problem areas for social, economic, environmental and cultural purposes. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 does not address the problem, but it is commensurate with IP 9.2 Supporting physical, economic and social revitalisation of poor communities and urban and rural areas. The measures will be consistent with the objectives of the National Spatial Development Concept 2030. |

*Source: own study.*

## Prioritisation of socio-economic challenges and needs identified in the diagnosis

The diagnosis prepared for the needs of the Programme does not define a list and does not prioritise the identified socio-economic challenges or needs in the region. The current *Template*... does not require these elements. It does not mean that the problems have not been examined correctly – references to the problems can be found in different parts of the diagnosis. Strength of the diagnosis is the proper way of merging a thematic (sectoral) approach with spatial approach.

The lines of the region’s policy identified in strategic documents were the main, except for conditionalities resulting from the guidelines for national programming, category of data determining the scope and structure of the interventions planned under ROP K-PV 2014-2020. However, the objectives formulated for individual priority axes do not allow ranking and thus prioritisation of individual specific objectives corresponding to the investment priority. This issue makes it difficult to perform a quantified evaluation of the impact of individual specific objectives on achieving the main objective of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 and evaluation of the Programme’s structure in terms of the appropriateness of fund allocations for individual TOs.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended to consider reconstructing the provisions of the diagnosis towards prioritisation of the needs indicated in the diagnosis in line with the structure of the costs projected for individual TOs and IPs in order to ensure greater internal cohesion and logic of interventions under the Programme.

## Relevance and accuracy of analyses of socio-economic trends used in the diagnosis

The data used in the diagnosis are considered relevant, based on time series that allow vectoring socio-economic changes in particular areas. Socio-economic trends have been defined correctly. The causal relationships between the presented problems and challenges and the expected effects and results have been described in detail for individual axes in the additional materials (axis diagrams and descriptions of causal relationships).

For some priority axes, also gaps and inconsistencies in the imaging of socio-economic trends have been identified, which may affect the assumptions concerning the anticipated results. They are presented in the table below.

**Table 2. Gaps and inconsistencies in the imaging of socio-economic trends identified in ROP K-PV 2014-2020**

| **Gaps and inconsistencies in the statistical description** | **Recommendation** |
| --- | --- |
| **PA 1. Building innovation of the region through R&D activity of enterprises** | |
| No cross-cutting or dynamic data concerning the problem of poor links of the enterprise sector with the science sector and related absence of systemic solutions aimed at supporting the innovation and technology transfer system. | It is recommended to support the proposed thesis on the problem that consists in "Poor links of the enterprise sector with the science sector and related absence of systemic solutions aimed at supporting the innovation and technology transfer system" with relevant data in this regard. |
| **PA 2. Digital development** | |
| Lack of regional data on the use of ICT in enterprises and lack of data reflecting the degree of digitisation of public administration makes it impossible to fully examine the situation in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship. | It is recommended to supplement the description of PA 2 and the relevant parts of the diagnosis with data thematically related to a given area, concerning Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship (e.g. disaggregation of CSO data). |
| Lack of regional data on the use of ICT in enterprises and lack of data reflecting the degree of digitisation of public administration makes it impossible to determine the trend vector. | It is recommended not only to supplement the description of PA 2 and the relevant parts of the diagnosis with current data thematically related to a given area, concerning Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship, with historical data and projections, if possible. The purpose is to allow determining the trend vector and, ultimately, to improve the diagnosis and suggest remedial actions. |
| **PA 4. Energy efficiency and low-carbon economy in the region** | |
| Lack of statistical data reflecting the condition of the voivodeship in terms of renewable energy and low-carbon economy. Information included in the Programme diagnosis describe the situation of the region (strengths, competitiveness of the region), but do not describe its weaknesses. Relevance of data (data from the Energy Regulatory Office from September 2013) is an advantage, but the range of data for one year does not reflect the dynamics of changes in the region in terms of using/generating energy from RES. There are no statistical data to confirm the grounds for selecting individual measures/PIs in this thematic area. | It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis with a description of the condition of the voivodeship in terms of renewable energy and low-carbon economy along with statistical data to reflect its weaknesses, the diagnosed problems and their changes in subsequent years (dynamics). |

*Source: own study.*

## Accuracy of proposed objectives in the context of identified socio-economic challenges and needs

Specific objectives of individual investment priorities contribute to achieving the objective of the Programme. The direction of changes has been defined correctly, consistently with the diagnosed trends. Yet in some cases the objectives do not reflect the effects of measures, but rather the processes which are to lead to them. This is the case for:

* Investment Priority 2.2 *Development of e-services of the public sector* – objective *Support for using information and communication technologies (ICT) in production and services* has been formulated in terms of the planned measures, not the effects;
* Investment Priority 3.1 *Promoting entrepreneurship, particularly by facilitating economic use of new ideas and supporting setting up of new companies* – objective *Creating favourable conditions for setting up and development of enterprises* does not show the vector of desired changes;
* Investment Priority 3.2 *Developing and implementing new business models for SMEs, particularly for internationalisation* – objective *Internationalisation of enterprises from Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship* does not show the vector of desired changes, similar to IP 3.1;
* Investment Priority 6.3 *Protection, promotion and development of cultural and natural heritage* – objective *Protection of cultural heritage* has been formulated in terms of public tasks, not the expected effect of the Programme.

# INTERVENTION LOGIC ASSESSMENT

Evaluation question B. Will the intervention logic proposed under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 allow to accomplish the assumed development objectives?

This component is the essence of ex ante evaluation. It consists of comprehensive and interrelated issues which constitute the basis for assessing the validity of the proposed strategy.

## Analysis and assessment of causal relationships

This chapter presents the evaluation of the consistency of the planned measures with expected effects and results. In general, ex ante evaluation found full consistency of the planned measures and investment priorities with the diagnosed needs and challenges. However, numerous cases of incompleteness and inconsistency of the intervention logic were found with regard to indicators measuring the effects of the planned measures. The table below presents a proposal to complement output indicators, strategic result indicators and deferred result indicators with items allowing to measure the majority of the planned effects.

The extension of the list of indicators is also justified by evaluation potential of the monitoring system. The lack of indicators standardised at the level of the draft Programme would not allow to measure efficiency and effectiveness of the planned intervention in the n+2 period.

**Table 3. Recommendations on changes and complements to the list of indicators**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Recommendation** | **Justification** |
| **PA 1 Building innovation of the region through R&D activity of enterprises** | IP 1.1: Adding an output indicator *Number of R&D projects implemented thanks to support* | The proposed indicators correspond to the Operational Programme Smart Growth. |
| IP 1.2: Adding an output indicator *Number of supported business environment institutions - innovation centres* | Along with the indicator: *Number of implemented product innovations*, which is included in the Programme, it will constitute measureable verification of implemented measures. |
| IP 1.2: Adding an output indicator *Number of supported clusters* and *Number of enterprises involved in supported clusters.* | The indicators will constitute measurable verification of investment activities under IP 1.2. |
| **PA 2 Digital region** | IP 2.2: Adding an output indicator *Number of new supported enterprises* | The indicator is logically related to an indicator included in the draft Programme, namely, *Number of enterprises supported in order to introduce new products for business*, since enterprises supported in order to place new products for businesses on the market constitute a part of the total number of supported enterprises. |
| IP 2.3: Adding an output indicator: *Number of persons receiving consulting and training to develop digital competence.* | The lack of an output indicator measuring the effects of measures aimed at improving digital competence. |
| IP 2.3: Adding an output indicator *Number of works from public resources which were digitalised and made available online.* | The output indicator will constitute measurable verification of implemented measures related to supporting digitalisation of cultural, scientific and educational resources owned by regional/local institutions, as well as provision of common and open access to those resources in a digital form. |
| IP 2.3: Adding an output indicator *Number of digital services based on reuse of public sector information and open resources.* | The output indicator *Number of offices which streamlined their functioning thanks to digital advancement* does not cover all complex and multidimensional aspects related to digitalisation of public institutions. The proposed indicator will refer to measures aimed at implementing modern forms of education using the available ICT tools. |
| **PA 3 Strengthening the competitiveness of the economy of the region** | A strategic result indicator, corresponding to the indicator from the Partnership Agreement, October 2013, should be introduced, namely: *Value of investment expenditure in enterprises of the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship* [PLN million]. The indicator will cover IP 3.1, IP 3.2 and IP 3.3. | In the version of the Partnership Agreement from October 2013, the following indicator from the Partnership Agreement: *Percentage of industrial enterprises from the services sector which introduced innovation in the total of enterprises* (medium-sized enterprises) was transferred to TO1. The following indicator was established for TO3 in the Partnership Agreement: *Rate of investment in the private sector (gross fixed capital formation in the private sector as a % of GDP).* A corresponding strategic indicator should be introduced for the Programme. |
| IP 3.1: Adding an output indicator *Number of enterprises receiving support* | An indicator from the Common List of Key Indicators. According to the *Template*…, the indicators selected should be adequate for the majority of interventions under the given IP and should allow to assess the progress in its implementation. The indicator will allow to measure the effects of projects aimed at supporting the SME development in the region, in particular the innovation development, i.e. development of business incubators and centres supporting academic entrepreneurship, as well as investment support for newly established enterprises/start-ups. The indicator will be consistent with another output indicator *Area of supported (prepared) investment land* [ha]. |
| **PA 5 Adaptation to climate change** | IP 5.2: The following output indicator was adopted in the draft Programme:  *Number of threat monitoring systems and early warning systems put into operation.* | The indicator does not measure directly the output of the proposed measure, since this type of intervention is not included in the description of PA 5, although the specific objective of PA 5 is to improve the organisation of early response and rescue systems. A type of intervention corresponding to the PA objective should be introduced or the indicator should be replaced with another indicator measuring the following: *Number of purchased specialist fire and rescue equipment* or *Number of rescue service units that received equipment for rescue operations and removing the consequences of disasters.* |
| **PA 10 Innovative education** | IP 10.1: Adding a direct result indicator *Number of pupils who achieved better results in education thanks to support (Regional Examination Board)* | Indicator:   * directly related to the output *Number of pupils supported under the programme*, which in turn is the effect of investment activities, * is a measurable outcome of the measures consisting in support for pupils in the region, in order to improve education results and access to the education system, * corresponds to the Europe 2020 strategy, the National Action Plan against Poverty and Social Exclusion 2020 and the Operational Programme Knowledge, Education, Development 2014-2020.   The improvement of results will be measured by comparing the results of external exams achieved before and after the support was granted. The data will be obtained from the Regional Examination Board. |
| **PA 11 Cohesive society and competitive human resources** | Replacement of the strategic result indicator: *Poverty risk indicator (after including social transfers)* with the indicator: *Expected increase in the number of patients receiving oncological treatment or treatment for cardiovascular diseases after the completion of measures under the project.* | The indicator to be removed cannot be generated by measuring the effects of IP.  The new indicator refers to the detailed monitoring indicator for the Development Strategy for the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship by 2020, namely, *Deaths due to cancer and cardiovascular diseases - total for 10 000 inhabitants.* The indicator will be measured at the project level. It will correspond to the output indicator: *Number of supported health care providers.* |
| IP 9.3: Adding the following output indicators:  *Number of persons at risk of social exclusion who used the basic social services under the programme*  *Number of new jobs created in social economy entities.* | The proposed output indicators monitor the strategic result indicator. They are easy to measure at the project level. They also refer to measures supported under IP. |
| IP 10.4: Adding the following output indicators:  *Number of built (converted) and extended facilities of educational institutions,*  *Number of schools equipped with technological and teaching infrastructure under the programme.* | The indicator proposed in the Programme is insufficient, since it does not measure investments in technological and teaching infrastructure planned under PA. |
| IP 10.4: Adding a strategic result indicator  *Number of pupils participating in classes using the modernised technological and teaching infrastructure.* | The indicator complements the indicator: *Percentage of children aged 3-5 receiving pre-school education (included in the DSK-PV).*  According to the intervention logic, the planned measures will include both pre-school education and general education. Adding an additional indicator to the strategic result indicator (two strategic result indicators may be used under one IP) will allow to measure the results of all types of intervention planned. |
| **PA 12 Territorial policy** | IP 4.3: Adding the following strategic indicators:  *Greenhouse gas emissions [1990=100],*  *Primary energy consumption [thousand tonnes].* | The strategic result in the form of greenhouse gas emissions [1990=100] is a logical result of the direct result indicator: *Estimated decrease in greenhouse gas emissions [tonnes of CO2 equivalent]*. The reduction of the demand for electricity and heat in public utility buildings and in common parts of multi-family buildings results in the reduced use of fossil fuels which translates into reduced emissions of pollutants, including greenhouse gases, into the air.  The investments aimed at energy modernisation of buildings result mainly in the reduction of primary energy consumption which is beneficial for the environment and contributes to the reduction of expenditure for maintenance of buildings. The direct result indicator: *Reduction of primary energy consumption in public buildings [kWh/year]* is logically related to the strategic result indicator measuring the consumption of primary energy [thousand tonnes]. Both indicators must be considered consistent and relevant for the IP 4.3 implementation. |
| IP 4.5: Adding an output indicator:  *Number of modernised street lamps.* | The indicator measures the outcome of measures consisting in lighting modernisation. |
| IP 6.2: Adding a strategic result indicator:  *Percentage of the population using the water supply network.* | The indicator is necessary for appropriate measurable verification of the direct result indicator: *Additional population served by improved water supply [persons].* The indicator comes from public statistics (Central Statistical Office), since the specific indicators listed in the Partnership Agreement do not apply here. |
| IP 6.4: Adding a strategic result indicator:  *Tourists accommodated per 1000 inhabitants*  *Share of areas protected by the law in total area [%]* | The proposed indicators are taken from public statistics (Central Statistical Office), since the specific indicators listed in the Partnership Agreement are not applicable.  The first of the proposed indicators presents the number of tourists who spent more than one day in the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship per 1000 inhabitants. Therefore, the achievement of a direct result in the form of an increase in expected number of visits to places belonging to cultural and natural heritage and constituting tourist attractions is justified upon implementation of the result.  The second indicator is logically consistent with the direct result *Area of habitats supported to obtain a better protection status [ha].* The research aimed at gaining more information about the environment and natural resources should contribute i.a. to identification of areas of high natural value which should be protected or to changing their previous legal protection status. The inventorying of natural resources and the resulting planning documents should contribute to an increase in the area protected by law. |
| IP 6.5: Adding a strategic result indicator:  *Devastated and degraded land requiring reclamation [ha],*  *Emission of gaseous pollutants from plants especially noxious to air purity in total [tonne/year]*  *Emission of particulate pollutants from plants especially noxious to air purity in total [tonne/year]* | The indicators are necessary for appropriate measurable verification of direct result indicators. They are taken from public statistics (Central Statistical Office), since the specific indicators listed in the Partnership Agreement are not applicable. |
| IP 9.5: Adding an output indicator:  *Length of built or converted bicycle routes [km]* | It is important to add an output which corresponds to investments under IP 4.5 and reflects the impact on achieving the direct indicator: *Estimated decrease in greenhouse gas emissions [tonnes pf CO2 equivalent].* |
| IP 9.6: Adding an output indicator:  *Number of buildings erected in line with passive building standards.* | The implementation of low-carbon economy should be improved based on information campaigns and campaigns promoting environmentally friendly solutions. In particular, awareness of the society should be raised and the construction of buildings only in line with passive building standards should be promoted. Compared to traditional buildings, zero-emission buildings is characterised by a lower demand for heat. In order to verify investment measures in the form of information and promotion campaigns, a product in the form of *Number of buildings erected in line with passive building standards*, which will contribute to achievement of the direct result indicator: *Estimated decrease in greenhouse gas emissions [tonnes pf CO2 equivalent].* |
| IP 9.7: Adding an output indicator:  *Number of buildings converted in line with passive building standards.* | The proposed indicator is necessary to verify the campaigns promoting zero-emission buildings. By presenting the benefits not only for the environment, but also such benefits as the reduction of building maintenance costs, information measures should encourage the inhabitants of the Kujawsko-Pomorskie region to convert buildings in line with passive building standards, and thus should contribute to achieving the direct result indicator: *Estimated decrease in greenhouse gas emissions [tonnes pf CO2 equivalent].* |

*Source: Own study.*

The ex ante evaluation of the remaining **PA** reveals that output and result indicators are complete with regard to the planned measures under the adopted intervention logic.

## Assessment of the impact of the Programme's implementation on the regional and national socio-economic situation

The ex ante evaluation did not find a risk of the Programme’s negative impact on the socio-economic situation. The architecture of objectives and intervention is consistent with the desired changes and diagnosed trends.

Some symptoms and regularities of the Programme’s impact on the socio-economic situation of the region, resulting from the intervention logic, should be highlighted. No negative effects of the PA implementation were identified, except for two priority axes where such risk exists. The details are presented in the following table.

**Table 4. Description of the impact of axes and individual investment priorities implementation on the socio-economic situation**

| **Number and name of the priority axis** | **General description of the impact of the axis implementation on the socio-economic situation** | **Description of the impact of individual investment priorities** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PA 1 Building innovation of the region through R&D activity of enterprises** | In the short term (during the project implementation), the implementation of the axis should contribute to an increase in the scale of R&D&I, their efficiency and effectiveness.  In the medium term (up to six months from the project completion), the axis implementation should increase the innovation of the region and employment in the sectors related to R&D&I.  In the long term (at a distant date from the Programme completion), the axis implementation should reduce environmental burden and be conducive to creation of economical products, services and processes; stimulate the growth of innovation implemented in enterprises and result in the development of the region’s economy and the growth of its importance at the national and the EU level. | **IP 1.1** will contribute to ensuring infrastructure and competence necessary to implement R&D&I projects which in the long-term will be reflected in increased innovation of the economy and eventually in socio-economic transformations of the region.  **IP 1.2** will contribute to enhancing the cooperation of various types of entities in the area of R&D&I which should result in an increased number of implemented results, increased innovation of the economy and eventually in socio-economic transformations of the region. |
| **PA 2 Digital region** | The effect of the PA will be an increase in innovation and competitiveness of enterprises using ICT (including those provided by the administration) and generation of entrepreneurship growth due to the creation of new entities, products and services, and the channels of their supply (and thus an increase in employment). The results will include also more effective monitoring and use of resources and a quality improvement and streamlining of the public administration management.  In the long run, all this should generate economic growth followed by the changes of social conditions. | **IP 2.2** Development of the existing and new areas of entrepreneurship; and the resulting increase in employment (including new jobs), improvement of the economic situation and subsequent improvement of the social situation.  **IP 2.3** Improvement of the quality and streamlining of the public administration management; facilitated access to public goods, translating into benefits in the area of education, health, culture, etc. Improvement of social and economic well-being. |
| **PA 3 Strengthening the competitiveness of the economy of the region** | The effects of support will be visible at once in the form of direct support for entrepreneurs. The long-term effect will be the strengthening of the entrepreneurship potential in the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship and the creation of conditions conducive to location of enterprises and investment in the area. The following impact of the axis implementation on the socio-economic situation of the region is assumed:   * development of innovation * increase in employment * ecological effect * development of local production * efficient overcoming of the recession by small companies * effect of regional decentralisation - by adopting territorial determinants of support for entrepreneurs * mobilisation of capital - by providing support to a limited extent in the form of grants and implementing financial instruments. | **IP 3.1** will contribute to professionalization and increase in BEI capacity in terms of enterprise incubation and support for enterprise development.  **IP 3.2** will contribute to supporting the internationalisation of enterprises from the region and to economic and tourist promotion of the voivodeship at the national and international level.  **IP 3.3** will contribute to investment support for enterprises from the region and to the development of business cooperation, in particular in the form of local and regional clusters.  **IP 3.4** will contribute to professionalization of BEI services and to efficient support for enterprise growth and development. |
| **PA 4 Energy efficiency and low-carbon economy in the region** | The implementation of measures under PA 4 entails an improvement of the socio-economic situation of the region. In economic terms, the projects will contribute to the reduction of costs due to increased energy efficiency of buildings (here: public and housing buildings). Energy audits of enterprises and introduction of new technological solutions in the energy sector will contribute to an increase in economic efficiency and innovation of SMEs. It is worth noting a social aspect, highlighted in ROP K-PV 2014-2020, which is related to a necessary change of behaviour and attitudes due to the application of new solutions and increased requirements concerning the low-carbon economy, including efficient management of resources.  **Negative impact of PA:** Investments involving the use of RES entail a risk of a negative impact on the environment. However, PA includes measures minimizing the risk (e.g. support for small hydroelectric power plants depending on the possibility to use the existing water conditions, the use of wind power stations respecting the precious landscape features). | **IP 4.1** is to contribute to increasing the share of RES in the energy balance of the voivodeship.  The development of energy production from renewable sources is to contribute to more efficient use of ecological and energy resources. The measures focusing on support for the production of energy from renewable sources contribute also to improving the energy security, creating of new jobs and, indirectly, increasing the innovation of the region.  **IP 4.2** will allow to reduce energy consumption in the private sector and improve the energy security of the region by means of diversification of energy sources to include more RES. This will translate into marked economic benefits and to increased innovation of enterprises. It will also contribute to an improvement in the competitiveness of the region’s economy.  **IP 4.3** Projects consisting in energy audits, modernisation of equipment and support for using RES installations and heat sources replacement will result in a significant reduction of heat and electricity consumption which will contribute to savings in public finances.  **IP 4.5** serves to increase the significance of smart and environmentally friendly public transport and to reduce the emissions of harmful substances into the air. In conjunction with measures under PA 12, IP 4.5 is to contribute to increasing the significance of public transport in the entire voivodeship. |
| **PA 5 Adaptation to climate change** | PA 5 may have a substantial impact on the socio-economic situation. Flood and drought prevention measures protect agriculture and production, as well as the society, against negative consequences of those natural phenomena. The measures implemented under PA 5 may contribute to reduction of potential losses in the economy. | **IP 5.2** will reduce the impact of precipitation deficiency in the Kujawy region. A comprehensive small-scale water retention and irrigation system will be expanded and the consequences of flooding due to precipitation will be eliminated or mitigated which will have an impact on the agri-food sector. The IP will also result in increasing the efficiency of agricultural production by reducing the water deficit. |
| **PA 6 Environmentally friendly region** | The ex ante impact of the planned intervention is significant in terms of the use of development potential of the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship. The planned measures will result in an increase of visits to the region which will entail multiplier effects for animation of the region’s economy. The investments planned in landscape parks and nature reserves will halt the devastation of natural heritage which slows down the economic growth rate due to the reduction of the number of tourists vising the areas of high natural value. The inclusion of those areas in the protection plans will allow to appropriately channel and rationalize the tourist flows in economic terms. | **IP 6.3** will contribute to social integration and an increase in attractiveness of the voivodeship.  **IP 6.4** will contribute to active protection of nature, in particular the animal species the number of which is decreasing and which are at risk of extinction. The area of habitats will increase and the non-existent habitats will be restored. All those effects will contribute to increasing the attractiveness of the region for tourists and investors. |
| **PA 7 Internal cohesion and external accessibility of the region** | The impact of the axis on the socio-economic situation is indisputable. At the local level, modern road infrastructure must be considered a necessary, but certainly an insufficient condition for local economic development.[[21]](#footnote-21) The economic effect is also very selective in terms of sectors. It is already visible in the logistics and storage, but markedly lower in the production sector.[[22]](#footnote-22) In general, new road investments do not have a significant impact on micro and small enterprises at the local level. The construction of new roads translates directly into the location of industrial and production plants, which generate new jobs, in the vicinity of road junctions. [[23]](#footnote-23)Reduced time of travel to work is also a factor preventing depopulation of areas distant from development centres. This contributes to an increase in the local economic effect.  **Negative impact of PA:** Potential negative effects at the regional level are related to the investment cycle and the closing of roads due to works. Therefore, complementarity with the measures at the national level must be ensured to avoid the effect of transfer of the transport corridors to the areas excluded from intervention, thus influencing the traffic safety indicators and contributing to an increase in environmental pollution. | **IP 7.2** Due to the increasing share of road transport in terms of both freight and passengers, the measures planned under IP 7.2. are of key importance for generating the socio-economic growth in the region.  **IP 7.3** will contribute to an increase in tourist attractiveness of the voivodeship and an increase in the intermodal transport potential.   * **IP 7.4** may contribute to the socio-economic growth by increasing the mobility of labour force and the potential of matching supply and demand in the labour market. It will also contribute to reducing the traffic intensity in passenger transport. |
| **PA 8 Active participation in the labour market ESF** | PA 8 is of strategic importance for implementation of other objectives of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, since high labour force participation in the economy contributes to increasing the value added and thus the income of the population, thus increasing the competitiveness of the region and the quality of life of its inhabitants. | **IP 8.5** The planned projects will increase the attractiveness of the unemployed and professionally inactive persons for employers, increase the scale of their entry or return to the labour market and, in the longer perspective, the professional mobility of the labour force in the region. They will also reduce the unsatisfied demand for labour.  **IP 8.7** The economy of the region will be strengthened due to financial instruments available to new entrepreneurs; the situation in the labour market will improve as a result of new jobs and self-employment of previously unemployed persons; the migration of the region's population at the working age will be halted as a result of increased opportunities to start one’s own business.  **IP 8.8** will contribute to an increase in professional mobility of persons (mostly women) taking care of dependants.  **IP 8.9** will support the economic growth and will improve the situation in the labour market. If the condition and competitiveness of enterprises do not deteriorate after economic transformations, the situation in the labour market will not deteriorate either (since enterprises will not only maintain the current employment level, but also will be able to absorb the surplus of labour force).  **IP 8.10** will have an impact on the economic condition of the region and health of the supported group. Medical rehabilitation and prophylaxis programmes will result in maintaining the employment of persons who without such support would temporarily or permanently exit the labour force, and will prevent negative social and economic consequences of their exit from the labour force. |
| **PA 9 Cohesive society ESF** | The intervention will halt negative upward trends in the number of people at risk of social exclusion, in particular families and disabled persons, with persistent systemic deficits related to the sector of social services of general interest. The lack of intervention would result in a further increase of the scale of social exclusion, with persistent stagnation in the labour market in the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship. | **IP 9.7** The creation of new services, improving the employability of persons taking care of dependants, will contribute both to the reduction of the scale of social exclusion of families and to generation of new jobs in the so-called silver market, and the creation of a prospective services sector which will undergo economisation in the long run.  **IP 9.8** Social economy supported under IP 9.8 will provide new jobs for socially excluded persons. The introduction of the mechanisms of measures commercialisation and competitiveness and increasing the competence of the SEE personnel will popularise social economy and its further uptake in the region. The support will also provide the basis for outsourcing and deinstitutionalisation of social services. |
| **PA 10 Innovative education** | PA 10 is of strategic importance for implementation of other thematic objectives of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, since high quality of education adjusted to the needs of the economy is conducive to the reduction of unemployment (mainly structural and long-term unemployment), increasing the quality of human capital and labour productivity, thus facilitating the generation of higher incomes. All this contributes to an improvement of the quality of life in the region. | **IP 10.1** The improvement of the quality of general education and equal access to education will reduce the duplication of social inequalities resulting from the dependence of education opportunities of pupils on their place of residence and socio-cultural (and economic) capital of their family, and not on their ability and willingness to learn. The halting of the above process will generate benefits for the society in the long run, as a result of an increased number of talented and well-educated entrepreneurs, scientists and social activists.  **IP 10.3** An improvement of the quality of vocational education and lifelong learning will result in an increased interest of entrepreneurs in cooperation with schools and other vocational education institutions which in turn will have a favourable impact on economic development of the region and innovation of sectors where the phenomenon will occur. A closer cooperation between educational institutions and enterprises with regard to vocational education will allow to rationalise public expenditure for such education in the long run. |
| **PA 11 Cohesive society and competitive human resources ERDF** | The impact of intervention will depend on the location of support and its relevance for diagnosed challenges and needs with regard to social exclusion in the region. | **IP 9.1** Investments in health care and social infrastructure, which contribute to national, regional and local development and to reduction of health inequalities, as well as to the shift from institutional services to services at the level of local communities, respond to the challenges related to exclusion due to taking care of dependants and to insufficient accessibility of high quality health care services.  **IP 9.3** Interventions supporting the infrastructure of social enterprises will contribute to extending the scope of their operations, improving their sustainability and increasing the number of jobs in the sector. They will also provide support for human resources in the sector of social services.  **IP 10.4** Investments in infrastructure will allow to improve the access to modernised, high quality education. |
| **PA 12 Territorial policy ERDF** | The planned measures are to meet the identified socio-economic needs and contribute to solving the related problems. The barriers include mainly low energy efficiency of buildings, insufficient activities in the area of low-carbon economy and water and sewage systems, nature protection and promotion, degraded urban areas, air pollution, high risk of poverty and exclusion and insufficiently developed educational and training infrastructure. | **IP 4.3** Projects consisting in energy audits, modernisation of equipment and support for using RES installations and heat sources replacement will result in a significant reduction of heat and electricity consumption which will contribute to savings in public finances.  **IP 4.5** serves to increase the significance of smart and environmentally friendly public transport and to reduce the emissions of harmful substances into the air. In conjunction with measures under PA 4, IP 4.5 is to contribute to increasing the significance of public transport in the entire voivodeship.  **IP 6.2** will contribute to restoring biological diversity, soil protection and reclamation.  **IP 6.4** will contribute to active protection of nature, in particular the animal species the number of which is decreasing and which are at risk of extinction. The area of habitats will increase and the non-existent habitats will be restored. All those effects will contribute to increasing the attractiveness of the region for tourists and investors.  **IP 6.5** will allow to restore degraded areas for their reuse.  **IP 9.2** will contribute to reducing poverty and exclusion in disadvantaged areas.  **IP 10.4** Investments in infrastructure will allow to improve the access to modernised, high quality education. |
| **PA 13. Territorial policy – Family friendly local development ESF** | The planned measures are to help solve the problems consisting in: low level of labour force participation of socially excluded persons or persons at risk of social exclusion, insufficient support for SEE, low quality of education at all levels, unequal access to pre-school education, mismatch between the education system and the needs of the regional labour market and insufficient measures to support lifelong learning. | **IP 9.4** will increase the social potential and labour force participation of persons and groups who are excluded or at risk of social exclusion.  **IP 9.8** Within the framework of support for social economy, jobs will be created for socially excluded persons and structures will be established to carry out the tasks of the sector of social services of general interest.  **IP 10.1** Improvement of the quality of education as a result of elimination of disproportions in access to good quality education and improved qualifications of teachers.  **IP 10.3** Improvement of the quality of education in schools and educational institutions offering vocational education and lifelong learning, resulting in a better adjustment to the labour market. |
| **PA 14 Community-led local development** | Interventions in the field of physical and social revitalisation and rehabilitation or urban and post-industrial areas, with a particular emphasis on spas and places with tourism potential, will contribute to reducing the migration balance which will result in economic and social recovery in those areas, aimed at stimulating the increase in the number of tourist and using the attractiveness of areas requiring rehabilitation and revitalisation. The measures supporting entrepreneurship will have a direct impact on the socio-economic development. | **IP 9.2** will contribute to promoting the activity of the society and improving the services, reducing poverty and social exclusion. The region’s attractiveness will increase.  **IP 9.9** will contribute to promoting the activity of the civic society which will result in the development of horizontal cooperation networks and confidence which is the basis for economic development. |

*Source: Own study.*

## Analysis of alternative methods of achieving the assumed objectives

The ex ante evaluation did not find any need for an alternative scenario for implementing the objectives of **PA 1** and **PA 2**. The selected set of interventions, resulting from the Demarcation Line, implements the objectives most accurately and optimally and allows to achieve the assumed results.

The ex ante evaluation of **PA 3** shows that optimal investment priorities were selected for achievement of the assumed objectives and results. RECOMMENDATION: However, the removal of some types of intervention under IP 3.1 should be considered due to fragmentation of allocation and low target value of indicators which does not generate socio-economic changes. This concerns investment support for newly established enterprises (start-ups), creation and development of infrastructure of business incubators and centres supporting academic entrepreneurship. The support for entrepreneurship and self-employment will be provided from the ESF under TO8. The analyses on entrepreneurship highlight the fact that quantitative development of entrepreneurship in the voivodeship does not coincide with qualitative development which generates the growth of innovation and competitiveness of the region. The number of new, highly innovative companies operating in the area where the economy meets R&D or implementing innovative projects is still insufficient. With the limited allocation of funds, the support should rather be granted to the sectors specified in the RIS. The situation is similar under IP 3.4 with regard to consulting and training projects increasing the capacity of SME and PG to build and boost their competitive advantage on the market and the projects concerning BEI networking under Regional Innovation Systems. The support for PG will be provided from the RDP 2014-2020 under the measure dedicated to those groups[[24]](#footnote-24), while the support for BEI will be available at the national level under OP SG 2014-2020.

The funds from the allocation would be spent on supporting the existing innovative companies from the region under the RIS. This solution will reduce the excessive fragmentation of funds for innovative entities.

The cost-effectiveness analysis points to the need to extend the scope of services supported under the system project to include consulting services consisting in the assessment of market and economic potential and concerning the market implementation of new products or services (promotion, distribution and financing)[[25]](#footnote-25). Diagnostic and consulting services addressed to SME, namely, the innovation audit, should be provided. The experience of systemic support for SME (the Enterprise Europe Network) under the project run by the Toruń Agency for Enterprise Development should be used in the future programming period.

The evaluation did not find any need for an alternative scenario for implementation of objectives under **PA 4**.

RECOMMENDATION: The analysis of options (alternative scenarios) for **PA 5** revealed the need to increase the allocation for selected types of intervention due to the lack of support at the national level for financing of projects consisting in development of small-scale water retention facilities. New type of intervention should be introduced under IP 5.2, namely, projects related to establishment and development of natural disaster monitoring and warning systems which are essential for increasing the safety of the population. The projects will complement the measures related to providing rescue equipment to rescue services.

The ex ante evaluation of **PA 6** shows that optimal solutions have been applied in the draft Programme. The recommendations do not concern the elimination of any IP. RECOMMENDATION: However, the inclusion of IP 6.1 *Meeting significant needs for investment in the waste management sector* in PA 6 should be considered to meet the obligations stemming from the EU law.

RECOMMENDATION: According to the description of PA 6, the projects will be implemented in landscape parks. Nature reserves should be added as the location of projects. The area supported under IP 6.4 will then be consistent with the selected output indicator: *Number of landscape parks and nature reserves receiving support.*

The analysis of the intervention options under **PA 7** is difficult due to the lack of the target value of strategic result indicators and output indicators in the evaluated draft Programme. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate the assumed change of internal potential accessibility as a result of the planned interventions. The lack of specification of the proportion of new-route roads and modernisation of the existing transport routes does not allow to assess the impact of individual types of intervention on the actual change of the proposed strategic result indicator. However, the socio-economic diagnosis and strategic documents of the voivodeship do not allow to define the types of intervention which do not require support. The specification of target values of output indicators and the strategic result indicator should allow to assess the rationale for IP 7.3 implementation with regard to intermodal transport. The current provisions of the Programme do not specify the contribution of the planned investment to an improvement of accessibility of main transport nodes and appropriate external and internal accessibility of the voivodeship. RECOMMENDATION: The financing of PA 7 should give appropriate priority to railway projects which are an important priority of the European Commission in programming the cohesion policy for 2014-2020.

The lack of the target value of long-term result indicators and output indicators in the evaluated version of the Programme does not allow for comprehensive analysis of alternative implementation methods for the **PA 8** objectives.

RECOMMENDATION: Nevertheless, the allocation shift between individual investment priorities should be considered in view of the identified risks. It seems that IP 8.10 is risky due to low sustainability of prevention and rehabilitation programmes for which the major part of funds is allocated. The concentration of allocation on prevention and rehabilitation programmes, which will be completed upon the expiry of the programming period, does not seem to be a cost-effective solution. The allocation for this investment priority should be reduced.

RECOMMENDATION: At the same time, the percentage of the allocation for IP 8.9 is not adequate to the gravity of the problem presented in the socio-economic diagnosis. Therefore, the allocation for this IP should be increased. The reason for the increase is the expected impact of the IP on maintaining employment of professionally active labour force which is of key importance during the economic slowdown.

The evaluations show that certain requirements for long-term employment efficiency of grants for self-employment (in particular with identified risk factors) and sustainability of subsidized jobs should be introduced.[[26]](#footnote-26) The subsidies for jobs (taking into account their sustainability determined by the long-term result indicator) should be strongly dependent on the implementation of accessibility criteria and strategic criteria extending the required period during which an employer must maintain the jobs. RECOMMENDATION: Repayable instruments should be used or the allocation for IP 8.7 should be reduced and the target groups should be limited to disadvantaged groups.

The analysis of complementarity of various types of intervention under individual investment priorities has not found the risk of allocation fragmentation. The interventions to be supported provide an opportunity to compile complementary packages appropriate for a given category of the target group. All of them, except for above-mentioned ineffective and non-sustainable areas of intervention, contribute directly or indirectly to achieving the deferred result, i.e. increasing the employment effectiveness.

The analysis pointed to the need to reduce the allocation for some types of intervention due to comprehensiveness of support provided at the national level. The need to implement training projects addressed to the SME sector and concerning adaptability to changes, strategic change management, etc. should be analysed. The measures to be implemented under IP 8.9 at the national level may generate sufficient demand of enterprises for such services and lead to the demand being met in the market without the need for direct support from the EU funds. For example, a project aiming at mitigating the negative consequences of the economic change, i.e. "Fast Response Instrument", is implemented at the national level on commission of the Polish Agency for Enterprise Development. Under this partner project, implemented jointly with the Cracow University of Economics (The Malopolska School of Public Administration), comprehensive, long-term training and advisory support is granted and 210 enterprises are to receive comprehensive assistance foe development and implementation of Individual Development Plans.[[27]](#footnote-27) RECOMMENDATION: Interventions concerning adaptability to changes should be used only as a tool supporting the maintenance of employment in the SME sector, with the expenditure under IP 8.9 focused on retraining programmes for employees and on outplacement support.

The ex ante evaluation of **PA 9** has not found a need to reconstruct the intervention logic under the Programme. A sufficient package of intervention types chosen from among the options stemming from the Demarcation Line was implemented under the axis.[[28]](#footnote-28) The planned areas of intervention were defined in a comprehensive and complementary way, which fully justifies the extensive scope of intervention. The logic scenario proposed in the draft Programme provides the best chance for achieving the synergy effect with other thematic objectives of the ESF and with PA 14. However, some forms of support under IP 9.4 and IP 9.7 overlap. The support for community care for the disabled under IP 9.4 overlaps with the tasks of an assistant of a disabled person under IP 9.7. RECOMMENDATION: The detailed provisions on individual types of intervention under PA 9 should be revised to avoid overlapping of interventions.

No viable alternative scenario for the implementation of the **PA 10** objectives has been identified. The investment priorities are optimal for the planned results. The lack of the target value of strategic result indicators and output indicators in the evaluated version of the Programme does not allow for comprehensive analysis of alternative implementation methods for the objectives under PA 10. It is impossible to estimate the assumed socio-economic change resulting from the planned interventions. The allocation shifts may be proposed only after the assumed target values of output and result indicators are proposed.

Interventions under **PA 11** provide investment support to accomplish the objectives of axes 8, 9, 10 and 12. Support for health care, education and social infrastructure with a particular emphasis on social economy entities was provided for. Alternative methods of implementing the objectives require allocation shifts under individual items. The investment support for health care providers seems relatively high which is not justified by the intervention logic of the Programme. RECOMMENDATION: The shifting of allocation to protected housing infrastructure and infrastructural support for entities providing deinstitutionalised social services should be considered.

Changes to the intervention logic should be made under **PA 12**. RECOMMENDATION: A new investment measure for IP 6.5 should be added, namely, support for the SME sector for investments related to air quality improvement (including investment in installations and equipment for reducing air pollution) and for air quality monitoring systems, since the reduction of air pollution is necessary to improve the condition of the urban environment.

RECOMMENDATION: A new investment measure should be added under IP 10.4, namely, support for investments in infrastructure for vocational training and lifelong learning. Such intervention is necessary to overcome the problem of insufficient development of educational and training infrastructure.

RECOMMENDATION: A measure consisting in support for lifelong learning projects should be added to complement the intervention under **PA 13**. Such addition is particularly justified, since the level of lifelong learning in the case of persons aged 25-64 in the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship is below the national average, as already noted under ROP K-PV 2014-2020. The measure is beneficial, since it will improve the labour market situation for persons participating in lifelong learning projects. This may translate into the reduction of unemployment, improvement of employees’ qualifications and their effectiveness, mobility and professional flexibility. The measures for lifelong learning development correspond to the objectives of the Europe 2020 strategy, DSK-PV, NDS, Human Capital Development Strategy, Social Capital Development Strategy, National Strategy of Regional Development 2010-2020, National Action Plan against Poverty and Social Exclusion 2020, POWER and the Perspective of Lifelong Learning.

The types of intervention, which were not provided for in the Demarcation Line for IP 9.2 and IP 9.9, will be implemented under **PA 14**. The measures stimulating local entrepreneurship (including support for investment and development of business incubators, building entrepreneurial attitudes and advisory and training support for persons planning to start their own business) were planned under IP 3.1. The support for creation of social cooperatives (and other social economy entities), as well as building cooperation networks of local entities for development of social cooperatives, were provided for under IP 9.8. The types of intervention do not include projects planned for IP 9.2 which is due to consultation with the potential beneficiaries of support under the axis:

* urban renewal, along with establishment and strengthening of new socio-economic and cultural functions in the areas covered by local development programmes;
* urban renewal, along with establishment and strengthening of new socio-economic and cultural functions in other areas;
* improvement of the environment and aesthetic qualities of space for further use of the land or its reuse.

The scope of intervention under PA 14 does not contradict the objectives of CLLD. It must be noted that the scope of intervention under individual investment priorities has not been defined by the MID yet.

## Method of applying the principle of thematic concentration

The general provisions on thematic concentration (so-called ring-fencing) in the Operational Programmes were included in the Partnership Agreement, and then specified for individual regions by the MRD in a letter to the MA of 31 July 2013. The allocation of funds between individual thematic objectives proposed in the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 meets the requirements for minimum levels of concentration of funds as specified by the MRD. The requirement **has been met** both in the case of allocation for TO1-TO4 (in the draft Programme it amounts to 44.5% at the minimum level of 38.3%) and in the case of provisions on the financing of TO4 and TO9. However, the original assumptions included in the Partnership Agreement have not been fulfilled.

Table 5. Assessment of the fulfilment of the principle of thematic allocation according to guidelines of the MRD of July 2013

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Allocation [EUR million]** | **Share of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 allocation** | **Ring-fencing according to the MRD’s guidelines of 30 July 2013** | **Adopted ring-fencing level** | **Fund** |
| TO1, TO2, TO3, TO4 | 592.33 | **44.5%** | 38.3% | 59% | **ERDF** |
| TO4 | 226.28 | **17.0%** | 13.1% | 20% | **ERDF** |
| TO9 | 116.76 | **31.1%** | 7.8% | 21% | **ESF** |
| ***Total allocation*** | 1706.50 |  |  |  |  |
| ***ERDF*** | 1331.07 |  |  |  |  |
| ***ESF*** | 375.43 |  |  |  |  |

Source: Own study.

The allocation for technical assistance under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 complies with the guidelines[[29]](#footnote-29) specifying the maximum level of funds for the objective at 3.5% of the allocation. As required, the funds in total come from the ESF.

The requirement to allocate at least 60% of the funds from the ESF for a maximum of four IP **has not been complied with**[[30]](#footnote-30). The total funds for four IP of the ESF receiving the highest support (IP 8.5, 9.4, 9.7 and 10.1) amounted to EUR 186.21 million, i.e. 49.6% of the allocation from the ESF.

Due to the changes related to both an increase in the allocation under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 (to EUR 1901.7 million) and new guidelines of the MID in a letter of 19 November 2013, the compliance of allocation for individual TO with the MID’s guidelines was verified. The conclusions are presented in the table below.

**Table 6. Assessment of the fulfilment of the principle of thematic allocation according to guidelines of the MID of November 2013**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Ring-fencing for ROP K-PV 2014-2020 specified in a letter of the MRD of 19 November 2013** | **Allocation under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 [EUR million]** | **Share of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 allocation** |
| At least 50% of the ERDF funds must be allocated for **TO 1,2,3,4** | 54.5% | 663.176 | **45%** |
| At least 15% of the ERDF funds must be allocated for TO 4 | 19.8% | 226.28 | **16%** |
| At least 20% of the ERDF funds must be allocated for TO 9 | 28.9% | 116.76 | **24.6%** |
| ***Total allocation*** |  | 1901.7 |  |
| ***EFRD allocation*** |  | 1473.725 |  |
| ***ESF allocation*** |  | 427.975 |  |

Source: Own study.

The requirements concerning the minimum share of the allocation for TO 1,2,3 and 4 in total funds from the ERDF and individual assumptions for TO4 have not been met. The allocation for TO9 does not meet the requirement concerning its share in total funds from the ESF. The planned share of the allocation under the four largest IP (9.7, 10.1, 10.3, and 9.9) is also insufficient, since it amounted to only 47.4% of the funds from the ESF.

Only the allocation for technical assistance (3.15% of compared to the assumed limit of 3.5%) complies with the assumed ring-fencing levels.

RECOMMENDATION: The allocation of funds should be adjusted to the abovementioned requirements, unless otherwise agreed with the MID.

## Internal cohesion of objectives and measures to be implemented

The measures to be implemented are characterised by a high level of internal complementarity. The details are presented in the following matrix.

**Table 7. Internal cohesion of objectives and measures of priority axes (PA)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PA1 | PA1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PA2 | 0 | PA2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PA3 | 2 | 1 | PA3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PA4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | PA4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PA5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | PA5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PA6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | PA6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PA7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | PA7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PA8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | PA8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PA9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | PA9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PA10 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | PA10 |  |  |  |  |
| PA11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | PA11 |  |  |  |
| PA12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | PA12 |  |  |
| PA13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | PA13 |  |
| PA14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | PA14 |

*Source: Own study, 0 – lack of complementarity, 1 – medium synergy effect, 2 – high synergy effect.*

The relationships between investment priorities and priority axes are described in more detail below.

**PA 1/PA 3** (strength of relationship +2): Projects related to providing high quality research infrastructure in research units (IP 1.1) and comprehensive support for innovative activities of enterprises (IP 1.2) - the measures are of key importance for competitiveness of the economy and thus complement the measures under PA 3.

**PA 1/PA 4** (strength of relationship +1): It may be assumed that the R&D activity of selected enterprises will contribute to increasing the use of new energy sources.

**PA 1/PA 7** (strength of relationship +1): The implementation of PA 7 in the form of road investments contributes to achieving the objective of PA 1, in particular in peripheral areas at risk of depopulation**.**

**PA 1/PA 8** (strength of relationship +2): Comprehensive support for innovative activities of enterprises will be provided under IP 1.2. Its measures will contribute to increasing the competitiveness of the market and then to achieving the effect in the form of a higher labour force participation rate in the region (objectives of PA 8).

**PA 1/PA 10** (strength of relationship +2): The measures related to innovative education under PA 10 constitute the basic interventions in relation to the measures planned under PA 1. A good education system will provide not only scientists and innovators for the region, but also entrepreneurs able to use the results of their efforts.

**PA 2/PA 3** (strength of relationship +1): The measures under IP 2.2 and 2.3 will contribute to strengthening the competitiveness of the economy. The economy will become more attractive for investors. The use of ICT in the economy and administration is conducive for a faster and more effective handling of business matters and enables ongoing control of the processes.

**PA 2/PA 8** (strength of relationship +1): The implementation of PA 2 not only can boost the demand for ICT services (which translates into e.g. a growth of employment in this area), but first of all it provides an opportunity to implement completely new types of projects with different communication channels, logistics, etc. This offers a chance for new jobs (objective of PA 8).

**PA 2/PA 9** (strength of relationship +1): The projects under PA 2 relating to development of regional and supralocal ICT systems ensuring availability, integration and improvement of the quality of online public services are complementary with the objective of PA 9: increasing the availability and quality of social and health care services in the region.

**PA 2/PA 10** (strength of relationship +1): Innovative education is education using the achievements of technology for educational purposes. The increase of the quantity and quality of ICT in education, and the digitisation of educational resources, should have a positive impact on innovation and quality of education in the region.

**PA 3/PA 4** (strength of relationship +1): PA 3 and PA 4 strengthen the image of the voivodeship as an innovative voivodeship, using RES and taking care of the regional natural resources.

**PA 3/PA 8** (strength of relationship +1): The implementation of PA 8 will contribute to the achievement of the PA 3 objectives by means of reduction of the unemployment, elimination of barriers related to starting up and conducting a business, increasing the labour force participation, adaptability of employees and entrepreneurs to changes. PA 3 will contribute to strengthening of human capital and will enhance the competitiveness of the region.

**PA 3/PA 10** (strength of relationship +1): PA 10 will include measures having a positive impact on PA 3: improvement of the quality of education and adjustment of education to the market needs. The measures will contribute to strengthening of human capital and will enhance the competitiveness of the region.

**PA 3/PA 11** (strength of relationship +1): Investments in infrastructure (PA 11) will improve the condition of local companies and thus will contribute to achieving the objectives of PA 3.

**PA 4/PA 5** (strength of relationship +2): PA 4 is to contribute to prevention of excessive exploitation of natural resources and to adaptation to climate change. It is of particular importance with regard to PA 5. Moreover, the measures promoting RES may contribute to reducing extreme weather phenomena caused by climate change.

**PA 4/PA 6** (strength of relationship +2): By increasing the energy efficiency, PA 4 will reduce the pressure on the environment, thus contributing to the achievement of the PA 6 objectives.

**PA 4/PA 7** (strength of relationship +2): Investments in urban transport (IP 4.5) will multiply the effects of IP 7.4. The construction of R&D facilities will increase the demand for the regional railway services.

**PA 4/PA 12** (strength of relationship +2): PA 12 will contribute to the implementation of the PA 4 objectives by means of the following measures: improvement of energy efficiency of public utility buildings and housing buildings, measures listed in low-carbon strategies for given areas, including the measures aimed at developing the low-carbon public transport.

**PA 5/PA 6** (strength of relationship +2): Thanks to restoring biodiversity, protection and reclamation of land, the implementation of IP 6.4 will contribute to the objectives of PA 5. The preservation of green areas, in particular forests, has a positive impact on regulating the water conditions. PA 5 will have a positive impact on PA 6 by developing the threat monitoring and alert system. This will reduce the pressure on the environment.

**PA 5/PA 12** (strength of relationship +1): PA 12 does not provide for measures directly complementary to the measures under PA 5, but “improvement of water and sewage management” may have a positive (though limited) impact on overall water management and prevention of the related threats.

**PA 6/PA 12** (strength of relationship +2): PA 6 includes key projects consisting in protection of the cultural heritage. Other measures in this area will be supported i.a. under the axis concerning the territorial policy (PA 12). PA 12 provides for measures which will boost the effect of PA 6, namely, measures consisting in the protection of nature in urban and non-urban areas, activities using local natural resources and promotion, ecological education, as well as information and educational campaigns complementary to nation-wide actions and measures consisting in inventorying of the natural environment in the gminas.

**PA 6/PA 14** (strength of relationship +1): The revitalisation measures under PA 14 will complement PA 6 under which key projects consisting in protection of the cultural heritage will be implemented.

**PA 7/PA 9** (strength of relationship +1): Measures implemented under IP 7.4 (PA 7) may prove to be of key importance for increasing the access to social and health care services (PA 9, IP 9.7). Social and health care services will most likely be concentrated in urban areas. If the lifelong learning centres and vocational schools are located in medium-sized cities, the said investments may contribute to increasing their attractiveness thanks to a better territorial accessibility.

**PA 8/PA 9** (strength of relationship +2): PA 9 is complementary with PA 8, since it contributes to the strengthening of objectives consisting in promoting social activity and labour force participation (PA 9) under measures aimed at promoting labour force participation (PA 8). Furthermore, IP 9.7 is in synergy with IP 8.8, since projects consisting in provision of care and specialist services for families with dependent family members will facilitate achieving work-life balance.

**PA 8/PA 10** (strength of relationship +2): The improvement of the education quality (PA 10) will satisfy the needs of the economy and will contribute to reducing the unemployment (mainly the so-called structural and long-term unemployment; objectives of PA 8).

**PA 8/PA 11** (strength of relationship +1): Interventions under PA 11 will have a positive impact on the efficiency of measures regarding the labour market (PA 8). Furthermore, investments in health care and social infrastructure (IP 9.1) are complementary to measures under IP 8.10 Active and healthy ageing.

**PA 8/PA 12** (strength of relationship +1): PA 12 does not provide for measures directly complementary to measures under PA 8, however, measures aimed at social inclusion and lifelong learning have a positive impact on the measures related to promoting the activity in the labour market.

**PA 8/PA 13** (strength of relationship +1): The implementation of the PA 13 measures related to active integration and social economy entities should be in synergy with measures promoting labour force participation (PA 8).

**PA 9/PA 10** (strength of relationship +1): PA 9 and 10 complement each other by strengthening the objectives consisting in promotion of social activity and labour force participation by means of lifelong learning.

**PA 9/PA 11** (strength of relationship +2): Investments under PA 11 may contribute to efficiency of measures in the area of social inclusion (PA 9): infrastructure-related measures under IP 9.3 (PA 11) will allow to extend the competences of SEE to be implemented under IP 9.8 (PA 9).

**PA 9/PA 12** (strength of relationship +1): The measures under both axes will counteract social exclusion.

**PA 9/PA 13** (strength of relationship +2): The implementation of the PA 13 measures should contribute to achieving the effects of the PA 9 measures in the area of support for social economy and social enterprises.

**PA 9/PA 14** (strength of relationship +1): Measures implemented under IP 9.2 and 9.9 (PA 14) are complementary to PA 9 with regard to pro-social policy. PA 9 provides for the remaining IP under TO 9. The support under PA 14 and PA 9 may generate a synergy effect due to the same final beneficiaries.

**PA 10/PA 11** (strength of relationship +2): PA 11 will have an impact on the efficiency of intervention in education (PA 10) - a synergy exists between IP 10.1 (PA 8, improvement of the school education quality) and the objectives under IP 10.4 (PA 11, development of educational and training infrastructure).

**PA 10/PA 12** (strength of relationship +2): The measures under PA 12 are of key importance for the measures under PA 10 with regard to lifelong learning, as a result of the development of educational and training infrastructure.

**PA 10/PA 13** (strength of relationship +2): The measures under PA 13 are complementary to the measures under PA 10 with regard to lifelong learning.

**PA 11/PA 12** (strength of relationship +1): A synergy should occur between the measures planned under PA 12 and the measures under PA 11, though there are certain risks related to implementation of similar measured under two axes and some divisions are required.

**PA 11/PA 13** (strength of relationship +1): The measures under PA 13 are important for the measures under PA 11 with regard to lifelong learning, ensuring the best possible use of the educational and training infrastructure supported under PA 11.

**PA 11/PA 14** (strength of relationship +1): Investments responding to the same needs and addressed to the same final beneficiaries are to be carried out under PA 11 and PA 14.

**PA 12/PA 13** (strength of relationship +1): The measures under PA 13 should have a positive impact on the effects of PA 12 in the area of social inclusion and lifelong learning.

**PA 12/PA 14** (strength of relationship +2): Both axes provide for the implementation of IP 9.2 Support for physical, economic and social revitalisation of poor communities and of urban and rural areas. The difference will consist in the method of project implementation under ITI.

**PA 13/PA 14** (strength of relationship +2): The projects to be implemented under IP 9.8 (PA 12) Support for social economy and social enterprises are similar to those planned under PA 14 - support for SEE: social cooperatives.

The implementation of **PA 15** will be complementary to the measures of all other PA, since its objective is to support the implementation of the entire Programme.

Summing up, the synergy of effects in the Programme will occur at the level of both entire priority axes (cohesion of objectives) and individual IP, or even types of intervention.

## Appropriateness of the method of taking the territorial dimension into account

The analyses revealed that the description of the objective and the method of applying the territorial approach in the Programme was rather general. ROP K-PV 2014-2020 takes into account the territorial dimension only to some extent. It is a traditional sectoral document and the extensive description of the spatial dimension would require fundamental changes to the text of the Programme. Since this solution seems impossible at this stage, some minor but significant amendments should be made.

RECOMMENDATION: At its beginning, Section 4 should include an analysis/diagnosis of the usability and usefulness of territorial instruments (ITI, CLLD, SIA) for achieving the objectives of priority axes 1-11, i.e. those which do not directly take into account the territorial approach.

It is important to explain why those instruments are not used under the said PA and why under those axes there is no need to adjust intervention to the needs and potential of the specific type of territory. The suggested solution is to include in Section 4 a description of the effects that the local government wants to achieve by applying an integrated territorial approach under PA 12-14. The description should define the method of measuring the performance of an objective included in ROP K-PV 2014-2020, i.e. integration of policies and adjustment of intervention to specific types of territories.

Another criterion for ex ante evaluation was the verification of whether the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 builds on a territorial diagnosis. We are of the opinion that the diagnosis included in the Programme does not have a territorial dimension. The form of the said part of the Programme is traditional - it defines the major development challenges, problems and economic sectors. Some issues are presented in a spatial dimension (maps from page 12, figures 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11), but their reference to the territory of the voivodeship does not correspond to the structure and spatial scope of intervention under individual priority axes.

The diagnosis of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 builds on DSK-PV, where the territorial dimension is more pronounced (e.g. under the *strong metropolis* priority), but the analyses within the framework of the said strategy were not sufficiently adapted to ROP K-PV 2014-2020. For example, the conclusions resulting from the strategy do not correspond to SIA under the Programme.

The diagnosis of the socio-economic situation covers all aspects that are important for the appropriate orientation of public intervention, although the diagnosis seems insufficient in the case of problems concerning urban areas, in particular since PA 12 is largely focused on this issue.

RECOMMENDATION: Therefore, the suggested solution is to add a special dimension to the diagnosis of social and economic phenomena described in this part of the Programme, inter alia, to add descriptions of the phenomena presented on graphic elements (maps) and extensively explain the grounds for intervention in the said areas.

RECOMMENDATION: A separate chapter should be devoted to urban areas due to their significance, as evidenced by a separate priority axis established for cities and their surrounding areas (PA 12). This would allow to define subjects/areas/problems in ROP K-PV 2014-2020 that require spatial differentiation of intervention or suprasectoral and multilateral cooperation, i.e. an integrated territorial approach. This would prompt reflection on territorial differentiation of intervention under other axes (1-11) or at least the material for such reflection.

As regards the use of the territorial mechanism to differentiate the objectives and intensity of intervention, adjusted to spatial differences presented in the diagnosis, ROP K-PV 2014-2020 includes a reference to strategic intervention areas identified in Annex 3 to DSK-PV. However, it is alarming that the Programme includes only 7 from among 9 strategic intervention areas listed in the said Annex and does not provide any justification for their inclusion and rejection of the two remaining ones. Only four strategic intervention areas are included in ROP K-PV 2014-2020 as its elements.

The selected strategic intervention areas are thematic (e.g. an expected increase in employment refers to the entire voivodeship) or their spatial delimitation is imprecise. The relatively explicitly defined strategic intervention areas concerning the Toruń and Bydgoszcz agglomeration will be implemented only under PA 12. However, even those existing references to the strategic intervention areas have only a slight impact on the structure of the document. There is no reference to strategic intervention areas in the rules of operation selection under individual criteria. The preferences for some areas are provided for in the case of intervention under PA 12, 13 and 14, and to some extent also under PA 5, where the territory of implementation is defined as the entire voivodeship, with a particular emphasis on the Kujawy region, but this does not result from earlier identified strategic intervention areas.

As regards the territorial approach, it is significant that the Programme does not provide actual mechanisms for area preference of intervention under ROP K-PV 2014-2020.

ROP K-PV 2014-2020 provides for the use of Integrated Territorial Investments (ITI) and CLLD. The references to ITI and CLLD are rather general. The Programme should refer to the specific characteristics of the region to a greater extent and should define the process of selection of ITI or CLLD based on the diagnosed local conditions.

Moreover, the scope of ITI seems to be significantly reduced compared to the scope of intervention. This gives rise to doubts concerning its integrated nature, as it lacks e.g. a social aspect.

The designation of a separate priority axis for CLLD must be praised. The voivodeship stands out from among other voivodeship in terms of the progress of work on inclusion of local activities, since most voivodeships have not begun the work on the issues related to community-led local development.

RECOMMENDATION: The rules of implementing CLLD and ITI in the voivodeship, taking into account the specific characteristics of the region, should be developed and included in ROP K-PV 2014-2020. This would ensure an integrated nature of intervention and would allow to avoid the implementation of unrelated projects. The discussion between the MA and potential beneficiaries of ITI and CLLD on assumptions and selected elements of ITI or CLLD tools could serve as a starting point in this regard.

The analysis revealed the lack of a vertical and horizontal coordination mechanism for the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 implementation, which would take into account the territorial and integrated approach. There is a routine mechanism, usually applied in ROP K-PV 2014-2020, but it is built without reference to an integrated territorial approach. The management of priority axes 12, 13 and 14 is centralised. Such approach facilitates coordination, but may tempt to focus on the results of the EU funds absorption and not on strengthening the synergy between the priority axes. There is no coordination with regard to strategic intervention areas which is most likely due to the lack of area preferences in PA 1-11.

RECOMMENDATION: The estimated allocation of the ESF and the ERDF for CLL should be specified in line with the Partnership Agreement. The procedure for selection of LAGs to implement LDS should be introduced. The LAGs should be selected by the committee for LAG selection at the level of the Marshal’s Office. The voivodeship government should approve the selection of LAGs. The criteria for selection of innovative projects under CLLD should be defined, simplified rules for settlement of the costs of the Leader operations should be introduced and the system for cost management should be established with regard to standard costs, flat rate payments and lump sum grants. According to the *Template*…, Section 4.1. should include arrangements on preparatory support for CLLD.

The experience of implementing the Leader 2007-2013, financed from the EAFRD, and Axis 4 of OP FISHERIES financed from the ERDF shows that the role of local partnerships should be increased beyond the assessment of the compliance of operations with LDS. The LAGs should be authorised to perform necessary verification and controls to decide about the eligibility of the given operation for financing.

RECOMMENDATION: A mechanism should be created within the MA under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 to ensure coordination of PA 11 and PA 12 with the results of other axes. The mechanism should focus on identification and strengthening of synergy and eliminating dis-synergy.

As regards monitoring of the results in terms of territorial approach, the evaluation revealed the lack of such a mechanism. The effects specific for the territorial approach have not been defined in ROP K-PV 2014-2020. There are no indicators monitoring the implementation of territorialised PA 12-14 either.

Therefore, it is of utmost importance to define the effects of implementing the territorial approach and the methods for their monitoring in the Programme. This refers not only to the expected effects of PA 12-14 implementation, but to a broader monitoring of the objective/intention which consists in integration of policies and adjustment of intervention to specific types of territories.

The entities carrying out ITI and CLLD should also be identified.

## Appropriateness of assumed forms of support – financial instruments

The draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 only to a limited extent defines the forms of support to be provided under individual measures of the Programme. In the majority of cases, the decision on the form of financing is suspended until the ex ante analysis of financial instruments is performed. At the current stage of programming, the only investment priority where the planned use of repayable financing has been explicitly provided for is IP 8.7. The instruments will include preferential loans for starting up a business and creating new jobs. This form of support is appropriate.

It should be noted that in the new programming period repayable financing will be used on a significantly larger scale than previously. Repayable financing is considered to be one of the key methods for more efficient disbursement of resources from structural funds.[[31]](#footnote-31) Therefore, the scope of measures supported by financial instruments must be extended and repayable financing should be used also for other investment priorities under the Programme.

## Evaluation of fulfilment of ex ante conditionality

The Supplement to ROP K-PV 2014-2020 - Ex ante conditionality includes a description of fulfilment of ex ante conditionalities. It is consistent with Annex 4 to the draft Partnership Agreement - Fulfilment of ex ante conditionality for European funds 2014-2020 by Poland.[[32]](#footnote-32) Section 9.2 includes Table 26: Actions to be taken in order to fulfil the applicable thematic ex ante conditionalities.[[33]](#footnote-33)

RECOMMENDATION: ROP K-PV 2014-2020 should specify the date of adoption of the Regional Innovation Strategy 2014-2020 (draft of 29 May 2013) after public consultation by the Voivodeship Board. The information about the stage of preparation of the EIA for the draft RIS 2014-2020 should be included.

In conditionality 6.2. *Protecting the environment and promoting the sustainable use of resources*, the applicability of the criterion was wrongly defined as the national level and the description of its fulfilment at the regional level was not included.

RECOMMENDATION: In order to meet the requirements of the EU law, the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 should include IP 6.1 *Meeting significant needs for investment in the waste management sector.*

RECOMMENDATION: The adoption of the voivodeship waste management plan for 2012-2017 with a perspective for 2018-2023 should be described.

As regards conditionality 7.1. Promoting sustainable transport and removing bottlenecks in key network infrastructures - roads and 7.2. Promoting sustainable transport and removing bottlenecks in key network infrastructures - railway, a reference should be made to DSK-PV[[34]](#footnote-34) - Modernisation plan 2020+, strategic objective: Strategic technical infrastructure.

RECOMMENDATION: The following provisions of the *Template…* must be complied with: *Pursuant to Article 17 of the CPR, each programme must identify all ex ante conditionalities applicable to it, regardless of the responsible body and level for actions to be taken in order to fulfil those conditionalities. Due to an extensive thematic scope of regional programmes, all general conditionalities and most of thematic conditionalities must be referred to based on self-assessment included in the Partnership Agreement (although the central level bodies are responsible for fulfilment of the majority of conditionalities).[[35]](#footnote-35)*

# ASSESSMENT OF THE OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME’S CONSISTENCY WITH EXTERNAL DOCUMENTS

Research question C. Are Programme’s assumptions and objectives consistent with the most important EU, national and regional policies and strategies, including in particular Europe 2020 strategy, Common Strategic Framework, the Partnership Agreement and the National Development Strategy 2020?

When replying to this question the following issues shall be taken into account:

* consistency of the assumptions and objectives of the Operational Programme (including those defined in the diagnosis on challenges and developmental needs) with the most important EU, national and regional strategic objectives (to what extent will the expected results of the Operational Programme contribute to the implementation of strategic objectives at different levels, in particular to the implementation of Europe 2020 strategy objectives);
* consistency of the Operational Programme with the recommendations of the Council of the European Union referred to in the draft Regulation (Article 48(3) (d)).

## National Strategy for Regional Development

The analysed document generally complies with the NSRD and the inconsistencies presented below are not material.

Annex 2 to ROP K-PV 2014-2020 (version of the Annex from June 2013) presents the implementation of Programme's objectives in relation to those specified in the NSRD. The present assessment aims at determining to what extent, according to the table in annex 2, the objectives presented in these documents are consistent in reality, i.e. to what extent their thematic content is not contradictory. It is not sufficient to state that both the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 and the NSRD aim at increasing human capital – it is necessary to verify whether the relevant documents define this type of capital in a similar way and whether they provide for similar instruments to strengthen it. The same applies also to the main objective of ROP K-PV 2014–2020, which refers to the principles of competitiveness and innovativeness, i.e. concepts strongly emphasised within the NSRD. The authors of the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 perceive the concept of competitiveness broadly and, as in the case of NSRD, focus heavily on mobilising endogenous developmental resources. On the other hand the scope of the concept of innovativeness, even though within the Programme it is not limited do enterprises and the economy itself, is narrower than in the NSRD, where it is inherently related to individual creativity of the inhabitants. The analysed document does not refer to the concept of creativity. Creativity and innovativeness are not synonyms, but different categories of concepts – the former is more closely related to individual attitudes, developed due to the impact of various socialization processes and education rather than the impact of measures implemented by companies, universities and public institutions; on the other hand, innovativeness describes the ability to implement individual ideas and solutions in practice in the social and economic context.

RECOMMENDATION: The importance of creativity for regional development, including the growth of economy’s innovativeness, needs to be stressed. It is worthwhile to consider adding the following passage to the Programme, supplementing the description concerning the growth of economy's competitiveness, e.g. *Increase in broadly understood innovativeness, including non-technological innovativeness, will be supported by measures aiming at increasing the creativity of the region's inhabitants, including in particular young people, i.a. by investing in their cultural capital and modern educational programmes.* When considering the need to improve the quality of the part of the Programme devoted mainly to education (PA 10), it is worthwhile to stress the need to promote teaching programmes, which will be conducive to promoting creative attitudes and will develop creative thinking. The document should also discuss the topic of creative industries, indicating that an increase in their significance will be beneficial for improving the innovativeness of the region’s economy. In this context it is also necessary to strengthen the instruments used for investing in the cultural capital and present the culture at the level of Programme’s objectives more as a resource conditioning creativity rather than only as a heritage which needs to be maintained.

The objectives of the IP of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 make no reference the issue of social capital. In NSRD the role of social capital in socio-economic processes is highlighted, calling for supporting its development by engaging the social partners in developmental process, establishing co-operation networks, etc. (see e.g. p. 64 and 94). ROP K-PV 2014-2020 also refers to such initiatives e.g. in PA 14, but it does not discuss the issue of social capital, even though such measures will contribute to the development of such capital. Inclusion of a separate Priority focusing on the mechanism of local community-led development in the Programme has to be assessed very positively.

RECOMMENDATION: ROP K-PV 2014-2020 should focus to a larger extent on the importance of social capital for the development of the region; for this reason e.g. the description of PA 14 should be reworded. The description of PA 2 should also indicate that the use of ICT has a positive impact on the creation of social capital.

The NSRD puts a strong emphasis on this issue, e.g. *The use of the Internet stimulates activity and involvement in public life. Internet users get involved in matters concerning their local community much more frequently, are more active and voted in 2007 elections in larger numbers than other groups. This indicates how important the high level of information society development is for the development of social capital and thus for regional development* (p. 63).

The following parts of the document also require some small modifications: Since Annex 2 to the Programme constitutes an integral part of the document, it is safe to assume that its authors took care to maintain the consistency of the Programme with the NSRD – however, the NSRD is not mentioned among the documents taken into account when considering the Programme's objectives (p. 61). RECOMMENDATION: The NSRD should be mentioned at p. 61 of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 as one of the documents taken into account when developing the thematic objectives of the Programme.

In ROP K-PV 2014-2020 the SIA has been defined so broadly (e.g. employment growth or protection of agricultural production areas) that the level of concentration of Programmes activities cannot be regarded as high.

RECOMMENDATION: SIA should be described in detail by presenting specific measures for their implementation, so that the Programme could be regarded as fulfilling the principle of thematic concentration.

The current situation, where e.g. maintenance of agricultural production potential constitutes one of the SIA, even though there is no reference to this SIA anywhere in the objectives/priorities, is unacceptable. Obviously, taking the provisions of the demarcation line into account, direct modernisation of agriculture cannot be financed on the regional level, even though it is possible to support such modernisation indirectly at this level, e.g. by organising training sessions focusing on re-training of persons formerly employed in agriculture – reduction of employment in agricultural sector constitutes a necessary prerequisite for its modernisation.

RECOMMENDATION: The authors of the Programme should also once again analyse whether all of the SIA mentioned in the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 are really necessary, due to the fact that lack of measures aiming at decreasing their number combined with as many as 15 PA means that the Programme in its current form does not fulfil the principle of concentration of thematic intervention.

With regard to compliance of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 objectives related institutional childcare, it needs to be pointed out that the NSRD does not limit it exclusively to preschools, but stresses the need to *increase the diversity of forms of care over pre-school children (in cooperation with LGUs, social partners)* (p. 126). The analysed Programme refers only to pre-schools and does not include any measures for popularising the institution of daily carers or family pre-schools (home pre-schools), which is particularly important with regard to rural areas, where due to low population density construction of traditional pre-schools is often unprofitable.

RECOMMENDATION: In the context of activities aiming at facilitating the reconciliation of professional and family life focusing on pre-schools is not sufficient – it is necessary to also mention the daily carers, family/home pre-schools and pre-schoolers clubs.

The NSRD stresses the role of diffusion of growth impulses in regional modernisation i.a. by presenting proposals for investments in transport infrastructure linking urban centres with the outskirts (p. 66), also by means of promoting the so-called circular mobility (p. 43). The diagnostic part of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 does contain a reflection on weak functional links between rural areas and peripheral areas and the big cities, which makes diffusion of developmental impulses more difficult, but the objectives of the Programme lack such an approach, even though frequently the best way to improve the situation on the local labour market is to strengthen its ties with the closest major city.

RECOMMENDATION: In the context of activities aiming at achieving permanent improvement of the situation on the labour market there is a need to pay greater attention to constructing efficient public transport systems, especially between the cities and rural areas, also by means of promoting the so-called circular mobility. The following passage from the NSRD can be used in this regard: *Key measures should focus both on improving the appeal of rural regions by increasing the accessibility of goods and public services, as well as improving circular mobility of the population, contributing to better spatial cohesion between the rural areas and the cities* (p. 47).

ROP K-PV 2014-2020 contains a provision limiting the scope of territorial approach only to the IP under 3 axes. According to the NSRD the regional approach is meant to be applied with regard to all development-related activities (NSRD, p. 15), while *The policy based on the principle of integrated territorial approach (place based policy) corresponds with the policy which: (1) focuses on utilising endogenous capacity, territorial resources and knowledge, (2) makes it possible to implement interventions aimed at developmental challenges which are precisely adjusted to local conditions* (p. 16). The NSRD juxtaposes the territorial approach with the sectoral approach and calls for increasing the role of regional level in developmental processes. In other words, in the context of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 territorial policy should not be limited to PA 12, 13 and 14, but this paradigm should also include other activities.

RECOMMENDATION: Provisions on territorial policy (i.a. p. 59) need to be modified and the territorial approach (*place based policy*) has to be implemented in the majority, and not in the selected few, IPs of ROP K-PV 2014-2020. The diagnostic part of the document should also include an explanation that this approach constitutes a new paradigm of regional policy and, potentially, a description of this paradigm (for this purposes the table at p. 15 of the NSRD can be used; see also the recommendation related to the description of cohesion of the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 with the NDS).

It is necessary to improve the internal cohesion of the document, e.g. since making the protection of agricultural production area is one of the SIAs, the issues related to agriculture should be included in the description of the Programme’s objectives and priorities, and this element is lacking in the ROP K-PV 2014-2020. Moreover, this would be in line with the NSRD, which indicates that many developmental problems occur in rural areas (p. 34) and modernisation of agriculture constitutes one of the means of solving such problems (p. 105–106).

RECOMMENDATION: The provisions of the so-called demarcation line indicate that support at regional level may be directed towards farmers in order to improve their situation on the labour market, e.g. in the context of acquiring new skills[[36]](#footnote-36). Description of objectives and priorities needs to be supplemented with these issues.

## Europe 2020 strategy

Europe 2020 strategy is mentioned at several points of the Programme (e.g. at p. 10, 62), but the issue of cohesion of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 with the aims of the strategy is not discussed. Furthermore, there is no separate subchapter discussing the issue of external cohesion with the most important European strategic documents and national and regional documents (such subchapter was included in the draft from June 2013).

RECOMMENDATION: Subchapters on external and internal cohesion need to be included in ROP K-PV 2014-2020 or subchapter on the cohesion with national and regional documents provided for in the draft from June 2013 needs to be restored and supplemented with external cohesion dimension. In particular there is a need to indicate how the main objectives of the Strategy will be implemented under ROP K-PV 2014-2020.

For example, the Smart Growth objective of the Europe 2020 strategy will be implemented under PA 1, 2, 3 and 12. The Sustainable Development objective of this strategy will be implemented under PA 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11 and 12. The Inclusive Growth objective of the above-mentioned Strategy will be implemented under PA 8, 9, 10 and 12. It is also recommended to develop separate detailed table summary including information about links between subsequent PA under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 and the objectives and the so-called flagship initiatives of Europe 2020 strategy. Consistency of individual PA with flagship initiatives is indicated in the table below.

**Table 8. PA consistency with Europe 2020 strategy flagship initiatives**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Europe 2020 flagship initiatives** | | | | | | |
| Innovation Union | Youth on the Move | European Digital Agenda | A resource-efficient Europe | An industrial policy for the globalisation era | Agenda for new skills and jobs | European programme against poverty |
| **Priority axis** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Source: own study.*

Furthermore it is also recommended to indicate in ROP K-PV 2014-2020 the elements whose introduction in the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 will further improve its consistency with Europe 2020 strategy:

RECOMMENDATION: In the case of PA 1 there is no mention of smart specialisation. The description of PA 3 refers only the health-resort, food production and tourism sector (draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 v. 2.0, p. 107, paragraph 3).

RECOMMENDATION: In the case of PA 2 it is necessary to consider the inclusion of measures aiming at improving the citizens' ability to access the Internet.

## Common Strategic Framework

Common Strategic Framework (CSF) is an important document used for the purposes of programming EU support measures, including planning of European cohesion policy in the 2014–2020 period. Draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 is consistent with the CSF, though it may be worthwhile to consider certain changes and supplements to improve such cohesion. In line with the table at p. 52 of the draft Programme all thematic objectives indicated in the CSF will be implemented under priorities of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, with the exception of objective 11 (Improving the administrative capacity and public administration effectiveness). However, the above-mentioned objective will be partially implemented under the Technical Assistance PA. The most important conclusions and recommendations concerning potential changes in the assessed document are presented below.

RECOMMENDATION: Draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 should make reference to consistency of the PA with CSF thematic objectives. Matters related to consistency are presented in the table below.

**Table 9. Consistency of the PA with CSF thematic objectives**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **CSF thematic objectives** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** |
| **ROP K-PV 2014-2020 Priority Axis** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Source: own study.*

RECOMMENDATION: It is worthwhile to consider supplementing the projected activities of the Operational programme under PA 1 with support in the form of strengthening measures aiming at establishing cooperation between enterprises and research institutions in the region or cooperation aiming at more efficient use of existing R&D infrastructure.

RECOMMENDATION: The scope of PA 2 could be broadened by introducing other activities suggested under the second CSF thematic objective, including in particular those related to improving access to ITC infrastructure in less developed areas.

RECOMMENDATION: The scope of activities provided for under PA 3 may be broadened by introducing other activities suggested under the third CSF thematic objectives, i.e. supporting the creation of innovative companies and companies using new technologies, as well as the development of internet tools in companies. It is also advisable to supplement the fragment discussing specific objectives of Axis 3 with a measure supporting the introduction of new business models (currently it only includes reference to IP 3.2 [on p. 109]).

RECOMMENDATION: PA 5 proposes to broaden the scope of inclusion of other measure indicated under the CSF thematic objective 5, i.e. development of strategic planning, including regional action plans and crisis management plans.

RECOMMENDATION: PA 7 suggests the possibility of including measures supporting integrated urban transport planning, provided that such measure is included in the scope of DSK-PV.

RECOMMENDATION: PA 9 proposes to broaden the scope of inclusion of activities listed under the CSF thematic objective 9, in particular activities related to activation and modernisation of the regional social protection system.

RECOMMENDATION: PA 10 proposes to broaden the scope of inclusion of activities listed under the CSF thematic objective 10, in particular activities related to supporting educational opportunities of disadvantaged and particularly gifted children and youth.

RECOMMENDATION: PA 11 proposes to broaden the scope of inclusion of activities listed under the CSF thematic objective 9 implemented by using the ERDF funds, i.e. related to support for social enterprises.

RECOMMENDATION: Some PA 12 activities may be carried out by social enterprises or within the scope of local development strategies. In such a case, LAGs should be included on the list of beneficiaries.

RECOMMENDATION: PA 13 proposes to broaden the scope of inclusion of activities listed under the CSF thematic objective 9 implemented by using the ERDF funds.

RECOMMENDATION: PA 14 proposes to include activities provided for under this Axis in appropriate earlier PA (e.g. 9, 10 and potentially 11).

## Commission’s services position on the drafting of partnership agreement and programmes for 2014-2020 in Poland

PA is an important document and it is necessary to ensure that the content of Operational Programmes implementing the EU cohesion policy complies with it. This is reflected in numerous provisions of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 (e.g. on p. 7, 62–74). Since at the time of the assessment of draft Programme the PA was not prepared yet, further considerations in that regard will be based on the European Commission's position on this matter. This position will be of utmost importance for the final shape of the PA for 2014–2020 in Poland. The most important conclusions and recommendations concerning supplements to the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 are presented below.

*Position of the Commission Services on the development of Partnership Agreement and programmes in Poland for the period 2014-2020[[37]](#footnote-37)* presents four priorities in the field of financing and thematic objectives related to them. Draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 is consistent with those priorities, though certain changes and supplements meant to improve such cohesion may be considered.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended to present the consistency of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 with the PA in the form of a table.

The first priority of the PA remains in line i.a. with PA 7 and 2 of ROP K-PV 2014-2020. RECOMMENDATION: In order to increase the consistency of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 with the PA, the financing of PA 7 should give appropriate priority to railway investments which are an important priority of the European Commission in programming the cohesion policy for 2014-2020.

The second Commission’s priority in the field of funding, i.e. Business environment stimulating investment, is consistent with PA 1, 2, 3 and – to some extent – with PA 14. RECOMMENDATION: It is advisable to emphasize the issue of strengthening relations between the business circles and research and development centres and supporting the transfer of technology and knowledge from these centres to enterprises under PA 1.

The third Commission priority in the field of funding, i.e. Increasing labour market participation by means of improving the policy in the field of employment, social inclusion and education, is consistent with PA 8, 9, 10, 11, 13 and – to some extent – with PA 14. It has been determined that there is no need to introduce any supplements in order to improve the cohesion of the draft Programme with the PA.

The fourth Commission priority in the field of funding, i.e. Environmentally friendly and resource-efficient economy, is consistent with PA 4, 6 and 12. It has been determined that there is no need to introduce supplements in order to improve the cohesion of the draft Programme with the PA.

## National Development Strategy 2020

NDS aims at “strengthening and exploiting economic, social and institutional capacities ensuring swifter and sustainable national growth and improvement of the quality of life of the population” (p. 23). Thus the strategy puts a strong emphasis on the citizen’s perspective. Public intervention under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 is meant to bolster the region's competitiveness and innovativeness, while the issue of improving the quality of life of the inhabitants is addressed under specific objectives of the Programme. The main objective of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 is therefore in line with the objective of the NDS.

Furthermore, it is worthwhile to consider the extent to which the terms competitiveness and innovativeness are understood similarly in these documents. As far as competitiveness is concerned, the NDS puts a very strong emphasis on the fact that previous competitive advantages, which were primarily based on low labour costs, are nearly exhausted and need to be replaced by “new assets” (NDS, p. 62), i.e. in particular increase of innovativeness of the economy – this is also the approach adopted in ROP K-PV 2014-2020. Therefore the two documents are consistent with one another in that regard.

As far as innovativeness is concerned, aside from lack of references to creativity, the main non-conformity with the NDS stems from far narrower understanding of innovativeness, which is understood in ROP K-PV 2014-2020 as referring to technology and solutions in companies (e.g. p. 92), while in the NDS it is understood broadly and may be of technological, process- and products-related, marketing, organisational and social nature (NDS, e.g. p. 13).

RECOMMENDATION: ROP K-PV 2014-2020 needs to be supplemented with a provision calling for supporting non-technological, e.g. social, innovativeness. For this reason it is worthwhile to reword and supplement the provisions of PA 14. The direction of the intervention provided for under this axis – “development of social economy on the local level” could be framed in the following manner: development of social economy at the local level and promotion of social innovations. Earlier, in the diagnostic section of the document where territorial approach is discussed, the following footnote could be added when the first reference to the concept of CLLD is made: *Activities supporting community-led local development include all manner of social innovations, e.g. social economy measures, which are conducive to the establishment of cooperation networks between different development entities and which create new instruments for the modernisation of the region. Programmes for granting microcredit or social clusters are some of the examples of social innovation frequently cited in the literature.*

Issues related to the quality of governance constitute another important element which is strongly visible in the NDS, and which is not emphasized under ROP K-PV 2014-2020. In the context of regional operational programmes it is worthwhile to mention the need for the transition from administering to governing growth emphasized in the NDS, as well as the need to utilise “the energy of the self-organising civil society” (p. 24). The latter of these proposals is implemented in the framework of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, in particular under PA 14. On the other hand, ROP K-PV 2014-2020 does not make reference to good governance nor to proposals of activities aiming at eliminating administrative and regulatory barriers to growth. Even though the analysed document includes section 10 (Reducing administrative burdens from the beneficiary’s perspective), it nevertheless relates to the implementation of the Programme, and not broader activities which could be implemented in order to improve e.g. the comprehensive development management by increasing the efficiency of entities responsible for this process[[38]](#footnote-38).

There are also other issues which could be modified/supplemented in the framework of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 in order to increase its consistency with the NDS. Increase of developmental expenditure for the modernisation of the country constitutes an important objective of the NDS (p. 137-138). The description of the objectives of the PA does not make reference to such category of expenditure. Developmental expenditure constitutes expenditure related to undertaking difficult modernization challenges (i.a. changing the structure of the economy, demographic issues, increasing production efficiency, employment growth). In this context the fact that short-term expenditure has a positive impact on the GDP growth cannot be regarded as sufficient reason for classifying such expenditure as developmental expenditure. Moreover it is possible that interventions financed e.g. by the EU will have a positive impact on individual macroeconomic aggregates in the short-term, but in the long-term their influence will be negative (e.g. social transfers, which increase GDP by stimulating private consumption, but which at the same time deactivate particular social groups, strengthening their exclusion). In some cases short-term impact of expenditure on growth may be negative, but in the long-term it might be conducive to raising competitiveness of the economy (e.g. financing programmes for the closure of unprofitable sectors of the economy).

RECOMMENDATION: The document should include a reference to categories of developmental expenditure, regardless of further work on ROP K-PV 2014-2020, and in particular its financial part (current section 3, p. 220). Reference to categories of expenditure could be included in subchapter 1.1.2. and the relevant category could be defined in the same chapter; in addition, it might be worthwhile to state clearly, that ROP K-PV 2014-2020 aims at maximising the number of expenditure of developmental nature in the meaning of the NDS.

## National Reform Programme

Taking the material scope of the NRP into account, the area of influence of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, as well as arrangements adopted under the so-called demarcation line, it is possible to identify some inconsistencies between the analysed programme and the NRP (even though they are not substantial)[[39]](#footnote-39).

The NRP stresses that citizens’ health is the key factor for increasing their quality of life (p. 24) and proposes to introduce healthcare co-financing, as well as changes of organisational nature. The importance of general health of the society, e.g. for the labour market, is also stressed in the NRP (NDS, p. 83). Even though regulatory reforms in this sector remain outside of the scope of influence of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, provision of co-financing for health institutions in the region, including in particular those belonging to local government units, remain in the scope of its competence. The issue of health is mentioned in the description of Programme objectives/priorities usually in the context of digitalisation of healthcare (e-health, p. 98–99) and employees’ professional activity (p. 154), while only the PA 11 makes reference to general investments in the healthcare system, though it does not present any specific information in that regard. Furthermore, ROP K-PV 2014-2020 does not contain a clear indication that modern healthcare needs to make prophylaxis one of its main priorities (also in terms of expenditure).

RECOMMENDATION: Issues related to investments in healthcare, in particular those concerning measures in the field of preventive health care, need to be developed by e.g. specifying under PA 11 that activities carried out in the framework of the Programme will lead to an increase in funding for the broadly understood preventive health care.

NRP points to the need of taking “coordinated administrative measures” (p. 4) in the field of regional policy and “maintaining high quality of public services provided by public administration bodies” (p. 5). However, the NRP calls for greater involvement of public-private partnerships in the context of carrying out investments financed from EU funds. ROP K-PV 2014-2020 does not make any references to the PPPs.

RECOMMENDATION: There is a need to call for carrying out a greater number of investments by using EU funds in the framework of public-private partnership (PPP), therefore the lists of potential beneficiaries presented in the descriptions of the majority of PAs should be supplemented with PPPs.

One of the objectives of the NRP (p. 7) aims at reducing the percentage of early school leavers and increasing the percentage of people with higher education. ROP K-PV 2014-2020 refers directly only to the former issue, though at the same time information presented in the diagnostic part indicate that the percentage of Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship inhabitants with higher education is lower than the national average. RECOMMENDATION: In the context of activities in the field of building human capital it has to be stressed that the Programme aims at increasing the number of people with higher education.

## 6.7 Long-term National Development Strategy. Poland 2030. Third Wave of Modernity

The aim of the LNDS is to improve the quality of life of Poles (p. 42), which is strongly emphasised in the document and is reflected i.a. by the fact that HDI is one of the two main indicators used to measure its implementation, in addition to GDP. The main objective of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 does not focus on the citizen’s perspective, though such perspective is present in specific objectives. In the context of NDS provisions, which correspond with the provisions of NDS in this area, it seems that the region inhabitant’s perspective could be taken into account at the level of the main objective of the Programme.

RECOMMENDATION: It is worthwhile to consider the possibility of modifying the objective of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 in order to give it the following meaning: *To make Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship a competitive and innovative European region and to improve the quality of life of its inhabitants.*

RECOMMENDATION: The fragment focusing on improving quality of life of inhabitants definitely needs to be changed by supplementing it with the following description: *Inhabitants of the region are the subject of regional policy implemented under the Programme, therefore all activities carried out in its framework have to lead to the improvement of the quality of their life. This objective will constitute a derivative of a number of activities carried out in the framework of the Programme, including those conducive to improving the situation on the labour market, increasing the quality of the offer of educational establishments or modernising the communication infrastructure. Initiatives aiming at improving the quality of public services, including those supporting the balance between work and childcare, will be particularly important for the quality of life of the inhabitants of Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship. At the same time support needs to cover services, including healthcare services, for which the demand is expected to grow due to the ongoing process of population ageing. The above-mentioned activities will be carried out under the paradigm of objectification of all stakeholders of the development policy, in particular the inhabitants of the region, i.a. by implementing initiatives in the framework of community-led local development.*

LTNDS clearly emphasises the significance of expenditure financed from European funds in creating growth. The message of the LTNDS is that regional development cannot become too dependent on EU funds, which will probably decrease significantly after 2020. Such perspective needs to be included in ROP K-PV 2014-2020.

RECOMMENDATION: During the introduction into the Programme or potentially in the context of describing its main objective it is necessary to indicate that implemented measures will contribute to establishing foundations for long-term socio-economic development, and not only stimulate growth by means of simple cash transfers. The wording of this paragraph could be as follows: *Development policy carried out under the paradigm resulting from the provisions of LTNDS – a document superior to ROP K-PV 2014-2020 – will be conducive to establishing foundations of long-term regional development and will not be dependent on financial transfers from the EU. For this reason developmental expenditure will be maximized in line with their definition in the NDS in order to build technical, human and social capacity.*

The LTNDS stresses the importance of social, professional and spatial mobility, which is related to the adopted model of territorial development balancing – this concept should also be used in the framework of ROP K-PV 2014-2020. RECOMMENDATION: In the context of the model of territorial development balancing provided for in the LTNDS and proposed in the above-mentioned recommendation the relevant provision could be supplemented by adding the following passage: *Programme activities will be carried out under the paradigm of the model of territorial development balancing, which means that promoted balance between its objectives relating to the issue of stimulating the hubs of growth (i.a. investments in rural areas), creating diffusion channels for growth impulses (i.a. transport infrastructure), as well as supporting absorption capacity of peripheral regions (i.a. investments in human capital and local infrastructure).*

In the context of earlier comments on the issue of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 consistency with various strategic documents stemming mainly from the LTNDS – a document superior to them – it is worthwhile to use relevant provisions of the long-term strategy when modifying the Programme. Therefore, in case of investments in social capital a reference to the following provisions of the LTNDS could be made: “[it is necessary to] increase the presence of culture in people’s everyday lives by constantly increasing the accessibility of cultural resources and fostering cultural habits” (p. 125) or “[it is necessary to] modernise the infrastructure and broaden the social functions of cultural institutions, including libraries and cultural centres” (p. 126).

Generally it is recommended to increase the focus of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 on the citizen, as well as to create long-term foundations of the region’s development, including by developing the project of its modernisation in three dimensions: polarisation, diffusion and absorption.

# ASSESSMENT OF INCLUSION OF HORIZONTAL POLICY OBJECTIVES IN OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME

Research question D: If, and to what extent, does ROP K-PV 2014-2020 include and contribute to achieving the objectives of horizontal policies (the principle of equal opportunities, including of men, women and disabled, non-discrimination and sustainable development)?

## Degree and extent of inclusion of horizontal rules in the programming process

According to programming assumptions, implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 is supposed to contribute to achieving the following horizontal objectives of Europe 2020 strategy:

1. The principle of sustainable development,
2. The principle of equal opportunities: projects aimed at preventing discrimination on grounds of sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or beliefs, disability, age or sexual orientation,
3. The principle of gender equality.

According to the provisions of the PA and the *Template*..., programming assumptions should allow evaluating the Programme’s input in and influence on promoting horizontal rules and take into account their objectives at the stage of programming, implementation, assessment, monitoring, evaluation and control.

Under the ESF, it is mandatory to observe the principle of equal opportunities and gender equality. RECOMMENDATION: It is necessary to describe the way in which the principle will be implemented with respect to individual challenges in this area, planned propositions that ensure inclusion of the principle of gender equality at the Programme implementation stage, especially within project selection procedures and the very process of project implementation, specific monitoring and evaluation solutions that serve tracking correctness of implementing the principle of gender equality along with a description of how monitoring and evaluation results would be taken into consideration. Specification of these propositions in the Programme should refer to individual IPs which achieve the objectives and implement the principles.

The degree and extent to which the **principle of sustainable development** is considered is insufficient. RECOMMENDATION: According to the *Template*..., apart from specific action (Priority Axis and measures devoted to implementing the principle of sustainable development) the draft Programme must also present instruments for ensuring compliance with the principle. The instruments may concern selection mechanisms, control mechanisms or reporting mechanisms – indicators for other infrastructural projects.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the description of the way and extent of implementing the principle of sustainable development should propose specific ways of enforcing compliance with the principle in interventions of both the ERDF and the ESF from beneficiaries. For example, it is recommended to introduce a provision that a formal requirement (access criterion) for projects under Priority Axis 7 will be to provide funds for preventive measures and measures mitigating the effect of infrastructure on the environment. As to modernisation projects in the framework of physical regeneration (Axis 14 and Axis 12), it is recommended to award extra points for energy efficiency and energy savings.

According to the Partnership Agreement, exclusion of certain ESF Axes (Axis 8) from specific provisions on implementing the principle of sustainable development must be well justified. RECOMMENDATION: Yet, the possibility of implementing interventions aimed at green jobs in the framework of a region’s smart specialisation could be considered.

According to the *Template*..., the MA should ensure equality of **gender opportunities** in the framework of the proposed implementation system by suggesting specific solutions for project selection and implementation, or the monitoring and evaluation system. It is linked with the Framework Regulation which, in the case of reports filed in 2017 and 2019, imposes the obligation to provide relevant information defined in Article 101.2 of CPR. It will also be necessary to present in the report the assessment of specific propositions aimed at promoting gender equality and preventing discrimination, including availability to the disabled and facilitations that ensure inclusion of the gender perspective in the Programme and projects.

As to the monitoring system, it should also be emphasised that the MA’s task is to make sure that the data on indicators are divided according to gender in the cases required by Annex 1 to the ESF Regulation (*Common output and result indicators for ESF investments*).

The draft Programme tackles the **principle of equal opportunities** insufficiently. Specific target groups covered by horizontal interventions have not been defined, implementation areas of horizontal objectives (IPs, intervention types) and specific intervention selection and monitoring mechanisms, along with control procedures, have not been specified. The socio-economic diagnosis does not include an in-depth description of the situation of the listed social categories in the areas covered by the Programme.

As a matter of principle, under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 separate monitoring statistics are kept for individual social categories covered by the principle of equal opportunities and gender equality. The Programme should be supplemented with a description of how the monitoring and evaluation results would be used.

RECOMMENDATION: The draft Programme should provide grounds for excluding prevention of discrimination and unequal opportunities from projects co-funded by the ERDF.

## Expected contribution of the operational programme to the implementation of horizontal policy objectives

The draft guidelines for the application of the principle of gender equality and the principle of equal opportunities in ESF projects for 2014-2020[[40]](#footnote-40) emphasise the need for adequate planning of expenditures aimed at promoting equality of men and women and preventing discrimination. The issue is important as it will be analysed in the framework of mandatory ex ante evaluation of every operational programme. Therefore, every MA is under the obligation to earmark sufficient funds for this horizontal principle. Due to absence of MID guidelines and recommendations in this respect, the draft Programme does not refer to the objectives of horizontal principles. The target value of sub-indicators that refer to discriminated groups and women is presented only at the level of the Specification.

Another instrument that contributes to implementing the equality policy at the stage of Programme and project financing could consist in earmarking a separate pool of funds specifically for equality measures, which would be defined during consultations with target groups.

Yet, it should be noted that the obligations of the MA that result from the draft Partnership Agreement do not require it to specify the budget for the implementation of horizontal objectives. Monitoring indicators will be defined at the level of Programme Specification, except for the indicators that describe the implementation of the principle of sustainable development under thematic axes (Priority Axes 4 and 5).

# ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION SYSTEM AND ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY

Research question E: Is the existing institutional system, including human resources, sufficient to implement the assumptions and objectives of the Operational Programme, and if so, to what extent? What is the degree of anticipated effectiveness of investments planned in order to reduce administrative burdens for the beneficiaries?

## Assessment of adequacy of human capital and administrative capacity

Without sufficient resources, organisation and management and administration capacity, implementation of the Programme will be at risk. The main task of the evaluator in this part of the study was therefore carrying out an assessment of administrative capacity, including the assessment of human resources of institutions involved in the management and implementation of ROP K-PV 2007-2013 and the regional component of OP HC. The analysis focused in particular on identifying risk areas and barriers to effective and efficient implementation of the Programme.

The draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 included plans on establishing an administrative system without Intermediate or Implementing Bodies, which will constitute a change in comparison to the current programming period, where 2nd level Intermediate Bodies – VLOs and RCSPs – were involved in the implementation of the regional component of OP HC. Arguments for using the above-mentioned new administrative system in the framework of the Programme as well as the arguments against this system, including opportunities and threats related to its use, are presented below.

**Reasons for introducing the new administrative system:**

* Chance for better communication effectiveness

Implementation of the new management system will make it necessary to develop new communication channels, which will take some time, and during the initial period such channels may not function efficiently. Nevertheless, in the longer perspective lower number of units may, though it does not have to, contribute to faster and better communication and shortening the waiting time for issuing a decision.

* Opportunity to create a brand of OMKPV as a partner in implementing EU funds at regional level – both the ERDF funds and the ESF funds

Due to image-related reasons it is worthwhile to consider whether the aim is to build a brand of an institution implementing different types of projects, both infrastructural and social, or to specialise the relevant institutions, i.e. OMKPV as an entity responsible for infrastructural projects and VLOs and RCSPs – as entities responsible for soft projects. Undoubtedly maintaining the whole scope of activities related to implementation of the Programme on the side of OMKPV will contribute to building the brand of the office as the single entity responsible for distributing EU funds at regional level.

* Higher chance for a uniform approach in the field of information and interpretation

There is a risk that complex structures in one entity may paradoxically make it more difficult to manage it. Such complex structures have to include precise paths of procedures, which may make it more difficult to effectively implement the Programme, since it does not allow for any flexibility and swift reaction to emerging needs. On the other hand in the framework of one institution it is easier to ensure uniformity of interpretation and uniformity of the approach to information, promotion and databases, information systems. The same can be said about informational and promotional activities: establishing a single centre responsible for information points guarantees the proximity and availability of information and consistent and comprehensive information about the Programme.

* Possibility to better coordinate the timetables of contests

Decreasing the number of intermediate bodies makes it easier to synchronise contests. This is important from the point of view of potential beneficiaries. This is particularly important in light of the need to ensure complementarity of support from ERDF and ESF.

**Reasons against the introduction of the new administrative system:**

* Insufficient level of employment in the existing units

One of the largest risks related to accumulation of all activities related to the implementation of the new Programme on the side of OMKPV is linked with insufficient number of employees to carry out planned activities. OMKPV units already experience the shortage of workers. In the case of the MA of ROP K-PV 2007-2013 there are currently 33 vacancies (which corresponds to 16% of the entire number of jobs), and in the case of the IB of OP HC the number of vacancies amounts to 6 (5%). It needs to be emphasised that staff constitutes one of the strong points of OMKPV, since both in the MA of ROP K-PV 2007-2013, as well as in the IB of OP HC the rate of employee turnover is low.

The employees of the MA of ROP K-PV 2007-2013 and of the IB of OP HC already suffer from being overworked, which frequently leads to “bottlenecks” in the implementation process. It has to be borne in mind that transferring all tasks related to the implementation of the new Programme to a single entity will result in taking over the activities which up until now were delegated to other units (some of which will be completely new to the employees of OMKPV). It is also necessary to take into account the fact, that the voivodeship will have at its disposal larger amount of funding than in the current perspective, which will additionally contribute to broadening the scope of the Programme. RECOMMENDATION: It is necessary to optimize the structure of employment in the MA of ROP K-PV 2007-2013. Though in the context of the following point concerning excessively complex structures of units carrying out the tasks of MAs, a simple increase in the level of employment may not be sufficient to solve this problem.

* Saturated OMKPV structures

Insufficient level of employment is accompanied by saturation of OMKPV structures. At the end of the 2nd half of 2013 there were 237 people employed in the MA of ROP K-PV 2007-2013[[41]](#footnote-41). There are teams consisting of up to 20 people in the Implementation Department – in the opinion of their directors such teams are too numerous, since managing such a large number of employees ceases to be effective and turns into an administrative function, losing its management-related and substantive properties. When planning the next perspective it should be borne in mind that current structures of the MA of ROP K-PV 2007-2013 are already saturated in terms of the number of employees and should not be additionally extended. For this reason making use of the capacity of external units might be a better solution than supplementing the OMKPV structures. Furthermore, in order to establish a new unit it is necessary to: choose an appropriate location, equip and prepare the premises, employ and train the staff, establish departments and teams.

* Intention to move away from using the mechanism of substantive assessment carried out by external experts

An additional risk in the context of insufficient level of employment and being overburdened with responsibilities is related to the assumption that the new programming period will no longer include an option allowing an external assessor to carry out substantive assessment of applications for co-financing. Generally, this move is reasonable due to numerous problems related to low availability of high-level experts and improving substantive competences of the MA employees responsible for carrying out relevant tasks. On the other hand, this will contribute to increasing the amount of responsibilities imposed upon these employees in comparison with the previous financial perspective.

* Loss of knowledge and experience obtained by the units implementing the regional component of OP HC

“Investments” in institutions implementing EU funds and persons employed in such institutions have been carried out for years in order to adequately prepare them for the tasks imposed upon them. This is a substantial capital. Stripping VLOs and RCSPs from their function as IBs results in at least partial loss of this potential. This loss is partial, not total, as it can be assumed that some workers employed in these institutions will be employed as members of the ESF personnel under the new system.

Another reason for maintaining the current function of VLOs and RCSPs as IBs is related to the fact, that they are organisational units of voivodeship local government carrying out its tasks in the field of labour market and social policy. ESF funds increase the amount of public funding for carrying out such tasks and should supplement the national measures. Implementation of both types of measures in the same entities will contribute to improving their consistency.

* Reduced effectiveness due to the lack of continuation of activities within the institutional structure

When the management and implementation system undergoes significant changes, there is a risk of reducing labour efficiency due to the sequence of responsibility of units and teams of employees. Lack of experience within units which currently are not part of the system (e.g. units for the implementation of ESF) may have a negative impact on the effectiveness of the process of preparation for implementation tasks (faulty procedures, lack of developed information channels) and the implementation process itself (insufficient ability to predict risks and eliminate them, risk of poor coordination of available resources), as well as the clearing process (efficiency of funds handling).

* Insufficient expertise of OMKPV employees in the field of ESF

Knowledge about the implementation of the ESF projects within the MA of ROP K-PV 2007-2013 (in the framework of existing structures) is insufficient. RECOMMENDATION: It is advisable to create teams of employees responsible for the ESF and having relevant experience and expertise, i.e. e.g. due to the fact that they have participated in the implementation of OP HC on the side of VLOs and RCSPs within the new administrative system which does not include for the IBs/IAs.

* Applicants’ confusion

A change of administrative system may result in significant changes for current beneficiaries of OP HC, used to cooperation with RCESFs, VLOs and RCSPs. When planning the structure of the system it might be useful to take also this aspect into account.

* The risk of later designation

It is very likely that making use of the existing structures, solutions, procedures and IT systems in the new perspective will ensure swift and conflict-free designation. Introduction of substantial changes and inclusion of new units in the system (in particular units with no experience in implementing EU funds) may slow down this process and make it more difficult. Relevant procedures, communication channels and IT systems will have to be developed from scratch. This process may prove to be not only lengthy, but also costly.

* Higher costs of closing the 2007-2013 financial perspective

An important aspect which needs to be taken into account when developing the institutional model is the necessity to finalise (clear) the 2007-2013 programming period. In this regard maintaining the “old” institutional model may prove to be beneficial (allowing for more fluent transition to new programming period). When planning the system for the management and implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 it is necessary to take into account the costs and the amount of time required to close the 2007-2013 perspective. It is safe to assume that this process will last for the next several years, due to the fact that the voivodeship still has at its disposal an unspent amount of PLN 1.8 bln.

**Other threats to the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 management and implementation system:**

* Risk of staff turnover

Significant changes in the management system may result in an outflow of experienced employees. This risk may be particularly high in the early stages of the implementation of new perspective, as mobilisation of funding may contribute to increasing the demand for consultants responsible for preparing project documentation. Experienced MAs employees may be particularly important in this regard. The risk of negative impact of the outflow of experienced employees from the office on the efficiency of the administrative system will be even higher due to the fact that MAs are meant to remain responsible for carrying out all tasks related to substantive assessment of applications for co-financing. Without experienced employees this will be nearly impossible. The risk of staff turnover is additionally increased by unsatisfactory level of remuneration and lack of financial incentive system. OMKPV employees receive the lowest (average) remuneration in comparison to all the other Marshall Offices – according to data for the end of 2012 this average remuneration amounted to PLN 3220. In regions comparable to Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship in terms of average monthly gross remuneration (CSO data), e.g. Warmińsko-Mazurskie and Lubuskie Voivodeships these values amounted to PLN 3436 and PLN 3991, respectively. Even in Podkarpackie Voivodeship, which is characterised by the lowest level of remuneration in the entire country, the average gross salary in the MA within the Marshall Office amounted to PLN 3980[[42]](#footnote-42). RECOMMENDATION: Satisfactory level of remuneration which adequately reflects the scope and the amount of tasks carried out, as well as appropriate incentive system dependent i.a. on the quality of work and the scope of responsibility constitutes one of the factors contributing to reducing staff turnover.

* Dual funding structure and differences between ERDF and ESF

In the context of the new financial perspective differences between implementation of support under ROP K-PV 2007-2013 and the regional component of OP HC constitute a risk. They stem not only from diverging scope and nature of the projects (infrastructural vs. soft), but also from different approaches to implementation and clearing. The above-mentioned threat is particularly important in the case of dual funding axes, where teams responsible for these areas need to possess knowledge and experience related to the implementation of both ESF and ERDF. Assuming that under the future perspective the system will be largely based on experience of staff related to the implementation of ROP K-PV 2007-2013 and the regional component of OP HC and assuming that ROP K-PV 2014-2020 will combine ERDF and ESF funds under a single PA – it is necessary to provide a detailed description of the methods of implementing such activities. It is also worthwhile to focus on the proper preparation of staff, not only by organising training, but also by exchanging information and experiences between employees responsible for handling ERDF and ESF funds.

RECOMMENDATION: It will be necessary to combine knowledge and experience related to the implementation of both these funds and develop procedures which are clear for beneficiaries using the funding from one of these funds under a single Programme.

* Territorial dimension

ITI may serve as one of the means of spending funding. Developing a model of cooperation under ITI which will make it possible to select projects of appropriate quality and impact will constitute a challenge.

RECOMMENDATION: Experiences accumulated during the current programming period should be used for the purposes of developing criteria for the assessment of projects under ITI, as well as for developing procedures for the assessment of applications for co-financing (who takes part in substantive assessment, when is the assistance of external experts necessary, what are the requirements such persons are obliged to fulfil).

* Introduction of new functions related to expenditure certification in MAs

MAs will become responsible for carrying out tasks related to certifying expenditure to the EC. Ensuring that management and control tasks are separated from tasks related to certification constitutes a necessary prerequisite which will allow the MAs to fulfil these new obligations[[43]](#footnote-43). The above-mentioned tasks are new and require the introduction of changes in the OMKPV structure and appropriate training of employees.

## Assessment of the method of reducing administrative burdens for beneficiaries

In line with the *Template*… the section of the operational programme concerning reducing burdens for the beneficiaries should contain information on:

1. the main sources of burdens in 2007-2013;
2. the most important measures already taken in order to reduce burdens in 2014-2020;
3. the scope of further reductions, making reference to statistical data and results of evaluations and analyses;
4. the main activities planned in order to reduce burdens, together with estimated initial and final date.

The draft Programme does not mention the main sources of administrative burdens experienced by beneficiaries which were identified at regional level in 2007-2013 (in relation to ROP and the regional component of OP HC), nor does it indicate any measures taken in order to reduce them.

The results of studies, analyses of information presented on relevant websites and quantitative CAWI study carried out among the beneficiaries of ROP K-PV 2007-2013 and the regional component of OP HC for the purposes of ex ante evaluation indicate that the main sources of burdens in 2007-2013 included:

* The requirement to prepare comprehensive documentation and a large number of lengthy annexes,
* Unclear format of the application for co-financing and the need to submit numerous annexes which are not relevant for a given application,
* The amount and extensiveness od documentation which has to be submitted on paper at particular stages of implementation,
* The need to involve external consultants in the preparation of such documentation, which imposes an additional financial burden on the applicant,
* Significant degree of complexity of information contained in competition documentation,
* Financial barriers – lack of funding necessary to finance the required level of own contribution and the need to acquire resources for investment funding prior to costs clearance,
* Insufficient level of support from the institution implementing the Programme (difficulties in communication and impeded transfer of information, long times to produce a decision, frequent changes of the person responsible for the project and related changes of requirements, as well as insufficient support for projects from the persons responsible for their implementation – in particular with regard to OP HC),
* Excessively formal language of information and documents addressed to applicants and beneficiaries, very similar to the language of programme documents,
* Unclear, ambiguous provisions and their frequent amendments and updates constitute a difficulty not only for the applicants and beneficiaries, but also to the employees of MAs/IBs,
* Amendments to guidelines (e.g. guidelines on expenditure eligibility) during the implementation of projects.

The draft Programme does not include a list of activities aiming at improving relations with beneficiaries and reducing administrative burdens, which will be undertaken in the 2014-2020 financial perspective. In light of problems and needs indicated in point 1, previous activities of the MA in the following fields should be assessed positively:

* conducting information and promotional activities;

RECOMMENDATION: Due to the need to provide substantive support at the stage of applications submission emphasised by the applicants, Programme information points profile should be changed in order to focus more on consultancy and less on providing simple information.

* Organising training for potential beneficiaries e.g. on the preparation of projects;
* Providing training for beneficiaries. Analysis of errors made by beneficiaries in 2007-2013 proves the necessity to constantly increase their knowledge in the field of project implementation and clearance (errors related to the application of PPL, errors at the stage of tender procedure, incurring expenditure outside of eligibility period, introducing changes to the project without notifying the MA, wrong application of visualisation and promotion rules, etc.);
* Hosting the web portal – the fact that the questions most frequently asked by the beneficiaries and the errors most frequently made by them are published on the website has to be assessed positively;
* Use of flexible forms of project financing such as paying advances – in light of financial barriers faced by beneficiaries introduction of a comprehensive system of advances has to be regarded as a good solution. At the same time, beneficiaries point to the need to simplify the principles of clearance of advances.
* Developing a new, clearer and more user-friendly template of the application for co-financing;
* Drafting practical documents making it easier to submit applications and implement and clear the project.

Other measures taken to address the needs of applicants and beneficiaries include:

* Further simplification of relevant provisions (language) and gathering instructions and materials in one, easily accessible place – this concerns both the stage of applying for co-financing, as well as the stage of project implementation and clearance (e.g. preparation of requests for payment);
* Organising the activities of advisory desks to allow the consultants to take advantage of support provided by professional staff;
* Thematic support – according to beneficiaries support is limited to financial and administrative issues and there is a lack of thematic support during the entire life cycle of the project (in particular OP HC);
* There is a need to confirm arrangements made by phone in writing (e-mails). During the study, beneficiaries strongly emphasised the need to introduce a mechanism used to make the information submitted by the units employees binding;
* Greater flexibility during the implementation of project indicators – this concerns OP HC, where there were some problems with attracting target group to which the project was addressed. It has been suggested that in the case of longer-term projects it might be beneficial to measure the achievement of indicators at the end of the project, and not annually. Furthermore, a possibility to introduce an option to change projected values of the indicators in justified cases was suggested;
* Simplification of project clearing procedures and methods of describing financial documentation – also in the context of removing the obligation to submit documents in such large quantities, to copy them and to submit them on paper;
* Developing a new application generator – which will address the issue of frequent errors made by the applicants and in addition will lower burdens imposed on the applicants who pointed to numerous difficulties related to specific elements of the application in the CAWI study;

Striving for greater computerisation of the relations with the beneficiary – which will address the need to reduce the flow of paper versions of documents. RECOMMENDATION: It is worthwhile to consider introducing a solution allowing the beneficiaries to send even large files (e.g. technical documentation) by electronic means and to receive comments from the persons responsible for projects in the same manned (appropriately secured platform for the exchange of files and correspondence with the beneficiary);

Taking measures to reduce the waiting time for issuing a decision on project assessment and co-financing – which will address the frequently voiced problem of lengthy procedures for granting co-financing. RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended to establish an electronic information system within which the applicant (and each MA/IB/IB2 employee) will be able to check the current status of the application. It may be also worthwhile to consider the possibility of introducing a mechanism of informing the applicant by means of a text message;

* Taking measures to shorten the time required to clear requests for payment – similarly as in the case of applications for co-financing, this will contribute to solving the issue of long waiting time for a decision on disbursement of funding.

The problem of long waiting time for MAs/IBs/IB2 decisions has to be considered in the context of excessive workload of the employees of these institutions.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended to describe the main elements of staff management which will facilitate the process of implementing the Programme, e.g. use of a mechanism of flexible staff transfer during the life cycle of the Programme which makes it possible to carry out procedures effectively during the periods of greatest workload and react swiftly to delays at different stages of implementation, on the one hand, and utilising experiences of the employees knowledgeable about the projects owing to their participation in earlier stages of implementation, on the other hand.

Another issue relates to improving the internal flow of information and the flow between implementation system institutions. Computerisation of the relations between implementation system institutions and relations within the institution, as well as development of internal databases ensuring that available information are utilised for the purposes of providing relevant services to the beneficiary will contribute to the achievement of this objective. This solution will reduce the risk associated with frequent changes of people responsible for given projects and the lack of a single person designated to manage the project.

## Assessment of the concept of implementation system included in the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020

The draft Programme includes a chapter on institutional system. This chapter contains a clear and comprehensive description of the Programme’s institutional system with reference to the scope of responsibility of individual institutions, in particular MAs. The most important solutions and tasks at all stages of the Programme implementation – from preparation and consultation, through implementation, including selection and assessment of applications for co-financing, monitoring and evaluation, to issues related to financial clearance and reporting – were presented.

# EVALUATION OF THE ASSUMPTIONS OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION PROCESSES

The draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 describes the monitoring, reporting and evaluation process insufficiently, inconsistently with the requirements of the ministerial template.[[44]](#footnote-44) These shortcomings make it highly difficult to evaluate the solutions envisaged for effective implementation of the above processes.

RECOMMENDATION: The sections concerning the Monitoring and reporting system and the Evaluation system need to be supplemented according to the General Regulation, the *Template*... and Guidelines for the evaluation process drafted by the MRD.

## Assessment of adequacy of output and strategic result indicators

In the upcoming financial perspective, the selection of indicators was largely simplified thanks to introducing the Common List of Key Indicators[[45]](#footnote-45) (CLKI). It allowed eliminating some potential weaknesses of monitoring systems, such as the problem of indicators being unmeasurable. As output indicators proposed for individual IPs are to be based on the CLKI, assessment for clarity, statistical reliability, aggregability, availability and soundness is no longer needed.

Using only the CLKI imposes some restrictions, for example it is difficult to select indicators that would be adequate to measures. Therefore, sometimes it is necessary to use indicators from outside the list. Thus, accuracy of the indicators proposed from outside the CLKI to support the suggested intervention logic becomes an important element of indicator assessment.

The system of indicators covered by the ROP K-PV 2014-2020, based on indicators from the CLKI, is not complete. It includes output and strategic result indicators, but it does not state the target or basis values (for strategic indicators), not does it state data sources.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended to supplement target and basis values (for strategic indicators) and state data sources.

According to the *Template*…, the indicators should be selected to be adequate to the majority of interventions under the given IP and should allow to assess the progress in implementation (cf. measure effects measured using a single indicator).

## Assessment of the selection of indicators to evaluate the implementation of interim objectives (“milestones”)

The draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 does not state the value of interim objectives. According to information in Chapter “Monitoring and reporting system,” it is assumed that the achievement of milestones (interim objectives) would be monitored from the annual report submitted to the EC in 2017 (for 2016). In addition, implementation progress reports will be filed to the EC in 2017 and 2019 and Programme implementation evaluation will be performed in 2019. These proposals comply with the Partnership Agreement.

Shortcomings of the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 concern the definition of interim objectives (2018), final objectives (2023) and KES. Therefore, it is impossible to evaluate plausibility of selected interim and final objectives, and to perform a risk analysis.

RECOMMENDATION: It is necessary to supplement ROP K-PV 2014-2020 with interim and final objectives and KES.

The suggested solution is to state the performance reserve amount that will finally be allocated in 2019.

## Assessment of the ways to ensure timely delivery of relevant data range

Assessment of the ways to ensure timely provision of a relevant data range is difficult as the information describing the planned monitoring and reporting system (Section 7.1.1) and the evaluation system (Section 7.1.2) is insufficient. The Programme does not define dedicated organisational solutions in that respect, it only defines the tasks of the units/institutions involved in the monitoring and evaluation process and mentions Commission’s requirements for the reporting and evaluation process. Ensuring adequate solutions for timely provision of a relevant data range is particularly important due to the obligation to provide the EC with, *inter alia*, annual Programme implementation reports with financial data, general and Programme-specific data and target values of indicators.

One of the ways to allow timely provision of a relevant data range is undoubtedly the Local IT System developed on the basis of solutions from programming period 2007-2013. The system should collect data complementary with the data gathered by the central IT system SL 2014 and should be complementary with the latter system. The standardisation of the range of SL 2014 data is underway.[[46]](#footnote-46) The Programme lacks information on other solutions for timely provision of a relevant data range.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended to supplement ROP K-PV 2014-2020 with information on the ways to ensure timely provision of data.

## Assessment of data sources and generation methods, and of ways to ensure high quality of data

The draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 under analysis lacks information that would allow providing an unambiguous answer to questions on data generation methods, the ways of ensuring high quality of data and consistency of planned tools to acquire and store data. Similar to the definition of ways to ensure timely provision of a relevant data range, the Programme only defines the tasks of the units/institutions involved in the monitoring and evaluation process and mentions Commission’s requirements for the reporting and evaluation process.

Data sources, collection methods and ways to ensure high quality of data have been proposed by the evaluator in the framework of the initial concept of the evaluation process. The actions would include, *inter alia*, close cooperation with the key institutions involved in evaluation processes at the regional and national level (Regional Territorial Observatory (RTO), National Territorial Observatory (NTO), CSO, NEU), better coordination of evaluation studies by external institutions, introduction of effective technical solutions (in the framework of e.g. the local IT system). The proposed solution would be the point of departure for coming up with an organisation of these processes as the level of a region.

RECOMMENDATION: It is necessary to develop data generation methods and ways to ensure high quality of data using the initial concept of the evaluation process, prepared by the evaluator, which constitutes an annex hereto.

## Assessment of human resources and institutional capacity of the monitoring and evaluation system

Since pursuant to Article 44 of the CPR, the Managing Authority must submit annual reports on the key results of evaluations and progress towards implementing the evaluation plans, including implemented recommendations, appropriate human resources must be ensured to perform the tasks which are new compared to the current programming period.

The draft Programme states that the evaluation unit (EU) *has sufficient human resources and organisational capacity*, but it has not been confirmed by figures.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended to include more specific information in the Programme by referring *inter alia* to the experience of evaluation unit personnel from the evaluation process in 2007-2013.[[47]](#footnote-47)

The draft Programme provides information on evaluation unit’s obligations, but they are defined very generally. The draft says that the evaluation unit’s task is e.g. *to implement and coordinate the Programme evaluation process.*

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended to include more specific information on the tasks of the evaluation unit in terms of the specific functions of the unit’s personnel at different stages of the evaluation process, such as participation in the selection of evaluation study topics, organisation of the system for acquiring and collecting data necessary for the evaluation, publishing evaluation results. The description should also be supplemented with possible plans to carry out trainings and other initiatives aimed at developing the competence of evaluation unit’s personnel in the field of i.a. evaluation study methodology.

RECOMMENDATION: It is also recommended to include more specific information on the role of other institutions that would be involved in monitoring and evaluation processes, such as the Monitoring Committee, task forces appointed by the MA, CSO, RTO and the National Territorial Forum. Effective communication between the evaluation unit and individual participants of the monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes must be ensured.

# THE MOST IMPORTANT CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS[[48]](#footnote-48)

| **No** | **Report position** | **Conclusion** | **Recommendation** | **Type of recommendation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 4.2 Accuracy of interventions in the context of the socio-economic diagnosis. | Selected issues were described in the diagnosis in an unsatisfactory manner. | The diagnosis should be supplemented in line with specific recommendations presented in chapter 4.2 Accuracy of interventions in the context of socio-economic diagnosis (table 1). | operational |
|  | 4.4 Relevance and appropriateness of socio-economic trends analyses used in the diagnosis. | In certain PAs gaps and inconsistencies in socio-economic trends imaging, which could have an impact on the assumptions concerning projected results, were identified. | The diagnosis should be supplemented in line with specific recommendations presented in chapter 4.4 Relevance and appropriateness of socio-economic trends analyses used in diagnosis (table 2). | operational |
|  | 5.3 Analysis of alternative means of achieving the assumed objectives | Analysis of alternative scenarios for PA 5 supports the viability of increasing allocations to projects related to development of small-scale water retention forms.  There is a lack of measure on equipping emergency service personnel with systems for monitoring and warning against natural disasters. | It is recommended to increase allocations to projects related to development of small-scale water retention forms.  A new type of intervention should be added: equipping emergency service personnel with systems for monitoring and warning against natural disasters. | operational |
|  | 5.3 Analysis of alternative means of achieving the assumed objectives | IP 8.10 is risky due to low sustainability of prevention and rehabilitation programmes for which the major part of funds is allocated. The concentration of allocation on activities, which will be completed upon the expiry of the programming period, does not seem to be a cost-effective solution.  Furthermore, the scope of diseases contributing to absenteeism and the loss or restriction of the region’s inhabitants ability to work corresponds with national statistics. Therefore there is a risk of overlapping of the results of activities carried out at the national level under prevention programmes | The allocation for IP 8.10 should be reduced. | strategic |
|  | 5.3 Analysis of alternative means of achieving the assumed objectives | PA 8: Training measures addressed to entrepreneurs to be implemented at the national level may generate sufficient demand for such services among enterprises and lead to the demand being met in the commercial market without the need for direct support from the EU funds. | This category of intervention should be used only as a tool supporting the maintenance of employment in the SME sector, with the funding under IP 8.9 focused on retraining programmes for employees and on outplacement support. | strategic |
|  | 5.3 Analysis of alternative means of achieving the assumed objectives | The evaluations show that certain conditions for long-term employment efficiency of grants for self-employment (in particular with identified risk factors) and sustainability of subsidized jobs should be undermined. | Repayable instruments should be used or the target groups should be limited to disadvantaged groups. | strategic |
|  | 5.3 Analysis of alternative means of achieving the assumed objectives | Some forms of support under IP 9.4 and IP 9.7 overlap. For example: the support for community care for the disabled under IP 9.4. overlaps with the tasks of an assistant of a disabled person under IP 9.7. | The detailed provisions of individual types of intervention under PA 9 should be reconstructed to avoid overlapping of the scopes of intervention. | operational |
|  | 5.6 Appropriateness of the method of taking the territorial dimension into account | Diagnosis included in ROP K-PV 2014-2020 does not have a territorial dimension. Some issues are presented in a spatial dimension (maps from page 12, figures 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11), but their content does not correspond to the structure and spatial scope of intervention under PA.  The diagnosis of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 builds on the voivodeship strategy, where the territorial dimension is more pronounced (e.g. under the strong metropolis priority), but the analyses carried out under this strategy were not utilised in the framework of ROP K-PV 2014-2020. Diagnosis is inconsistent with subsequent selection of priorities, e.g. it does not include the diagnosis of urban issues, while PA 12 is largely devoted to this issue. | Diagnosis should be supplemented with a territorial dimension of analysed social and economic phenomena.  A separate chapter should be devoted to the discussion of urban issues, since they have such a significant impact on the development of the voivodeship (separate PA 12). This in turn would allow to define subjects/areas/problems in ROP K-PV 2014-2020 that require spatial differentiation of intervention and/or suprasectoral and multilateral cooperation, i.e. an integrated territorial approach. This would prompt reflection on territorial differentiation of intervention under axes 1-11 or at least provide the material for such reflection. | operational |
|  | 5.6 Appropriateness of the method of taking the territorial dimension into account | There are plans to use ITI and CLLD. The references to ITI and CLLD are very general and repeat well-known information gathered at the national level; they reflect the regional specificity only to a very small degree. | The rules of supporting CLLD and ITI, taking into account the specific conditions of the region, should be developed and included in ROP K-PV 2014-2020. | operational |
|  | 5.6 Appropriateness of the method of taking the territorial dimension into account | The lack of a vertical and horizontal coordination mechanism for the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 implementation, which would take into account the territorial and integrated approach. The management of priority axes 12, 13 and 14 is centralised. | The estimated allocation of the ESF and the ERDF for CLL should be specified in line with the Partnership Agreement. The procedure for selection of LAGs to implement LDS should be introduced. The criteria for selection of innovative projects under CLLD should be defined. According to the *Template*…, Section 4.1. should include the arrangements on preparatory support for CLLD.  The LAGs should be authorised to perform necessary verification and controls to decide about the eligibility of the given operation for financing.  ROP K-PV 2014-2020 in its current form needs a mechanism ensuring coordination of results of PA 12, 13 and 14 with the results of other axes, established within the MA. | operational |
|  | 6.2 Europe 2020 strategy | Europe 2020 strategy is mentioned in several parts of the Programme, but the issue of cohesion of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 with the aims of the strategy is not discussed. Furthermore, there is no separate subchapter discussing the issue of external cohesion, i.e. cohesion with the most important European strategic documents and national and regional documents (such subchapter was included in the draft from June 2013). | Subchapters on external cohesion should be included in ROP K-PV 2014-2020 or subchapter on cohesion with national and regional documents provided for in the draft from June should be restored and supplemented with national and regional documents. The Programme should include a separate table summary presenting the links between the PAs and the objectives and flagship initiatives of the Europe 2020 strategy. | operational |
|  | 6.5 National Development Strategy 2020 | Category of developmental expenditure, proposed and defined in detail in the NDS, should be used in the Programme, which will automatically translate into greater focus on activities aiming at building permanent developmental capacity of the region, making it possible to strengthen cohesion between Programme objectives/priorities and the structure of its funding. | Subchapter 1.1.2 should define and refer to the developmental expenditure category. | operational |
|  | 7.1 Degree and extent of inclusion of horizontal rules in the programming process | The method of taking the aims of horizontal principles into account is inadequate. Specific target groups covered by horizontal interventions have not been defined, implementation areas of horizontal objectives (IPs, intervention types) and specific intervention selection and monitoring mechanisms, along with control procedures, have not been specified. The manner in which the results of monitoring and evaluation will be utilised was not specified. | The provisions of the chapter “Horizontal rules” should be supplemented with a list of IPs and types of interventions related to individual horizontal rules, identification of target groups and specification of means of monitoring, evaluation and the methods of taking the results of monitoring and evaluation into account during the implementation of the Programme. | horizontal |
|  | 8.1 Assessment of adequacy of human capital and administrative capacity | The level of employment in the MAs or ROP K-PV 2007-2013 and IB of OP HC is insufficient to carry out current and planned activities. OMKPV departments already experience the shortage of workers. In the case of the MA of ROP K-PV 2007-2013 there are currently 33 vacancies (which corresponds to 16% of the entire number of jobs), and in the case of the IB of OP HC the number of vacancies amounts to 6 (5%). | The level of employment in the Mas of ROP K-PV 2007-2013 should be increased. In the context of the new perspective this is particularly justified due to the fact that the process of closing the 2007-2013 perspective will be carried out in parallel to the process of implementing ROP K-PV 2014-2020. | operational |
|  | 9.1 Assessment of adequacy of output and strategic result indicators | The system of indicators covered by the ROP K-PV 2014-2020, based on indicators from the CLKI, is not complete. It includes output and strategic result indicators, but it does not state the target or basis values (for strategic indicators), not does it state data sources. Identified shortcomings also concern the definition of interim objectives (2018), final objectives (2023) and KES. | Target and basis values (for strategic indicators) presented in ROP K-PV 2014-2020 should be supplemented and the lack of data sources should be addressed. | key |
|  | 9.3 Assessment of the ways to ensure timely delivery of relevant data range | The process of monitoring and reporting, as well as the process of evaluation is described in an unsatisfactory manner in the current version of the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020. | With regard to the *Template…* certain elements of the monitoring and reporting system (7.1.1) and evaluation system (7.1.2) should be supplemented. Detailed proposals of supplements were presented in the chapter on monitoring. | operational |

# ANNEXES

## Preliminary concept of the process of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 evaluation

**Introduction**

This document presents a preliminary concept of the evaluation process which will serve as the basis for drafting the *Evaluation Plan for Regional Operational Programme for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship 2014-2020* by the Contracting Authority. Pursuant to Article 49 of CPR[[49]](#footnote-49), the Managing Authority of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 shall draw up and submit to the European Commission an evaluation plan for the Programme, in accordance with the Fund-specific rules.

The National Evaluation Unit (NEU) is currently developing recommendations for drawing up evaluation plans, including i.a. specific subjects of strategic evaluation studies which must be included in evaluation plans for operational programmes.[[50]](#footnote-50) The guidelines are to be approved by the Minister of Infrastructure and Development (MID) in the first quarter of 2014.

Compared to the previous programming period, in the years 2014-2020 the European Commission puts even more emphasis on a wider use of evaluation results in the process of programming and implementing operational programmes.

In the new programming period, the evaluation process is to be subject to ongoing control by the European Commission. The Managing Authority (MA) must submit annual reports on main evaluation results and on progress in implementation of evaluation plans, including the implemented recommendations.[[51]](#footnote-51) In addition, an evaluation report, summing up the results of all evaluations and presenting the achieved programme objectives along with comments, must be drawn up for each programme.

A new principle will also be applied to independence of evaluators. Pursuant to Article 47 of the CPR, evaluations shall be carried out by internal or external experts that are functionally independent of the authorities responsible for programme implementation. Previously, independence was required only from the audit authority and the certifying authority.

**List of subjects of evaluations**

Evaluations proposed on the list are to examine the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of the programme in terms of accomplishment of the objectives under each priority axis of ROP K-PV 2014-2020.

According to the database of evaluations kept by the Ministry, the Managing Authority of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 commissioned 30 evaluations during the 2007-2013 perspective.[[52]](#footnote-52) The evaluations were defined by the Evaluation Unit within the Managing Authority (ROP Evaluation Bureau). The subjects of evaluations were selected based on the review of the *Evaluation plan*[[53]](#footnote-53), guidelines/recommendations of the European Commission sent to the MA as replies to annual reports on programme implementation, consultation with the ROP Steering Group, the ROP Monitoring Committee, the management of the ROP Implementation Department and persons in charge of the ROP Management Department.

The main difficulty encountered while defining the subjects of evaluations was the excessive number of subjects proposed, which often included analyses with insufficient scope and/or rationale. Another problem was related to limited human resources and time during the determination of the number of evaluations in a given year.[[54]](#footnote-54)

The list of subjects presented in this chapter may be extended or modified, if necessary, among others at the request of the Monitoring Committee. The European Commission recommends a regular examination and update of the evaluation plan at least once a year. The introduction of this plan does not exclude the possibility of additional evaluations, responding to new emerging needs.[[55]](#footnote-55) The Managing Authority should ensure appropriate financial resources for potential additional ad hoc evaluations which "by definition" cannot be covered by the said plan.

Due to the fact that some evaluations require the use of counterfactual methods, which entail higher costs than other methods, we predict that the average cost of evaluation will significantly exceed the average for the current programming period.

The list of proposed evaluations is presented below.

**Evaluation Plan for ROP K-PV 2014-2020**

| **Priority axis** | **Evaluation title** | **Evaluation method (1)** | **Evaluation kind**  **(2)** | **Evaluation type**  **(3)** | **Starting date**  **(quarters)** | **Predicted duration** | **Budget**  **(gross)**  **in PLN** | **Target group** | **Basic methods** | **Groups of respondents** | **Justification, indicating the period to be evaluated** | **Problem areas, including investment priorities of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 to be covered by the evaluation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PA 1. Building innovation of the region through R&D activity of enterprises | Evaluation of the impact of support under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 on an increase in innovation in the region and improvement of the competitive position of small and medium-sized enterprises from the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship | EXT | ON | F | 2020 Q1 | 5 months | 170 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Mainly desk research and qualitative methods (due to the evaluation period, quantitative analyses of the programme's impact will not be possible as yet) | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions participating in implementation, SME, R&D sector institutions  Domain experts | The study will allow to assess actual effects of support. Due to the significance of the supported area for the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy objectives (innovation and competitiveness), mid-term evaluation is recommended to enable potential changes, if the identified effects prove insufficient. | Problem area - contribution to the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy  IP 1.2 *Promoting enterprise investment in research and innovation, links between entrepreneurs, R&D centres and universities, especially in the area of developing products and services, technology transfer.*.. |
| Evaluation of the impact of intervention under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 on improvement of development potential and increase in employment in the R&D sector | EXT | ON | F | 2017 Q4 -  2018 Q1 | 4 months | 170 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Desk research. Quantitative (questionnaires) and qualitative methods, in particular IDI | Primary data obtained from beneficiaries and institutions involved in implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020  Domain experts | The study will allow to assess effects of support. It should also enable the assessment of effectiveness of measures targeted at R&D which may change due to a number of factors. The evaluation should be carried out mid-term. | Problem area - contribution to the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy  IP 1.1 *Improvement of research and innovation (R&I) infrastructure and increasing the capacity to create excellence in the area of research and innovation, and supporting competence centres, especially those in the interest of Europe* |
| PA 2. Digital region | Evaluation of the impact of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 implementation on increasing the supply of e-services in enterprises | EXT | ON | S | 2018 Q1-Q2 | 4 months | 75 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Quantitative and qualitative methods, desk research | Beneficiaries, potential beneficiaries (entrepreneurs)  Domain experts | The study will allow to assess actual effects of support under priority axis 2. Since the implementation system under this measure will be different than the previous one (increased use of repayable instruments), it will be necessary to identify the needs of potential beneficiaries, their capacity to finance the investments, as well as the barriers to project implementation in order to eliminate them.  The evaluation should be carried out after the first half of the programming period. | Problem area - contribution to the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy  IP 2.2 *Development of products and services based on ICT, electronic trade and increasing demand for ICT* |
| Evaluation of the impact of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 implementation on increasing the supply of e-services by public administration | EXT | EP | S | 2020 Q1-Q2 | 4 months | 40 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Quantitative (CATI, CAVI) and qualitative (IDI, FGI) methods, desk research | Beneficiaries (public administration and institutions) and recipients of services  Domain experts | The study will allow to assess effects of support under priority axis 2. It should identify critical areas in the implementation of IT projects, taking into account their effectiveness, utility for users and sustainability. The evaluation should begin at the end of the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 programming period. | Problem area - contribution to the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy  IP 2.3 *Strengthening the use of information and communication technologies for e-government, e-learning, e-integration, e-culture and e-health* |
| PA 3. Strengthening the competitiveness of the economy of the region | Evaluation of the impact of the activities of business environment institutions on development of the sector of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises in the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship | EXT | ON | F | 2019 Q2-Q3 | 5 months | 105 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Quantitative and qualitative methods.  Counterfactual methods should also be applied, e.g. comparison with a group consisting of SMEs excluded form intervention (i.e. SMEs eligible for assistance from BEI, but not using the BEI support). | SMEs using the services of BEIs and a control sample, BEIs, MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020  Domain experts | Business environment institutions performing tasks aimed at entrepreneurship development constitute a group of beneficiaries receiving support under ROP K-PV 2014-2020. Identification and development of the most effective services of BEIs provides an opportunity to strengthen the economy of the region, in particular the SME sector. The performance of the evaluation at the end of the programming period will allow to assess whether the support from those institutions should be granted in the following years, and if so, then on which measures it should focus. | Problem area - contribution to the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy  IP 3.4 *Supporting the capacity of SMEs to engage in a process of economic growth and innovation* |
| Evaluation of support for entrepreneurship under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 | EXT | ON | F | 2018 Q1-Q2 | 4 months | 90 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Methodological continuity should be maintained in terms of research questions, techniques and sampling. | Methodological continuity should be maintained in terms of research questions, techniques and sampling. | The study should be planned as a continuation of “Analysis of support for entrepreneurship under Regional Operational Programme for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship 2007-2013”; it should be carried out after the first half of the programming period. The purpose of the evaluation was to determine the efficiency and effectiveness of the involvement of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 for financing projects under the priority axes and various measures of the Programme, aimed at direct and indirect support entrepreneurship in the region. | Problem area - contribution to the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy  IP 3.1 *Promoting entrepreneurship, particularly by facilitating economic use of new ideas and supporting setting up of new companies – objective Creating favourable conditions for setting up and development of enterprises* |
| PA 4. Energy efficiency and low-carbon economy in the region | Impact of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 on increasing the energy efficiency in enterprises | EXT | EP | S | 2021 Q2-Q3 | 4 months | 105 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Quantitative (questionnaires)and qualitative methods (FGI, desk research) | Beneficiaries, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020  Domain experts | The region has unused renewable energy sources, such as solar energy, hydropower, geothermal energy, bioenergy. The study should allow to assess whether the potential is used thanks to the EU funds. The evaluation should be carried out at the end of the programming period. | Problem area - contribution to the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy  IP 4.3 *Promoting energy efficiency and RES use in public buildings and housing sector*  IP 4.2 *Promoting energy efficiency and RES use by SMEs / enterprises* |
| Impact of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 on popularisation of low-carbon strategies | EXT | EP | S | 2020 Q3 | 3 months | 30 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Quantitative methods (questionnaires), desk research | Beneficiaries, users of built infrastructure  Domain experts | The study may serve to assess the contribution to the Europe 2020 strategy implementation. It should be performed in the second half of the implementation period. | Problem area - contribution to the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy  IP 4.5 *Promoting low-carbon strategies for all types of areas, particularly in urban areas, including the promotion of sustainable urban transport and to take appropriate measures for adaptation and mitigation* |
| PA 5. Adaptation to climate change | Evaluation of implementation of the measures of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 aimed at improving the safety of the population and eliminating the consequences of natural disasters | EXT | ON | F | 2019 Q1 | 3 months | 30.000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Desk research, qualitative methods (IDI) | Beneficiaries and potential beneficiaries  Domain experts | Due to the relatively limited number of projects planned under axis 5 and a relatively low allocation, their implementation should be evaluated in terms of accomplishment of planned objectives, utility and sustainability of their effects. The evaluation should be carried out in the second half of the implementation period. | IP 5.2 *Promoting investment to address specific risks, ensuring disaster resilience and the creation of disaster management systems* |
| PA 6. Environmentally friendly region | Fulfilment of obligations stemming from the EU law as a result of implementation of priorities 6.2 of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 - implementation of indicators | EXT | EP | S | 2019 Q2-Q3 | 4 months | 50 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Desk research, qualitative methods (IDI) | Institutions involved in implementation of axis 6 of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 | Evaluation of accomplishment of specific objectives of axis 6 of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 in terms of waste and water and sewage management. The evaluation should be performed in the penultimate year of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 implementation. | IP 6.2 *Meeting the significant needs for investment in the water sector, in order to fulfill obligations under European Union law* |
| Effect of K ROP K-PV 2014-2020 to increase attractiveness of the region | EXT | ON | F | 2018 Q4 | 3 months | 30 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Qualitative analysis (PAPI or CAPI), quantitative analysis (IDI), measurement of tourist traffic | Local population, tourists, institutions involved in implementation of axis 6 of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 | Evaluation of the impact of activities related to the development and promotion of cultural and natural heritage in the region on increasing attractiveness of the region. | IP 6.3 *Protection, promotion and development of cultural and natural heritage* – objective *Protection of cultural heritage* |
| PA 7. Internal cohesion and external accessibility of the region | Evaluation of the impact of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 implementation on increasing the links within the road network (internal and external) and territorial cohesion of the region | EXT | EP | S | 2021 Q2 | 3 months | 70 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Desk research (basic method), measurement of occupancy rate of the means of transport, traffic intensity measurements | - Local population, tourists, institutions involved in implementation  - Domain experts | The evaluation at the end of the programming period will enable assessment of actual effects of support under priority axis 7 Sustainable transport for mobility of inhabitants. The study should determine whether the funds of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 have contributed to eliminating the problems identified in the diagnosis. | IP 7.2 Enhancing regional mobility through connecting secondary and tertiary nodes of the TEN-T infrastructure  IP 7.4 *Development and rehabilitation of a comprehensive, modern and interoperable system of railway transport* |
| PA 8. Active on the labour market | Evaluation of the impact of intervention under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 on employment increase in the region | EXT | ON | S | 2022 Q3-Q4 | 6 months | 90 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Quantitative (CATI, CAVI) and qualitative (FGI) methods, desk research | Beneficiaries, SMEs, institutions involved in implementation of axis 8  Domain experts | The evaluation at the end of the programming period should determine which types of measures are most and which least effective and why, which will help plan the measures for the next financing period. | Problem area - contribution to the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy  IP 8.5 *Ensuring access to employment to jobseekers and people professionally inactive people, including by local initiatives for employment and supporting mobility of employees*  IP 8.7 *Self-employment, entrepreneurship and job creation* |
| Evaluation of sustainability and effectiveness of support for starting a business, granted under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 | EXT | EP | S | 2022 Q1-Q2 | 6 months | 105 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Methodological continuity should be maintained in terms of research questions, techniques and sampling. | Methodological continuity should be maintained in terms of research questions, techniques and sampling. | The study should be planned as a continuation of “Evaluation of sustainability and effectiveness of support granted for starting a business under SOP HRD, IROP and OP HC.ongoing”.”[[56]](#footnote-56) The study focused on the condition of the market conditions companies established with the help of funds from the European Social Fund (ESF), and exactly for the survival of companies established in the projects implemented under the SOP HRD, IROP and OP HC. The subject of the evaluation was the assessment of the effectiveness of business support and additional effects generated by the project aimed to start a business (including the generation of new jobs). | Problem area - contribution to the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy  IP 8.7 *Self-employment, entrepreneurship and job creation* |
| PA 9. Cohesive society | Evaluation of support granted under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 in the area of social economy | EXT | ON | F | 2017 Q1-Q2 | 5 months | 90 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Quantitative (CATI) and qualitative (IDI, FGI) methods of data collection, desk research | Source data obtained from ultimate beneficiaries and institutions involved in the implementation process.  Domain experts | Social economy is a relatively new area of support; therefore, a comprehensive evaluation is required in terms of implementation of measures in this area, their outcomes in institutional and individual terms, as well as the developed systemic solutions aimed at further development of the sector in the region. The evaluation should cover the type and scope of needs related to development and improvement of the quality of the functioning of the social economy sector. The study should be carried out at the beginning of the second half of the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 implementation period. | IP 9.8 *Supporting social economy and social enterprises* |
| PA 10. Innovative education | Evaluation of the educational measures under ESF and ERDF in the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship | EXT | ON | F | 2017 Q1-Q2 | 5 months | 150 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Source data obtained from final beneficiaries and institutions involved in the implementation process.  Domain experts | Source data obtained from ultimate beneficiaries and institutions involved in the implementation process.  Domain experts | The evaluation carried out at the beginning of the second half of ROP K-PV implementation period should be planned as a continuation of evaluations of educational measures under ESF and ERDF in the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship. The study should be planned as a comprehensive evaluation of educational projects implemented under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 in the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship. | Problem area - contribution to the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy  IP 10.1 *Reducing early school leaving and ensuring equal access to good quality elementary, primary and secondary education*  IP 10.3 *Improvement in accessibility and supporting lifelong learning, enhancing the skills and qualifications of employees and jobseekers, increasing the adjustment of education and training systems to the needs of the labour market*... |
| PA 11. Cohesive society and competitive human resources – ERDF | Impact of support under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 on improvement of the quality and increasing the availability of health care services in the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship. | EXT | ON | F | 2019 Q1-Q2 | 5 months | 90 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Source data obtained from final beneficiaries and institutions involved in the implementation process, target groups (population of the region).  Domain experts | Source data obtained from ultimate beneficiaries and institutions involved in the implementation process.  Domain experts | The evaluation, carried out at the end of the implementation period, will be aimed at examining how health care and social projects supported under the programme will contribute to an improvement of quality and availability of health care services in the region. The measures may be innovative and thus their implementation must be closely monitored, in particular in terms of their adequacy, effectiveness and efficiency. | IP 9.1 *Investments in health care and social infrastructure (…)* |
| PA 12. Territorial policy – ERDF | Evaluation of the impact of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 on increasing the potential of capital centres of the region, including the development of metropolitan functions | EXT | ON | F | 2021 Q4 | 3 months | 130 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Methodological continuity should be maintained in terms of research questions, techniques and sampling. | Methodological continuity should be maintained in terms of research questions, techniques and sampling. | The evaluation should be planned as a continuation of the study entitled “Evaluation of the impact of K-P ROP 2007-2013 on increasing the potential of capital centres of the region, including the development of metropolitan functions”. It should be carried out in the second half of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 implementation period. The evaluation was focused on the analysis of the effectiveness and efficiency of the program's impact on increasing the capacity of Bydgoszcz and Torun as the centers of Kujawsko-Pomorskie, aspiring to be among the metropolitan cities and thus the development of metropolitan functions. | All implemented under axis 12. |
| PA 13. Territorial policy – Family-friendly local development – ESF | Impact of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 on the balance of social structure in the region | EXT | ON | F | 2019 Q3-Q4 | 5 months | 105 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection | Source data obtained from ultimate beneficiaries and institutions involved in the implementation process.  Domain experts | The study will be aimed at analysing the impact of measures under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 targeted at socially excluded persons or persons at risk of social exclusion, as well as persons living in poverty, in particular the measures aimed at increasing employment and social and economic independence to enable return to the labour market and active participation in social and economic life.  The evaluation should be carried out at the end of the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 implementation period. | All implemented under axis 13. |
| PA 14. Community-led local development | Evaluation of sustainability and effectiveness of CLLD projects under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 | EXT | EP | F | 2022 Q4 | 3 months | 80 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection | Source data obtained from ultimate beneficiaries and institutions involved in the implementation process, target groups (population of the region). | The evaluation will be aimed at assessing the impact of CLLD on the social and economic situation of the region, and at analysing the interest in CLLD and identifying the needs for its further development. The study will be particularly important for the region due to the separate part on CLLD in the OP. | Problem area - contribution to the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy  9.2 *Support the revitalization of the physical, economic and social communities and poor urban and rural*  9.9 *Local development strategies implemented by community* |
| 15 Technical Assistance | Evaluation of relevance of the adopted solutions in the Technical Assistance implementation system, including identification of difficulties and problems in implementing ROP K-PV 2014-2020 which may constitute barriers to the use of the allocation | EXT | ON | F | 2016 Q3 | 3 months | 60 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Desk research, IDI, quantitative methods (CAWI), heuristic methods | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 and other institutions involved in the system implementation, beneficiaries, experts | The evaluation should streamline the implementation of ROP K-PV and thus it should provide information on relevance of solutions adopted in the ROP K-PV implementation system and the impact of support granted under priority 15 on accomplishment of objectives concerning the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020.  The evaluation should also help identify difficulties and problems in implementation which may constitute barriers to the use of the allocation and provide recommendations on streamlining the implementation system. Therefore, it should be carried out at a relatively early stage of implementation. | Not applicable |
| Horizontal | Evaluation of information and promotion activities of MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 | EXT | ON | F | 2016 Q1 | 3 months | 70 000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Methodological continuity should be maintained in terms of research questions, techniques and sampling. | Methodological continuity should be maintained in terms of research questions, techniques and sampling. | The evaluation should be planned as the continuation of the study entitled “Evaluation of information and promotion activities of MA of ROP K-PV”[[57]](#footnote-57). The best timing for the evaluation is two years after the beginning of the programme implementation.  The study should focus on the evaluation of information and publicity MA ROP K-PV 2014-2020 under the angle of their effectiveness and efficiency. It is worth to consider including selected elements of the methodology of other studies of a similar area, including: "Evaluation of information and promotion activities implemented under the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 and the new portal of funds -[[58]](#footnote-58)[www.mojregion.eu:](http://www.mojregion.eu: ) [[[59]](#footnote-59)](http://www.mojregion.eu: ); „Metodologia badań dla działań informacyjnych i promocyjnych realizowanych ze środków Unii Europejskiej w Województwie Kujawsko-Pomorskim”. | Not applicable |
| Evaluation to identify problems with achieving the indicators for performance framework | EXT | ON, EP | S, F | 2018 Q1, 2020 Q3 | 3 months | 50.000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 and other institutions involved in the system implementation, beneficiaries, experts | Important is the ongoing monitoring of results achieved in the framework of the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 in relation to the benchmarks for the implementation of the framework. It is recommended to carry out a total of two evaluations, one during the mid-term (in terms of the implementation of appropriate additional measures in areas "problem"), as well as ex-post, summarizing the implementation of the ROP K-PV 2014-2020. | Not applicable |
| Evaluation summing up the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 | EXT | EP | S | 2023 Q4 | 3 months | 350.000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection | MA of ROP and other institutions involved in the system implementation, beneficiaries, experts | The study will include a comprehensive analysis of the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of the ROP K-PV 2014-2020. | Not applicable |
| Evaluation of the achievement of horizontal policy objectives | EXT | EP | S | 2020 Q4 | 3 months | 95.000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 and other institutions involved in the system implementation, beneficiaries, experts | The study will include an analysis of the impact of the program on improving the situation of discriminated people. The test may be carried out in cooperation with institutions at national level. | Not applicable |
| Rating knowledge of of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 among residents of the region | EXT | ON | F | 2015 Q2 | 3 months | 75.000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 and other institutions involved in the system implementation, beneficiaries, experts | The study will be to test the knowledge of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 among all its stakeholders.  The conclusions of the study may help identify implementation problems arising from the ignorance of potential beneficiaries and allow to design corrective action. | Not applicable |
| The study of effectiveness, quality and usability of selected tools of information and promotion of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 for beneficiaries and potential beneficiaries | EXT | ON | F | 2015 Q4 | 3 months | 105.000 | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, institutions involved in the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, MRD, NEU, beneficiaries, general public, European Commission | Quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection | MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 and other institutions involved in the system implementation, beneficiaries, experts | The study will aim to verify the effectiveness, quality and usability of selected tools of information and promotion of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 for beneficiaries and potential beneficiaries.  The knowledge gained in the study may help identify ambient communication barriers between the parties to implement and serve the possible modification of initial actions to ensure a more efficient, effective communication at a later stage of implementation. | Not applicable |

**Legend:**

**Column (3): Method of evaluation process organisation**

* External evaluation (EXT)
* In-house evaluation (IHE)

**Column (4): Type of evaluation (Division according to the timing of evaluation)**

* Ex ante evaluation (EX)
* Ongoing evaluation (ON)
* Ex post evaluation (EP)

**Column (5): Type of evaluation (Criterion concerning the function of evaluation)**

* Summative evaluation (S)
* Formative evaluation (F)

**Research methods in the programme evaluation process**

In the 2014-2020 programming period, the European Commission recommends a wider use of impact evaluation, i.e. evaluation aimed at analysing the impact of public intervention on economic, social and environmental well-being of EU citizens. It marks a significant shift from the model based mainly on evaluating the aspects related to implementation of support programmes (implementation evaluation).[[60]](#footnote-60)

The European Commission puts an emphasis on performing theory-based impact evaluations. The approach assumes that evaluation answers questions concerning both the process and the obtained results. The relevance of a given policy is determined, if the evaluation not only assesses whether the intervention had an assumed impact, but also answers why it happened or did not happen.[[61]](#footnote-61) Typical methods used in theory-based impact evaluations include desk research, analysis of data collected by government administration bodies, case studies, interviews, questionnaire surveys, as well as other qualitative and quantitative studies which provide extensive information allowing to analyse the logic of intervention under the programme and reconstruct its “theory”.

A new challenge for evaluators will be the impact assessment of integrated programmes, i.e. evaluation of how individual programme components interact with each other and reinforce the effects in a given area.

The following research methods are recommended for evaluations of ROP K-PV 2014-2020. The presented techniques include an information on the types of evaluation where they may be applied and the data they require.

**Desk research**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of evaluation** | Ex ante (EX), ongoing evaluation (ON), mid-term (M), ex post (EP) |
| **Data required** | (None) |

Desk research consists in using available secondary data, such as publications, reports, bulletins, databases, catalogues, information available on websites, etc. in evaluation. Before the data are used for evaluation, they are analysed in terms of their credibility, reliability and timeliness. Desk research is useful due to its high degree of objectivity and the possibility to use the data collected at subsequent stages of evaluation.

As regards the planned evaluation, particular significance will be attached to meta-evaluation, i.e. the analysis of results of all performed evaluations (ex ante, mid-term, ex post) in a given area, for both the current and the previous programming period. The results of meta-evaluations should be presented in line with the structure/logic of the Europe 2020 strategy (in particularly for the European Commission).

Desk research will use the types of data sources presented in the following table.

**Main sources of secondary data for evaluation process in the years 2014-2020**

| **Name of the source** | **Description** |
| --- | --- |
| **SL 2014** | The central IT system will support the implementation of operational programmes, becoming the main communication channel between beneficiaries and institutions involved in the programme implementation and a platform for collection and processing of data on implementation of operational programmes.[[62]](#footnote-62) The standardisation of the scope of data is underway.[[63]](#footnote-63) Compared to KSI SIMIK 07-13, the system will collect more data resources and will enable data reporting in the format useful for evaluation (thanks to the reporting system based on data warehouse). |
| **Local IT System** | A system aimed at supporting ongoing management and monitoring of ROP K-PV 2014-2020. |
| **Public statistics, institutional databases** | National statistics published by the Central Statistical Office, as well as other institutional databases containing information related to areas of support under the programme, such as databases of ministries, marshal's offices, government agencies and labour offices. Those sources will be useful for the majority of planned evaluations, in particular for counterfactual evaluations.[[64]](#footnote-64) |
| **Evaluations at the national level** | Evaluations at the national level, which will support the evaluations made at the regional level, such as impact evaluations using macroeconomic models which are based on the results of economic and econometric studies and take into account impacts and interactions in the entire economy; those models allow to evaluate the impact of the EU funds and the funds from the domestic public sector on the national economy and on regional economies.[[65]](#footnote-65) |
| **Databases concerning the 2007-2013 programming period** | **Historical data on the programme implementation in the previous programming period 2007-2013, including i.a. KSI SIMIK 07-13 and PEFS (monitoring subsystem of the European Social Fund); to be used mainly in ex ante evaluations.** |
| **Previous evaluations in the region** | Previous evaluations carried out in the region, in particular evaluations concerning both the current and the previous programming periods (meta-evaluation). The results of ex post evaluations allowing to assess the efficiency of public intervention under operational programmes implemented in the years 2007-2013 will be of particular importance. |
| **Strategic documents** | Strategic documents at the regional, national and community level, which are important from the point of view of areas supported under the programme. |
| **Scientific and professional literature** | Publications on the subjects related to the areas of support under the programme and other literature supporting the process of appointing evaluators and formulation of recommendations. |

*Source: Own study.*

**Quantitative research**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of evaluation** | Ex-ante (EX), ongoing evaluation (ON), mid-term (M), ex post (EP) |
| **Data required** | Desk research (mainly to develop adequate research tools) |

Quantitative analyses (CATI, CAWI, CAPI, PAPI) should cover in particular the beneficiaries of the programme. They will allow to determine whether the programme met the needs of the target group. The impact of intervention on the situation of beneficiaries, including the benefits obtained as a result of support, will be analysed. Counterfactual methods will be used extensively; in order to better evaluate the impact of intervention on beneficiaries, the analysis will also cover the situation of the entities from the control group, i.e. the group that has not received support.

**Individual in-depth interviews and focus group interviews**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of evaluation** | Ex-ante (EX), ongoing evaluation (ON), mid-term (M), ex post (EP) |
| **Data required** | Desk research (mainly to develop adequate research tools) |

Individual in-depth interviews (IDI) are in-depth conversations with individuals representing various groups of stakeholders of the programme (representatives of administration, beneficiaries, and ultimate beneficiaries of supported projects). Focus group interviews (FGI) constitute a method of qualitative research where a moderator conducts a discussion in a focus group, based on an earlier prepared scenario. As an interactive method, it will allow to highlight those aspects of the analysed issue problem which are less likely to emerge during IDI. Various stakeholders of the programme will be invited to focus group interviews to collect information allowing to analyse the selected problems from different angles. Focus group interviews increase the participating nature of evaluation - the involvement of partners from various communities will add to the credulity and objectivity of research results.

**Participant observation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of evaluation** | Ex-ante (EX), ongoing evaluation (ON), mid-term (M), ex post (EP) |
| **Data required** | (None) |

Participant observation is used to enable better understanding of the analysed problem by the evaluators by means of participating in real situations, e.g. observation of the programming process, decision-making, applying for support (where justified and possible).

**Delphi method**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of evaluation** | Ex ante (EX) |
| **Data required** | Summary of the results of earlier evaluations (desk research, quantitative and/or qualitative research) |

The Delphi method consists in a series of questionnaire surveys sent to a group of experts. The experts selected for evaluation will specialise in the fields covering the areas supported under the programme. The results of the first round are usually the source and the basis for another round of questions. The replies of experts granted at the second and each subsequent round are influenced by the opinions of experts presented in the preceding rounds. The structure of questionnaires for Delphi panel is to encourage respondents to express their opinions about the presented issues and to allow them to revise their answers in the light of the replies of other participants of the panel.

**Expert panel**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of evaluation** | Ex ante (EX), ex post (EP) |
| **Data required** | Summary of the results of earlier evaluations (desk research, quantitative and/or qualitative research) |

An expert panel is a working group specifically appointed for the evaluation which usually comprises independent specialists, recognised in the fields addressed by the programme. The panel specialists are to summarize information obtained at various stages of evaluation, analyse it from different points of view and support the process of formulating the final conclusions.

**Cost-benefit analysis (CBA)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of evaluation** | Ex ante (EX) |
| **Data required** | Desk research (to obtain information necessary to estimate costs and results of the planned project) |

Cost-benefit analysis (CBA) is a method for evaluating the effectiveness of public intervention in the area receiving support. Its aim is to determine whether the supported projects may contribute to the social and economic development of the region, taking into account all expected benefits and the related costs, including external costs (e.g. environmental and social costs). All benefits and costs are expressed in financial units, taking into account their changes over time (net current value).

**Cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of evaluation** | Ex ante (EX) |
| **Data required** | Desk research (to obtain information necessary to estimate costs and results of the planned project) |

Cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA) is a method to assess the effectiveness of the project in terms of accomplishment of its objectives. It consists in identifying alternative projects aimed at accomplishing the same objectives and then establishing which alternative maximizes the benefits compared to the costs. The project objectives are expressed in non-monetary units (e.g. decrease of disease incidence following an intervention in the health care sector).

**Macroeconomic models**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of evaluation** | Ex ante (EX), ex post (EP) |
| **Data required** | Desk research (to obtain statistical data to generate economic forecasts, e.g. Central Statistical Office) |

Macroeconomic model is a simplified description of the functioning of the economy using mathematical equations. It allows to obtain economic forecasts and estimate the impact of specific measures on the social and economic situation of the region. Macroeconomic models allow to simulate counterfactual situations to calculate the net effect of the analysed public intervention.

**Benchmarking**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of evaluation** | Ex post (EP) |
| **Data required** | Summary of the results of earlier evaluations (desk research, quantitative and/or qualitative research) |

Benchmarking is an assessment of the effects of the project as compared to other measures considered successful or exemplary. The comparison allows to identity strengths and weaknesses of the project, factors influencing its processes and to develop new, better solutions to the identified problems.

**Case study**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of evaluation** | Ex post (EP) |
| **Data required** | Summary of the results of earlier evaluations (desk research, quantitative and/or qualitative research) |

Case study is an in-depth description of the effect of public intervention in practice. It may concern an individual, organisation, project, decision-making method, etc. Case study summarizes qualitative and quantitative data collected at various stages of evaluation. The case study covers the phenomena which are to present best practices, i.e. particularly effective measures, or bad practices, i.e. measures which should not be applied in future due to their adverse impacts.

**Methods of ensuring an appropriate scope of data for planned evaluations**

The following measures/practices will be introduced to ensure an appropriate scope of data for planned evaluations:

1. **Measures concerning the evaluation planning and implementation**

* **Defining the needs in terms of access to data necessary for the evaluation process at the stage of planning individual evaluations –** precise definition of the needs in terms of access to data in each planned evaluation will allow to take steps to obtain such data in advance, including: (i) identification of the existing data sources from which the said data may be obtained; (ii) defining the scope of data to be collected on an ongoing basis from the entities participating in the programme; (iii) specification of data to be obtained during primary research);
* **Close cooperation with the Regional Territorial Observatory and the Regional Territorial Forum –** the cooperation with those two fora will allow to strengthen the methodology of planned evaluations, support the process of defining the needs related to access to data and identifying the available data sources;
* **Active cooperation with evaluators** – active cooperation with evaluators consisting in ongoing consultation on methodology and the course of the evaluation process, as well as providing the greatest possible support in terms of supply of data necessary to carry out high quality evaluation;

1. **Measures at the stage of collecting data necessary for evaluation**

* **Local IT System –** a local IT system compatible with the central SL 2014 system will provide valuable complementary information to data collected at the central level (in particular for the purposes of counterfactual evaluations);[[66]](#footnote-66)
* **Ongoing collection of data on institutions applying for support -** collection of information concerning both the programme beneficiaries and the institutions which failed to obtain support will facilitate the selection of the control group for counterfactual evaluations;
* **Ongoing monitoring of evaluation processes at the national level –** collection of information on evaluations carried out at the national level will allow to avoid carrying out similar evaluations at the regional and central level and will provide information about new sources of data which may be used in evaluations at the regional level;
* **Cooperation with the Central Statistical Office -** cooperation with the CSO will support the process of data collection for evaluation, also with regard to counterfactual evaluations (in particular in terms of selecting the units meeting the specific criteria);
* **Support for entities reporting data on the programme implementation -** technical support (i.a. user-friendly instructions) and thematic support (i.a. at consultation points) for entities reporting data to the local and central IT system will increase the likelihood of obtaining the appropriate quality data;

1. **Measures popularising evaluation practices**

* **Promoting evaluation practices in public institutions -** measures to increase interest in carrying out own evaluations at the level of individual institutions or projects will ensure access to results of individual analysis which, due to their details, could not be carried out as part of evaluation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020.

**Building evaluation capacity**

According to Art 49 CRP Member States are obliged to ensure appropriate capacity assessment.

According to the Commission's methodological manual EVALSED, building evaluation capacity occurs at many levels, including: individual (development of appropriate competencies and skills), organizational (design appropriate organizational structures and management), inter- organizational (strengthening the relationship between the public and private networks cooperation, procedures, partnerships) as well as general social (building public awareness of the evaluation)[[67]](#footnote-67). Many aspects of evaluation capacity makes the list of possibilities to take action in the direction of its development is very wide. What's more, these are the most common long-term measures and sometimes unspecified time. This makes the process of building a long-term evaluation capacity, and even infinite[[68]](#footnote-68) - it is a constant process of "learning" and improvement.

In 2007-2013, a number of actions were taken related to building evaluation capacity in the region. Maintained relationships with key national and regional institutions involved in the evaluation process (NEU), cared about the dissemination of evaluation results (conferences, sub-page on the program, training for MA and interested in the subject of beneficiaries), carried out actions for effective planning and monitoring of the process evaluation and implementation of the recommendations in the region. In order to increase the competence in the methodology of evaluation research, MA workers took an active part in the work conducted by the NEU.

2014-2020 programming period brings new challenges for the further development of evaluation capacity in the region. Commission guidelines[[69]](#footnote-69) indicate the need to include action to stimulate demand for research evaluation and supply institutions that could implement them. Also indicate the need for action in the field of extension evaluation practices in the region (eg, at the level of other institutions in the region), as well as better integration of evaluation processes of programming and program management support.

Taking into account the above recommendations, as well as previous experience of the region in building evaluation capacity, the actions undertaken in 2014-2020 will focus on the five main objectives:

**1) Ensuring adequate human resources and organizational solutions for the effective implementation of the evaluation process**

* **initiatives aimed at increasing the knowledge and competence of evaluation unit and other staff involved in the evaluation process** - training, workshops, conferences and other events to increase the team's ability to effectively and efficiently achieve its objectives, in particular in the context of increasing knowledge about the methodology of evaluation studies;
* **safeguarding the independence of the evaluation unit** - functionally independent evaluation unit implementing internal research and evaluation grants the outside;
* **cooperation in the framework of the Evaluation Steering Group** - a platform for cooperation between key stakeholders in the program that provides a constant flow of information and knowledge in the field of activities carried out within the framework of the evaluated operational programs and priority public actions undertaken in the region;
* **working with evaluation unit of other operational programs** - maintaining cooperation with representatives of regional and national evaluation units enabling a continuous exchange of ideas and experiences in the field of implementation of evaluation studies for their subsequent implementation in the region.

**2) Better organization and coordination of the evaluation process**

* **support from the Monitoring Committee of ROP K-PV 2014-2020** - cooperation with the Monitoring Committee will increase the quality and timely implementation of evaluation studies, which include current analysis of the progress of the plans and the results of evaluation studies, as well as monitoring the implementation of the partnership principle in the evaluation process;
* **cooperation with the National Evaluation Unit - cooperation will apply to both organizational and technical aspects related to the implementation of the evaluation process in the region, as well as substantive issues (such consultations evaluation plans, objects of the research);**
* **working with key public entities involved in the implementation of development policies** - a system of cooperation and information flow between the institutions involved in the processes of monitoring and evaluation of development activities at the country level and in the regions, including the Central Statistical Office, the Head Office of Geodesy and Cartography, National and Regional Territorial Development Observatory, Centre for Regional Studies and Regional Territorial Forum[[70]](#footnote-70).

**3) Stimulating demand for evaluation studies in the region**

* **Increase involvement of MA and IB employee in the planning process of evaluation studies** - current involvement in the programming process of evaluation of MA and IB employees in order to better adjust the scope of the research projects to the real needs of policy-makers and others involved in the program;
* **socialized planning process of the evaluation process** - the preparation and updating of the evaluation plan in consultation with the socio-economic partners, which will allow for better adaptation plans of evaluation research to the existing demand in the region (the principle of partnership).

**4) Stimulating the supply and provision of high -quality evaluation research**

* **cooperation with academic and expert** - increasing interest in issues of evaluation and cooperation with the scientific community in the planning of research projects will increase the chance of getting complete and correct results of evaluation studies; expert opinions will be helpful include the development methodology of the planned evaluation studies;
* **attention to the quality of the substantive content of the research evaluation -** precise and clear to define their expectations of the evaluation study in the contract, both the scope and the proposed methodological tools will increase the chance of doing high-quality research by an external evaluator;
* **reduction of the formal requirements for contractors evaluation studies** - to reduce the burden associated with the fulfilment of the formal tender requirements and focus on substantive and technical evaluation criteria open access to the tender new, qualified evaluators, will help to strengthen the merits of bids and increase the choice of the contractor;
* **active cooperation in the implementation of the external evaluation** - technical support evaluation studies carried out by the staff of the evaluation unit (through consultation among others, the scope of the study, research tools, methods, data analysis), will help to better focus the research process to achieve the aims of evaluation.

**5) Better use of the results of evaluation studies in the management and implementation of the program**

* **Check the status of implementation of recommendations** - monitoring of the implementation of new solutions in public institutions mobilize their representatives to work systematically and allow the current to solve emerging problems;
* **Working meetings of evaluators and representatives of institutions concerned recommendations** - Working meetings will be to discuss the results of the joint evaluation and planning of the implementation of recommendations, cost of consultancy services evaluator will be included earlier in the budgets for the implementation of individual studies.

Below we present a training plan for staff responsible for planning and implementation of the evaluation process of the program. The training plan should be consulted with a group of buyers and modified according to the needs reported by them.

**Plan of trainings for employees involved in the evaluation process**

| **No** | **Title/subject of training** | **Description/Main objective** | **Schedule** | | | | | | | | **Budget** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| 1 | Theory-based impact evaluation | * Increasing the competence in terms of evaluation methodology to improve the quality of planned evaluations and adjust them to the EU recommendations for the 2014-2020 programming period | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 000 |
| 2 | Use of counterfactual methods in evaluations | * Increasing the competence in terms of evaluation methodology to improve the quality of planned evaluations and adjust them to the EU recommendations for the 2014-2020 programming period | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 000 |
| 3 | Planning of evaluations using the public contract awarding procedures | * Developing common standards on planning of evaluations, preparing ToR and Detailed Description of the Subject of the Contract, including the evaluator selection criteria (taking into account the use of new methodological tools in evaluations); |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 000 |
| 4 | Data sources in evaluation and their use | * Extending the knowledge about the possibilities of using diversified sources to evaluate the programme; * Identification of data sources used in counterfactual evaluations; |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 000 |
| 5 | Meta-analyses and meta-evaluations | * Extending the knowledge on effective use of earlier studies (including evaluations); techniques of making meta-analyses and meta-evaluations |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |  | 7 000 |
| 6 | Complementarity of OP evaluations with evaluations concerning the development policy | * Joint adjustment of the plan of evaluation studies to the parallel evaluation process consisting in parallel evaluation of the development policy at the national level[[71]](#footnote-71) |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |  | 7 000 |
| 7 | Practical relationships between monitoring and evaluation | * Obtaining knowledge of the effective use of data acquired by the monitoring for the purposes of evaluation: both in the context of evaluation planning and implementing |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  | 4.000 |
| 8 | Efficient communication with beneficiaries | * Obtaining competence in cooperation, maintaining ongoing contact with beneficiaries and efficient provision of information services |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | 3 000 |
| 9 | Cooperation with the entity carrying out the evaluation of public intervention - Cooperation and participation in the evaluation process; Monitoring and assessment of evaluation | * Development of evaluation capacity in the public sector, in particular the ability to carry out evaluations taking into account the cooperation with the entity carrying out the evaluation - **advanced level** |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |  | 3 000 |
| 10 | Use of evaluation results and conclusions | * Designing the strategy of communicating the evaluation results to recipients * Use of conclusions and recommendations from evaluations |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 000 |
| 11 | Formative and summative evaluation | * To increase staff skills in the discrimination and skillful use of both types of evaluation * The use of lessons from formative evaluation for the purpose of summative evaluation |  |  |  |  |  |  | x |  | 3.000 |
| 12 | In-house evaluation - planning, performance, benefits | * Developing evaluation capacity in the public sector; * Increasing the competences in terms of in-house evaluation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | x | 3 000 |
| 13 | Presentation of the results of evaluations - best techniques | * Developing the presentation skills * Extending knowledge about best techniques of presenting the results of evaluations |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 000 |

**Methods of disseminating the results of evaluations**

Measures aimed at communicating the results of evaluations are also planned as part of the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 implementation. Pursuant to Article 47 of the CPR, all reports from evaluations must be made public and adequate actions must be taken to disseminate them.

In the years 2007-2013, knowledge and information about the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 evaluation were disseminated by such actions as organisation of thematic conferences after completion of key evaluations, moderation of a website on evaluation (www.mojregion.eu), organisation and participation in various initiatives related to evaluation process in the region and the country (i.a. conferences, meetings, trainings). The actions disseminating the results of evaluations are to be extended in the new programming period due to the increased use of the results of evaluations in the programming and implementation of operational programmes which is recommended by the European Commission.

The Commission guidelines state that an evaluation process needs to be user oriented from the beginning[[72]](#footnote-72). Actions must be aimed not only at adjusting the scope of evaluations to the needs of recipients but also to provide the obtained knowledge in the appropriate form. Measures aimed at communicating (disseminating) the results of evaluations will be targeted at the following groups presented in the table below.

**Recipients of measures aimed at disseminating the results of evaluations**

| **Symbol** | **Group** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **P** | Persons involved in the programming of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 | Persons making strategic decisions on programming public intervention under the programme |
| **R** | Representatives of public institutions to whom recommendations are addressed | Representatives of public institutions to whom recommendations formulated during evaluations are addressed |
| **B** | Beneficiaries and potential beneficiaries | Representatives of institutions implementing projects supported under the programme |
| **O** | Final project recipients | Persons who do not directly benefit from support under the programme, but benefit from the effects of implemented, supported projects |
| **E** | External evaluators, consultants | Employees of institutions which carry out evaluations |
| **A** | Analysts, researchers, scientific community | Representatives of the research sector specialising in particular in issuers related to regional policy and the areas supported under the programme |
| **S** | Society | Regional community, in particular persons who lack or have a limited knowledge about evaluation-related issues. |

**Methods of communication (dissemination) of the results of evaluations**

| **Communication channels** | **Description** | **Target group** | **Schedule** | | | | | | | | | **Budget** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| Organisation of meetings presenting the results of evaluations | Information meetings where the key results of evaluations will be presented. | Z, W, R, B, O, E, A, S |  |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x | 100 000 |
| Organisation of thematic conferences on evaluation | Thematic conferences where selected aspects of evaluation of public policies and support programmes in other regions, Poland and Europe will be discussed; preparation and provision of conference and follow-up materials publicising the evaluation process and results. | Z, W, R, B, O, E, A, S |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |  | x | 200 000 |
| Working meetings for employees of public institutions to whom recommendations are addressed | The aim of the working meetings will be to jointly discuss the results of evaluations and to plan the recommendation implementation process among the representatives of institutions implementing the programme, public institutions and evaluators. | R, E | Ongoing | | | | | | | | | 0 (advisory services included in the costs of evaluations) |
| Trainings for representatives of scientific community | Organisation of trainings on evaluation for representatives of scientific community from the region in order to raise their awareness, improve their knowledge and increase their interest in participation in evaluations of development policies implemented in the region. | A | x |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  | 25 000 |
| Working meetings with persons who decide about programming of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 | Ongoing provision of information about the results of evaluations to decision-makers will streamline the process of implementing the recommendations regarding public intervention under the programme (results of evaluation - identified problems - action). | Z |  | x |  | x |  | x |  | x |  | 30 000 |
| Publication of final reports from evaluations | Publishing paper and electronic publications presenting the results of conducted evaluations. | Z, W, R, B, O, E, A, S | Ongoing | | | | | | | | | 0  (as part of the costs of evaluations) |
| Publication of newsletters, brochures and other information materials presenting key data from evaluations | Presentation of key data from evaluations in user-friendly, visually attractive forms, e.g. infographics on the programme website, factsheets, newsletters, leaflets, etc.; materials presenting the effects of state aid. | R, B, O, E, A, S | Ongoing | | | | | | | | | 400 000 |
| Cooperation with local media to disseminate the results of evaluations | Provision of information about the results of evaluations via various media channels, local newspapers, radio or TV stations. | Z, W, R, B, O, E, A, S | Ongoing | | | | | | | | | 900 000 |
| Development of a subpage on evaluation on the website of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 | Subpage with up-to-date information about the programme evaluation process, including the current activities of the Evaluation Unit, evaluation plan, publication of final reports from evaluations as well as educational publications, etc. | Z, W, R, B, O, E, A, S | Ongoing | | | | | | | | | 15 000 (IT services related to development of a website) |

Source: Own study.

**Human resources for evaluation process**

Since pursuant to Article 44 of the CPR, the Managing Authority must submit annual reports on the key results of evaluations and progress towards implementing the evaluation plans, including implemented recommendations, appropriate human resources must be ensured to perform the tasks which are new compared to the current programming period.

Until now, the evaluation process in the region was coordinated by an evaluation unit created within the MA (from April 2009 - ROP Evaluation Bureau). The Evaluation Steering Group, consisting of representatives of the MA, the MC and domain experts[[73]](#footnote-73), provided substantive support for the evaluation unit. In addition, the Monitoring Committee for the Regional Operational Programme was entrusted with a task of supporting and monitoring ROP K-PV 2014-2020.[[74]](#footnote-74)

Since the requirements and the scope of activities related to coordination of the programme evaluation process have been extended, the team in charge of evaluation will most likely have to be extended compared to the number of persons performing similar functions in the previous programming period.

The list and tasks of main entities involved in the process of evaluation of the Regional Operational Programme for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship 2014-2020 at the regional level are presented below.

**Managing Authority of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 - Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship Board**

Evaluation of the Regional Operational Programme for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship 2014-2020 is the responsibility of the Managing Authority of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, and specifically the Evaluation Unit established within the MA which is responsible for evaluation of measures implemented under both ESF and ERDF.

Main tasks of the **Evaluation Unit**:

* Planning and coordination of the process of evaluation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 (including i.a. Evaluation Steering Group);
* Drawing up and updating of *Evaluation Plan for ROP K-PV 2014-2020;*
* Organisation and carrying out the evaluation process, cooperation with entities carrying out external evaluations;
* Cooperation with the National Evaluation Unit;
* Organisation of the system for collection and gathering of data necessary for evaluation;
* Carrying out the evaluations using accurate and advanced research methods (CIE, TBE and others);
* Active participation in the work of Task Forces established by the MA, whose aim is to develop methodology and perform cross-sectional studies in thematic areas;
* Animation and monitoring of the use of the results of evaluations concerning ROP K-PV 2014-2020, reporting of evaluation results to the European Commission, the Monitoring Committee and the National Evaluation Unit;
* Adjusting the programme evaluation system to the guidelines of the NEU, the European Commission and the recognised standards for structural funds evaluation;
* Dissemination of knowledge about the recognised evaluation standards for structural funds which are used in the European Union and Poland;
* Publication of the results of evaluations;
* Dissemination of knowledge and information about evaluations;
* Building evaluation capacity among institutions related to the programme evaluation process;

**Evaluation Steering Group**

The Evaluation Steering Group (ESG) will also participate in the programme evaluation process. Permanent members of the ESG will include: (i) employees of the Evaluation Unit, (ii) representatives of thematic departments of the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship Marshal's Office, (iii) representatives of institutions involved in the programme implementation; (iv) social partners, v) representatives of the Monitoring Committee, vi) representatives of scientific community, including specialist on designing the methodologies of evaluations, as well as (vii) representatives of the Regional Territorial Observatory; (viii) representatives of the Regional Territorial Forum. Furthermore, special Task Forces may be established for the purpose of carrying out specific evaluations.[[75]](#footnote-75).

The role of the Evaluation Steering Group is in particular to provide support to the Evaluation Unit in terms of:

* Identification of the subject of evaluations;
* Defining the scope of evaluations (including the subject of evaluations, main objective and specific objectives, research areas, evaluation questions);
* Defining the criteria of selecting the entity carrying out the evaluation and the criteria of assessing the bids submitted by bidders;
* Monitoring the progress of work of the Contractor with regard to the commissioned evaluation;
* Assessment of the evaluation products, including methodological reports, final or interim reports;
* Operationalization of conclusions and recommendations formulated by the Evaluator;
* Monitoring of the process of implementing the recommendations formulated as a result of evaluations;
* Issuing opinions on evaluation plans drawn up by the Evaluation Unit;
* Assistance in building the evaluation capacity.

**Monitoring Committee for ROP K-PV 2014-2020**

The Monitoring Committee for ROP K-PV 2014-2020 also participates in the evaluation process and performs the following functions:

* Approves the *Evaluation Plan for ROP K-PV 2014-2020* (at the first meeting) and approves the amendments to the *Evaluation Plan*;
* Monitors the Programme evaluation process;
* Recommends the areas to be evaluated under the Programme;
* Analyses the progress in implementation of plans and use of the results of evaluations;
* Monitors the observance of the partnership principle in the evaluation process.

## Index of references to European Commission’s requirements on the scope of ex-ante evaluation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lp. | The requirements of the European Commission. 55 proposal for a regulation of the General [[76]](#footnote-76) | Chapter | Pages in the report |
|  | Appraisal of the contribution to the Union strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, having regard to the selected thematic objectives and priorities, taking into account national and regional needs and potential for development as well as lessons drawn from previous programming periods | 6. ASSESSMENT OF THE OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME’S CONSISTENCY WITH EXTERNAL DOCUMENTS | 53-61 |
|  | Appraisal of the internal coherence of the proposed programme or activity and its relationship with other relevant instruments | 5. INTERVENTION LOGIC ASSESSMENT | 30-53 |
|  | Appraisal of the consistency of the allocation of budgetary resources with the objectives of the programme | 5.4 Method of applying the principle of thematic concentration | 44-46 |
|  | Appraisal of the consistency of the selected thematic objectives, the priorities and corresponding objectives of the programmes with the CSF, the Partnership Agreement and the relevant country specific recommendations adopted in accordance with Article 121(2) TFEU and where appropriate at national level, the National Reform Programme | 6. ASSESSMENT OF THE OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME’S CONSISTENCY WITH EXTERNAL DOCUMENTS | 53-61 |
|  | Appraisal of the relevance and clarity of the proposed programme indicators | 9.1 Assessment of adequacy of output and strategic result indicators | 71-72 |
|  | Appraisal of how the expected outputs will contribute to results | 5.2 Assessment of the impact of the Programme's implementation on the regional and national socio-economic situation | 34-40 |
|  | Appraisal of whether the quantified target values for indicators are realistic, having regard to the support envisaged from the ESI Funds | 9.1 Assessment of adequacy of output and strategic result indicators | 71-72 |
|  | Appraisal of the rationale for the form of support proposed | 5.7 Appropriateness of assumed forms of support – financial instruments | 52 |
|  | Appraisal of the adequacy of human resources and administrative capacity for management of the programme | 8. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION SYSTEM AND ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY | 64-71 |
|  | Appraisal of the suitability of the procedures for monitoring the programme and for collecting the data necessary to carry out evaluations | 9. EVALUATION OF THE ASSUMPTIONS OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION PROCESSES | 71-75 |
|  | Appraisal of the suitability of the milestones selected for the performance framework | 9.2 Assessment of the selection of indicators to evaluate the implementation of interim objectives (“milestones”) | 72 |
|  | Appraisal of the adequacy of planned measures to promote equal opportunities between men and women and to prevent any discrimination, in particular as regards accessibility for persons with disabilities | 7.2 Expected contribution of the operational programme to the implementation of horizontal policy objectives | 64 |
|  | Appraisal of the adequacy of planned measures to promote sustainable development | 7.2 Expected contribution of the operational programme to the implementation of horizontal policy objectives | 64 |
|  | Appraisal of measures planned to reduce the administrative burden on beneficiaries | 8.2 Assessment of the method of reducing administrative burdens for beneficiaries | 68-71 |

## Synthesis of the environmental impact assessment

Forecast on the environmental impact of the draft regional operational programme for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship for 2014-2020 (EIA forecast) was prepared by Agrotec Polska sp. z o.o. on commission of the OMKPV under agreement of 9 September 2013. Draft EIA forecast of November 2013 was analysed for the purposes of preparing EIA synthesis.

Conducting a synthesis of environmental impact assessment of the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, which includes the forecast, fulfils the legal requirement imposed by Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment and ensures compliance with the provisions of the Act of 3 October 2008 on the release of information about the environment and its protection, citizens’ participation in environmental protection and environmental impact assessments (Dz. U. [Journal of Laws] of 2008, No 199, item 1227, as amended).

**Finding of the EIA forecast**

Based on the assessment of potential impact of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 key environmental issues were identified in the following areas of the voivodeship:

**Water and wastewater management, including the quality of surface water and groundwater**

* Analyses of the watercourses flowing on the territory of Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivideship carried out in 2012 indicated that only 13% of points covered by the analysis can be classified as belonging to the 2nd class of purity. Low sanitary quality of water remains a constant problem – water in 2/3 of the points was contaminated with bacteria. This stems from the fact that the percentage of the population using the sewer network is too low;
* the percentage of population using the sewer network is too low (64.3%), but still higher than the national average (5th place in urban areas, 6th place in rural areas). 59% of the inhabitants of towns under 10 thousand p.e. use the sewer network (KPOŚK of 2011). There are too few wastewater treatment plants in towns under 2000 p.e. There is a need to raise public awareness with regard to water efficiency;
* The quality of watercourses, rivers and lakes in the voivodeship requires taking corrective actions in order to fulfil the requirements of the Water Framework Directive. Currently as many as 35 of 54 lakes and none of the 3 barrier reservoirs analysed are not compliant with the environmental objective established under the Water Framework Directive.

**Soil, natural resources and degraded land**

* The soil was found to be contaminated with polyaromatic hydrocarbons. In comparison with the results of studies carried out in 2001 and 2004, in the majority of analysed sections an increase in polyaromatic hydrocarbons content was observed;
* Rehabilitation of degraded and devastated land was deemed necessary.

**Flood and water deficit risk**

* The flood risk is present mainly in the area of Wisła, Drwęca and Noteć valley, but also locally in cities in which local flooding occurs due to violent atmospheric precipitation. Particular concerns in this regard are related to the technical condition of the dam in Włocławek and deteriorating quality of flood protection infrastructure (floodbanks, sluices, etc.).

**Ambient air, including RES and sustainable transport**

* According to the classification of ambient air quality for the protection of human health carried out in 2012, all 4 zones in the voivodeship (Bydgoszcz agglomeration, Toruń municipality, Włocławek municipality and Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship zone) were included in the unfavourable class C (concentration of pollutants above limit values plus margin of tolerance). Registered values of PM10 concentration indicate that this negative trend is worsening. Measurements proved that PM2.5 concentrations did not exceed the standardized value. Similarly as in the case of PM10 the highest concentrations – two, or even three times higher – were observed during winter;
* The data presented by the Inspectorate of Environmental Protection indicate that the number of complaints about excessive noise has kept increasing during the past few years – this concerns mainly traffic and road noise, which is obviously caused by dynamic growth of the automotive industry.

**Waste management**

* Waste is still being uncontrollably fed into the environment (not all inhabitants of the voivodeship are covered by the organised waste collection scheme). The level of the indicator related to selective collection of communal waste also needs to be increased (despite its growth from 4.9% in 2007 to 9.6% in 2010);
* Low level of public awareness about the issues related to waste management constitutes another problem;
* The share of biodegradable communal waste deposited in waste disposal sites is too high;
* The draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 does not include activities provided for under IP 6.1. There is a need to satisfy significant need in the field of investments in the waste management sector, which seems to be important due to the necessity to fulfil the obligations of the EU Directive 2008/98/EC.

**Nature protection, Natura 2000 and biodiversity**

* In Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship there are favourable conditions for the development of alternative energy industry on the basis of RES, such as: wind and water energy, biomass and biofuels. From the Natura 2000 areas perspective significant impact may be related with supporting activities in the field of building and modernising transport infrastructure.

Identification of expected impacts on specific components of the environment constituted one of the elements of analyses carried out under EIA forecast. Analysis and assessment of individual axes, objectives and measures did not point to a possible emergence of a significant negative and long-term impact, the scope of which would be large enough to materially and permanently deteriorate the status of any component of the environment.Negative impact will be mostly of temporary nature (during implementation of the investment). All activities related to the construction of the new infrastructure will have a short-term negative impact on the environment (e.g. emission of particulate matter during construction, increased car traffic. Negative impacts may also emerge in the social and economic context. Since human being is an integral and the most important element of the environment, all planned activities focus on improving the quality of his life in the surrounding environment.

It is considered that the implementation or ROP K-PV 2014-2020 will generally have a positive impact on the environment. Possible negative impacts will only occur in the case of PAs under which large investments related to the development of infrastructure will be carried out:

* **PA 4. Energy efficiency and low carbon economy in the region** in the form of pollutants infiltration at the stage of construction, land drainage, difficulties related to noise and dust emission during the implementation of investment, scaring birds whose habitats are frequently located in cracks in the buildings; possible negative impact may occur due to inappropriate designation of routes, e.g. in the vicinity or through urban protected areas and green areas; at the stage of conducting relevant works there may be instances of bird scaring and trees and bushes felling (e.g. scaring birds and bats on their flight routes – windfarms; risk of destroying or bricking in the birds and bats habitats during energy renovation of buildings); dust emission during renovation and construction works; formation of waste from construction;
* **PA 5. Adaptation to climate change** – possible negative impact on all components of the environment, depending on the type of investment at the stage of construction; relates to investments targeting particular types of risk, ensuring resistance to natural disasters and concerning systems of managing natural disasters;
* **PA 7. Internal cohesion and external accessibility of the region** – possible negative impact in the form of: direct destruction of habitats, fragmentation of natural habitats, creating barriers and breaking ecological corridors, altering the way in which the animals use a given space, synanthropisation, spreading ecologically and geographically alien species along the road, mortality rate of animals on the road, the need to carry out felling of trees and bushes, spills of oil into watercourses, presence of salts, risks related to natural disasters, changes in water conditions, soil pollution, landscape alterations during the course of investment, risk of polluting the earth layer when transporting dangerous substances (e.g. due to malfunction during the transport of such substances), growth in extraction of raw construction materials; in the case of proximity to road investments this may be related to higher level of dust emissions and higher degree of dust sedimentation on monuments, as well as greater exposure to vibration and noise (impact on construction works);
* **PA 12. ERDF territorial policy** – possible negative impact in the form of: difficulties caused by noise and dust emissions during exploitation of RES infrastructure, transformation of the soil profile and restriction of the surface area of soil due to construction of sewer network and water distribution network, creation of landmasses serving no purpose in a given location, removal of trees and bushes in the course of investment, formation of waste from construction, growth in extraction of raw construction materials due to investments in the water economy sector, exhaust gases emissions during construction (construction vehicles and machinery), noise emission during construction, scaring birds in the areas where investments are implemented, causing mechanical damage to plant life, felling trees and bushes in the course of investment implementation;
* **PA 14. Community led local development** – possible negative impact in the form of: scaring animals in the areas where investments are implemented, transformation of the soil profile and restriction of the surface area of soil as a consequence of investment implementation, creation of landmasses serving no purpose in a given location, removal of trees and bushes in the course of investment, formation of waste from construction, emission of noise and exhaust gases during works.

**Proposed solutions to prevent, mitigate or compensate for negative environmental impacts**

In the overwhelming majority of cases, the implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 will contribute to environmental protection and achievement of positive ecological effects (usually indirectly, with effects visible in a longer perspective). In order to reduce the expected negative environmental impacts to the minimum, appropriate technical and technological solutions should be adopted to avoid any negative environmental impact of the projects and the deterioration of the environment:

* **Administrative solutions**

The solutions focus on the quality of measures implemented by the local government administration which should take into account the environmental protection principles (in particular adoption of an appropriate approach to spatial planning in gminas and recommended use of the best available techniques);

* **Organisational and technical solutions**

Various organisational and technical solutions may be applied in projects implemented within the adopted framework determined by the administrative system, e.g. use of various project implementation variants, adoption of specific technical solutions. Technical solutions should be appropriately selected to reduce negative environmental impacts to the minimum. Therefore, appropriate technologies (low-carbon, low-waste, water, materials and energy efficient) must be used. Compensatory measures may prove to be necessary in the case of projects under PA 7 Internal cohesion and external accessibility of the region.

**Alternative solutions with regard to solutions in ROP K-PV 2014-2020**

At the current stage of the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 evaluation, only some assumptions can be made regarding the nature of the planned measures. The expected negative impacts identified based on the said assumptions require alternative solutions to be determined for the following axes:

**PA 4. Energy efficiency and low-carbon economy in the region**

The list of entities eligible for co-financing under PA 4 should be extended. Currently potential beneficiaries include only the following entities: enterprises, local government units, their unions and associations, the State Forests National Forest Holding and organisational units operating on their behalf. They should also include the following: regional water management boards, higher education institutions, associations/communities, national and landscape parks. As regards the projects consisting in building installations for production of biocomponents and biofuels and construction/modernisation of facilities producing equipment using RES, the support for such projects under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 should be granted at the very beginning of its implementation. This will allow to create capacity to support other projects implemented by entities producing energy from RES and entities responsible for such energy transmission in order to achieve an additional synergy and complementarity effects in terms of support for using RES. The projects to be implemented should include support for building of installations for production of second-generation biocomponents and biofuels.

**PA 6. Environmentally friendly region**

Due to the high value of tourist assets of the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship and the high number of tourists visiting the landscape parks, particular support should be provided for other forms of tourism than mass tourism under the Programme.

**PA 7. Internal cohesion and external accessibility of the region**

An appropriate approach to the transport policy of the region should be adopted under PA 7. The management of the demand for transport may be supported by developing compact city forms, appropriate development of suburban and rural areas and, in particular, by improving the availability of basic public services in local centres.

The problems identified based on the diagnosis of the region cannot be addressed other than through support areas defined in the Programme. It must be emphasized that individual priority axes and support areas under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 are the most appropriate from the point of view of environmental protection (it is difficult to identify other, i.e. more environmentally friendly, solutions under the Programme).

**Opinion of competent authorities for the Environmental Report**

During the EIA process, the required opinions of competent authorities were obtained pursuant to the regulations on the provision of information about the environment and its protection, participation of the society in environmental protection and environmental impact assessments. Detailed comments submitted by the Regional Directorate for Environmental Protection in Bydgoszcz were taken into account.

**Comments and conclusions from public consultation**

Public consultation on the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 along with the SEIA took place between 7 November and 17 December 2013. The comments concerning its further specification, more precise formulation and appropriate terminology, submitted during the public consultation, were included in the Environmental Report.

**Results of the procedure concerning cross-border environmental impact**

. The analysis of the provisions of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 found that the measures provided for in the Programme should not have any negative impacts outside the Polish borders. Potential cross-border impacts of the measures under individual investment priorities of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 depend on the location and nature of individual investments. In justified cases (nature of investment), the support areas under the Programme will be subject to separate environmental impact assessment procedures. During the environmental impact assessment, particular attention should be paid to projects located near the borders of the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship and to projects which may generate significant cross-border impacts at a considerable distance from the investment location. Potential consequences of the entire Programme implementation will not be cross-border within the meaning of Article 58 of the Environmental Law Act. None of the support areas under ROP K-PV 2014-2020 entails a risk of negative cross-border impacts. The evaluation did not find any possible accumulated cross-border impacts which may result from aggregated impacts of the Programme.

**Proposed methods and frequency of monitoring of the effects of implementing the Environmental Report provisions**

Under ROP K-PV 2014-2020, environmental indicators were defined in the areas concerning environmental protection, mainly under PA 5 and PA 6.

As regards environmental indicators used in PA 5, the proposed indicators refer to all specific objectives of the axis. Due to the problem with air quality protection in the region (the risk of exceeding the PM10 and B(a)P limits, surface emission), monitoring of the reduction of the carbon dioxide emissions should also include monitoring of the PM10 and B(a)P reduction.

As regards environmental indicators used in PA 6, the proposed indicators refer to environmental objectives and also take into account the problems relating to the analysed components of the environment, i.a. climate change, natural disasters (floods).

It is of utmost importance to include sustainable development indicators in ROP K-PV 2014-2020. From the point of view of environmental protection, the most important indicators are those assessing the resources of the environment and the quality of its individual components, e.g. air, soil and water. In order to determine the dynamics of changes, indicators presenting the changes in air quality, waste management and water and sewage management are required. The adopted monitoring system is consistent with the provisions of strategic documents at the national level, such as NSRD. The analyses should be performed at least once a year.

The existing monitoring data (official statistics, available data, and reports) should be used in ROP K-PV 2014-2020. They will allow to monitor the changes in the environment indirectly (also in terms of their environmental and spatial consequences).

Sustainable development indicators were included in the Programme (they refer to i.a. social, economic, environmental and institutional and political governance). However, indicators collected from several sources, based on available official statistics, should be used in project monitoring, for example, indicators monitoring greenhouse gas emissions by sectors of the economy in the region (in thousand tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent) in relation to e.g. the number of entities operating in the region and generated GDP.

To fully assess the environmental impact of the analysed document, the list of indicators should be extended to include indicators combining the assessment of obtained effects related to local development with environmental effects. The indicators assessing the condition of the environment will be included in the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 specification.

## Description of the scope and method of taking into account the conclusions and recommendations of the ex ante evaluation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020

1. **DESCRIPTION OF THE STAGES OF THE EVALUATION**

The ex-ante evaluation of the Programme was performed in parallel with its preparation, during the creation of the EU and national legal basis for operational programming, forming the final versions of the main strategic documents. These circumstances significantly conditioned analysis, both the team preparing the Programme and the team carrying out the evaluation.

The research was divided into 3 modules:

1. Evaluation of Programme internal accuracy and consistency,
2. Evaluation of Programme external accuracy and consistency,
3. Evaluation of Programme implementation system.

In accordance with the recommendations for the ex ante evaluation[[77]](#footnote-77) Managing Authorities had the option to apply one of the approaches to the ex-ante evaluation because of the way of implementation:

* Traditional - evaluation of the operational programme conducted after the completion of work on the draft programme,
* Participatory - evaluation conducted in parallel with the process of programming.

The Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship Board decided to choose the participatory model, which means parallel conducting the process of programming and the evaluation.

The purpose of the evaluation team was to support the team preparing the Regional Operational Programme 2014-2020 and the preparation of conclusions and recommendations, which took the form of proposals for changes in the programme, which consequently improved the quality of the programme. The process of evaluation includes both changing national conditions and related to the Structural Funds Regulations related to the process of negotiations.

Mainly desk research methods were applied: literature review and a review of research and evaluation results used for all evaluation modules. In addition, the methodology included quantitative (interwievs), qualitative (quantitative study covering potential institutional beneficiaries of ROP K-PV 2014-2020) and expert methods (Delphi research).

1. **SUMMARY RESULTS OF EVALUATION of the 2nd VERSION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME**
   1. **Assessment of the Diagnosis**

The diagnosis was assessed as adequate and based on reliable sources and appropriately selected data. It describes the key information focused on the areas targeted by the public intervention proposed in the program.The ex ante evaluation revealed it was justified to take up intervention in individual Investment Priorities (IP) within the scope of the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020. As to priority axes (PA), the proposed measures are adequate and the majority of them largely responds to the diagnosed problems and socio-economic challenges of the region. There are, however, several areas that require modification.

* 1. **External Consistency**

A high degree of consistency with regional, national and EU strategic documents was ensured in the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 projects. The assessed ROP K-PV 2014-2020 project is consistent with the Europe 2020 strategy and the Common Strategic Framework (CSF), as well as the national (National Strategy for Regional Development) and regional strategies (Development Strategy for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship). But it was pointed to the lack of a separate section devoted to the external consistency.

* 1. **The intervention logic and internal coherence**

Based on the analysis of the Investment Priorities under which Thematic objectives will be implemented, and based on the analysis of socio-economic theories and empirical evidence, it is concluded that the proposed intervention logic will contribute to achieving the planned development objectives. Specific objectives for individual IPs contribute to achievement of the Programme objective. The direction of changes has been defined correctly, it is consistent with the diagnosed trends. Yet, the objectives have been formulated with some inconsistencies, as some of the objectives fail to reflect the effects of measures but the processes that are supposed to lead to the effects. It is also recommended to change the main objective of the Programme, to further emphasize the orientation program to improve the quality of life of residents.

* 1. **Assessment of the Monitoring System and Evaluation of the Operational Programme**

The operational programme’s assumptions enable efficient and effective implementation of monitoring and evaluation processes. The draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 presents a list of strategic output and result indicators (ERDF) and long-term result indicators (ESF), although not for all axes. In the majority of cases, the indicators have been selected correctly and they comply with MID recommendations. Yet, not all basis and target values of these indicators have been defined. The selection and values of milestones are also missing. Preliminary concept of the process of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 evaluation was prepared, which will serve as the basis for drafting the *Evaluation Plan for Regional Operational Programme for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship 2014-2020* by the Managing Authority.

* 1. **Assessment of the Planned Conditions for Implementing the Programme**

The institutional capacity and human resources of institutions involved in implementation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 was assessed. It is correct that it provides basic information on major entities involved in ROP K-PV 2014-2020 implementation and their tasks. In connection with the planned changes to the structure of the implementation of the new program (aggregation of tasks in OMKPV without implementing institutions), the report of the ex-ante evaluation shows the strengths and weaknesses of the new system and the opportunities and risks that are associated with it. It is correct that the Programme includes the chapter focused on reducing the administrative burden on beneficiaries. The proposed provisions of the Template... have been used.

* 1. **Assessment of horizontal policy objectives**

Analysis of the adequacy of implementation of horizontal objectives at the level of programming confirmes that the Programme is supposed to contribute to achieving horizontal objectives of Europe 2020 strategy: the principle of sustainable development, the principle of equal opportunities and gender equality.

1. **KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN 2.0 AND 3.0 VERSIONS OF THE PROGRAMME:**
   1. **Assessment of the relevance of the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020 in relation to socio-economic challenges and needs:** The main difference between version 2.0 and 3.0 in terms of the diagnosis of socio-economic challenges and needs as described in the draft Programme is their classification according to thematic objectives, as well as the inclusion in Section 1 of all elements of the diagnosis and their deletion from Section 2, i.e. the description of priority axes. The diagnosis in each area was supplemented with a summary of the region’s challenges and needs pursuant to the diagnosis. The fact that the diagnosis’s volume has been reduced should be assessed positively: data pertaining to the identification of needs and challenges has remained, while some lengthy factual parts have been removed. Descriptions of the areas that shall not benefit directly from the Programme have been abbreviated, for example the key trends in agriculture of Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship and Poland in general, tourism and demography. The part of the diagnosis devoted to the territorial approach (intervention in areas with specific geographical features) was modified and adapted to the new form of priority axes (inclusion of an integrated territorial approach within the eight axes instead of separating them).

References to specific recommendations regarding Section 1 of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 and formulated following the ex ante evaluation are outlined in the table below.

* 1. **Intervention logic assessment:** Comments on intervention logic in the following areas have been taken into account: demarcation between individual Investment Priorities; detailing and assigning particular types of operations to specific objectives. A sequence allowing the representation of cause and effect mechanisms between different types of operations and objectives reached as a consequence was applied. Specific goals and the main objective of the Programme were reformulated, so as to present the expected vector of change in the region brought about by the intervention. However, recommendations relating to an increase of resources in the area of ​​small retention (IP 5.2) and a reduction of allocations for measures of low durability in health programmes (IP 8.10) were not applied, and consequently any qualitative change in the region’s situation will be less visible. The question of employment effectiveness in the risk area has been left in the IP 8.7 without a clear demarcation line between the system of subsidies and the use of repayable instruments.
  2. **Assessment of the coherence of the operational programme with external documents**: During the evaluation process, subsequent versions of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 were compared to the most important documents and strategies on the international, national and regional level. The result of each assessment was a series of recommendations aimed at achieving the fullest possible compliance of the provisions of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 with the analysed documents.

In terms of implementing recommendations, one should distinguish between two issues. When it comes to specific provisions, version 3.0. of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 is certainly more in line with the provisions of the analysed documents (e.g. in terms of the range of activities undertaken and reasons stated). What is missing is a separate section in which to outline the external coherence, i.e. consistency with key European strategic documents and consistency with national and regional documents.

* 1. **Assessment of the inclusion of the objectives of horizontal policies into the operational programme**: Horizontal policy objectives have been appropriately taken into account. As compared to the previous version of the programme, methods of monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the objectives and types of operations used to achieve the objectives of each horizontal rule, as well as target groups, have been outlined.
  2. **Assessment of the implementation system and the administrative capacity**: In ROP K-PV 2014-2020, the implementation system and the analysis of measures aimed at reducing the administrative burden for beneficiaries have been described appropriately. Recommendations from the ex ante evaluation relating to the analysis of the administrative capacity of the MA of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 remain in force; even though they will not translate into the programme’s content, they will need to be taken into account to ensure the efficiency of the programme’s implementation. Given that the Programme does not provide for the assignment of any tasks to intermediate bodies, it is necessary to optimize employment and complex MA structures to adapt them to new tasks.
  3. **Evaluation of the principles of monitoring and assessment processes**: As compared to the provisions of version 2.0. of ROP K-PV 2014-2020, version 3.0. is much closer to the provisions of the *Template of Operational Programme 2014-2020 in Poland with a Commentary*, taking into account many of the recommendations made by the Evaluator. It is worth noting that any information that went beyond the recommended template has been removed. In the current version, this section is more focused on the commitments set for the MA to ensure that it manages and implements the Programme properly.

**Table 1: Taking into account the conclusions and recommendations of the ex ante evaluation of ROP K-PV 2014-2020**

| **No** | **Conclusion** | **Recommendation** | **Type of recommendation** | **Scope and method of considering conclusions and recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Selected issues were described in the diagnosis in an unsatisfactory manner. | The diagnosis should be supplemented in line with specific recommendations presented in chapter 4.2 Accuracy of interventions in the context of socio-economic diagnosis (table 1). | operational |  |
|  | **PA 1. Building innovation of the region through R&D activity of enterprises**  **Problem**: Poor links of the enterprise sector with the science sector and related absence of systemic solutions aimed at supporting the innovation and technology transfer system.  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis justifies the problem to an insufficient extent. | **Justification:** ROP K-PV 2014-2020 mentions this topic only briefly, not providing specific figures, description of its dynamics, etc.  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis to address this problem; it is recommended to use relevant sources and information that have not been included in the diagnosis for the STOW analysis. |  | **Recommendation partially taken into account**.  The description of the issue has been extended, although only a small number of figures have been added to the diagnosis. In addition, the diagnosis was largely limited to cross-sectional data, which prevents any conclusions about the dynamics of changes in the analysed area from being drawn. |
|  | **PA 2. Digital region**  **Problem:** Low ICT use by enterprises, which manifests as low share of telework in the structure of employment and a low share of commercial transactions carried out using ICT (e-commerce).  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis describes/justifies the problem to an insufficient extent. | **Justification:** The description of PA 2 mentions the problem only briefly; no confirmation of its existence has been provided (data, study results, etc.).  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis with thematic data to substantiate the identified problem; data (e.g. from the CSO) should be presented at the regional level (the data given, if any, are national aggregates). |  | **Recommendation taken into account**.  The diagnosis was completed with thematic data on the regional level. |
|  | **PA 2. Digital region**  **Problem:** Relatively low digitisation rate of the economy and society, which manifests primarily in low level of development of e-education, e-health and e-government.  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis describes/justifies the problem to an insufficient extent. | **Justification:** The description of PA 2 mentions the problem only briefly; no confirmation of its existence has been provided (data, study results, etc.).  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis with thematic data to substantiate the identified problem; data (e.g. from the CSO) should be presented at the regional level (the data given, if any, are national aggregates). |  | **Recommendation not taken into account**.  Even though the problem was previously outlined in the description of Axis 2, neither the current description of the Axis nor the section of the diagnosis devoted to information society contain any references to it. |
|  | **PA 3. Strengthening the competitiveness of the economy of the region**  **Problem**: Difficulties faced by entrepreneurs in obtaining external capital.  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all. | **Recommendation:** The diagnosis and the SWOT analysis should be supplemented with the description from page 151 of the 2013 Agrotec report. It mentions adaptability of entrepreneurs, including lack of knowledge on external sources of financing of operations. |  | **Recommendation taken into account**.  Among entrepreneurship challenges and needs, ​recapitalization of the assets of SMEs has been referred to. In the new ROP, TO1 and TO3 interventions have been combined into one PA - Increasing the innovation and competitiveness of the region's economy. The description of the axis has been supplemented and it has been indicated that one of the main barriers to the development of entrepreneurship is the lack of equity capital necessary for starting a company and the early stages of its operation. |
|  | **PA 3. Strengthening the competitiveness of the economy of the region**  **Problem**: Poor development of agri-food processing (with high agricultural output – disproportionately small food production).  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis describes the problem to an insufficient extent. | **Justification:** The chapter on industry provides information on the food industry and the threat of insufficient use of its potential. There is no information on disproportionately low food production compared with agricultural output (Michna, W. ed. (2007) *Evaluation of the impact of food sector development on lines of modernisation of agricultural holdings in individual regions*, Institute of Agricultural and Food Economics; report entitled *Opportunities, threats and potential lines of development of rural areas in Poland at the regional level*, FAPA, Agrotec Polska sp. z o.o., Warsaw 2012).  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis and the SWOT analysis. |  | **Recommendation partially taken into account.**  The diagnosis was not completed with additional descriptions of the problem of poor state of development of the food processing industry. However in the description of the axis regarding IP 3.2 it is stated that aid shall also be granted to support international economic cooperation of enterprises (including agri-food producers). Description in the diagnosis has not been supplemented. |
|  | **PA 3. Strengthening the competitiveness of the economy of the region**  **Problem**: Limited knowledge of entrepreneurs on support offered by BEIs.  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all. | **Justification:** The diagnosis describes the benefits of support offered by BEIs, but it does not address the problem which consists in limited knowledge of entrepreneurs on support offered by BEIs.  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis and SWOT analysis with information from chapter „Using BEI offer by enterprises,” p. 33 from the *Operating model of business environment institutions that stimulates innovative cooperation of enterprises in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*. The source says that: only 8% of entrepreneurs used BEI, 46% declared they have never heard of BEI, 5% cooperated with BEIs.  **Source:** Brussa A., Tarnawa A. (eds.), *Report on the condition of the SME sector in Poland*, Warsaw 2011, Toruńska Agencja Rozwoju Regionalnego S.A., *Operating model of business environment institutions that stimulates innovative cooperation of enterprises in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*.  *Analysis of support for entrepreneurship under Regional Operational Programme for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship 2007-2013*, Agrotec Polska sp. z o.o., May 2013. |  | **Recommendation not taken into account.**  The diagnosis does not point to the problem of entrepreneurs’ limited knowledge of the potential support offered by BEI. |
|  | **PA 3. Strengthening the competitiveness of the economy of the region**  **Problem**: Absence of a well worked out and permanent structure and practices of cooperation of R&D units with BEIs and the SME sector.  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all. | **Justification:** The diagnosis describes the benefits of support offered by BEIs, but it does not address the practical problems with cooperation.  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis and SWOT analysis with information from chapter „Relationships between business environment institutions,” p. 22 from the *Operating model of business environment institutions that stimulates innovative cooperation of enterprises in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*.  The situation in terms of cooperation varies, entrepreneurs are aware BEIs exist, but cooperation has no consolidated form.  **Source:** Brussa A., Tarnawa A. (eds.), Report on the condition of the SME sector in Poland, Warsaw 2011.  Toruńska Agencja Rozwoju Regionalnego S.A., *Operating model of business environment institutions that stimulates innovative cooperation of enterprises in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*. |  | **Recommendation partially taken into account.**  The ROP does not refer to the lack of a permanent structure and cooperation practices of RDU with BEI and the SME sector. According to the guidelines of MID on the compatibility of the operational programme with the PA (8 January 2014) under the TO3, IP 3.4 can be supported only by specialized BEI services. |
|  | **PA 3. Strengthening the competitiveness of the economy of the region**  **Problem**: Small interest of companies in cooperation with other companies and BEIs**.**  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all. | **Justification:** The benefits of cooperation have been described, but the problem of lack of interest has not been addressed.  **Recommendation:**It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis and SWOT analysis with information from chapters „Using BEI offer by enterprises,” p. 33 and “Innovation and cooperation of enterprises in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship” from the *Operating model of business environment institutions that stimulates innovative cooperation of enterprises in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*. Study results confirm that BEIs cooperate with each other to a limited extent. Only 8% of entrepreneurs have cooperated with BEIs, 20% with chambers of commerce and science and technology parks *in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*. In 2008-2010, 5.6% of industrial enterprises and 2.1% of service sector enterprises started cooperation in the field of innovative activity.  **Source:** Toruńska Agencja Rozwoju Regionalnego S.A., *Operating model of business environment institutions that stimulates innovative cooperation of enterprises in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*. |  | **Recommendation taken into account**.  The diagnosis pointed to statistical data regarding enterprise collaboration (p. 12). |
|  | **PA 3. Strengthening the competitiveness of the economy of the region**  **Problem**: Unfavourable situation in terms of cluster development in the region.  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all. | **Justification:** ROP K-PV 2014-2020 provides only information on the need to develop cooperation with clusters, but their current situation on the market has not been described.  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis and SWOT analysis with information from the study by Toruńska Agencja Rozwoju Regionalnego S.A.  Cooperation in the framework of clusters is poor compared to Poland as a whole. The 2012 benchmarking exercise, based on recognisability in the media and strategy analysis, showed that only the Bydgoszcz Industrial Cluster is worth a mention. In 2011, Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship had the lowest percentage of industrial enterprises cooperating in clusters (6.5% against 12.4% nationwide, and 8.1% nationwide in 2010).  Apart from Dolnośląskie, Lubuskie and Opolskie Voivodeships, Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship is also the one with almost no service enterprises present in clusters (in 2010 only 4.8% of service enterprises participated in cluster initiatives). When all enterprises in the region are concerned, only 5.6% of industrial enterprises and 2% of service enterprises cooperated in the field of innovative activity. Of these, only 8% participated in clusters, which stands for 0.5% of enterprises in the region.[[78]](#footnote-78)  **Source:** Toruńska Agencja Rozwoju Regionalnego S.A., *Operating model of business environment institutions that stimulates innovative cooperation of enterprises in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*, 2010.  *Analysis of support for entrepreneurship under Regional Operational Programme for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship 2007-2013*, Agrotec Polska sp. z o.o., May 2013. |  | **Recommendation partially taken into account.**  Among the challenges and needs in the domain of ​​entrepreneurship, increased cooperation between companies is stressed (e.g. clusters). The description has not been supplemented with references to the current situation of clusters in the region. |
|  | **PA 4. Energy efficiency and low-carbon economy in the region**  **Problem**: Absence of modern innovative energy generation technologies (including RES).  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all. | **Justification:** The description of the voivodeship’s situation in terms of renewable energy generation consists only of a brief description of its position where energy generation from renewable sources as compared to other regions is concerned, with no mention of the diagnosed problems in this thematic area.  **Recommendation:** The diagnostic part should be supplemented with a description/analysis of problems related to RES in the voivodeship. |  | **Recommendation taken into account**.  Recommendations have been taken into account. The diagnosis was supplemented with both figures and an analysis of problems due to RES in the voivodeship. |
|  | **PA 4. Energy efficiency and low-carbon economy in the region**  **Problem**: Energy loss and use by SMEs.  **Conclusion:** One of the investment priorities is IP 4.2 Promoting energy efficiency and RES use in enterprises, but the problem to which this IP responds has not been described in the diagnosis. | **Justification:** Like in the previous case, it is an irregularity not to provide reference to the problems observed in the voivodeship which relate to this thematic area.  **Recommendation:** The diagnostic part should be supplemented with a description/analysis of problems related to RES in the voivodeship, especially as the planned actions (here: specific objective and IP) seem to respond directly to the problem. |  | **Recommendation not taken into account**.  The diagnosis refers to energy consumption in the industrial sector, although it does not include a thorough description of issues related to energy loss and consumption by the region’s SMEs, or any data on the subject, even though the problem has been addressed in IP 4.2. |
|  | **PA 4. Energy efficiency and low-carbon economy in the region**  **Problem**: Energy intensive public and housing sector.  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all. | **Justification:** The diagnosis does not address the problem even though IP 4.3 provides support for energy efficiency and use of renewable energy sources in public buildings and in the housing sector.  **Recommendation:** The diagnostic part should be supplemented with a description of current problems in the field of low-carbon economy and RES in the voivodeship. |  | **Recommendation taken into account**.  Basic data regarding energy consumption in the public sector and housing has been pointed out, together with its variability over time. |
|  | **PA 5. Adaptation to climate change**  **Problem**: Insufficient equipment of emergency services.  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all. | **Justification:** ROP K-PV 2014-2020 only provides information on the need to carry out measures to address the problem. Yet, the problem as such has not been defined.  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis and SWOT analysis with relevant fragments from the report *Status of flood control measures in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship*, Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship Land Improvement and Water Infrastructure Board, Włocławek 2011.  The report provides information on the significance of emergency services to flood control. |  | **Recommendation partially taken into account.**  The diagnosis does not refer to the problem of inadequate equipment of emergency services and does not associate this issue with the description of support under IP 5.2., i.e. equipping emergency service personnel and purchasing emergency response systems (Axis 6 Environmentally friendly region). |
|  | **PA 6. Environmentally friendly region**  **Problem**: Increased pressure on natural resources and biodiversity.  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all. | **Justification:** The diagnosis only provides information on natural resources. It does not describe the condition of the resources, nor does it mention the problem of increased pressure on natural resources and biodiversity.  **Recommendation:** The threat is mentioned in the environmental report, so it is recommended to supplement the diagnosis with the information.  The problem has been presented in the chapter of the environmental report (*Environmental report on the “Development Strategy for Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship by 2020,”*October 2013, Agrotec Polska sp. z o.o.) that covers threats – they will intensify if adequate actions are not taken. Failure to take actions to strengthen natural resources and biodiversity (recultivation, land restoration, restoring habitats, restitution of native plant and animal species, reconstruction of populations at risk of extinction) will result in greater pressure on these components of nature. |  | **Recommendation taken into account**.  In the description of the new Priority Axis 4 it has been indicated that actions undertaken shall result in an improved protection of natural resources​ and, at the same time, help attract visitors to these areas. The diagnosis was completed with statistical data on the environment and natural resources. |
|  | **PA 11. Cohesive society and competitive human resources – ERDF**  **Problem**: Insufficient educational infrastructure of general and vocational schools.  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all.  **Recommendation**: It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis with shortages of didactic and educational infrastructure. | **Recommendation:**  It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis.  **Source:** Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship Programme for Social Economy for 2013-2020 – draft. |  | **Recommendation partially taken into account**.  The above problem has not been outlined in the diagnosis. The description of the PA pointed to the relationship between improved education and interest in sciences on the one hand, and investment in education infrastructure on the other hand. |
|  | **PA 11. Cohesive society and competitive human resources – ERDF**  **Problem**: The need for expanding the infrastructure of existing social enterprises.  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all. | **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis with a mention of the need for infrastructural support for SEE, for example in connection with the plans to entrust them with the tasks of the social services sector intended for support under Priority Axis 9. |  | **Recommendation taken into account**.  The problem has not been outlined. It is also not addressed in IP 9.3. |
|  | **PA 12. Territorial policy – ERDF**  **Problem:** Low energy efficiency of public utility buildings and residential buildings and the associated problem of air pollution.  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis does not address the problem at all. | **Justification:** The diagnosis does not address the problem even though IP 4.3 provides support for energy efficiency and use of renewable energy sources in public buildings and in the housing sector.  **Recommendation:** The diagnostic part should be supplemented with a description of current problems in the field of low-carbon economy and RES in the voivodeship. |  | **Recommendation taken into account**.  The scope of implementation of recommendations (taking into account changes into the architecture of the axis) may be considered as sufficient. Basic data on energy consumption in the public sector and housing have been outlined with their variability over time. References have also been made to the problem of air pollution and the dynamic changes taking place in this regard. |
|  | **PA 14. Community-led local development**  **Problem**: Concentration of negative socio-economic phenomena.  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis describes the problem to an insufficient extent. | **Justification:** The SWOT analysis addresses the problem and it results from an analysis of many other phenomena, but it has not been summed up unambiguously. Analysis of individual phenomena has been presented in division into subregions.  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis with information from the reports referred to in the previous column.  In the first report, socio-economic gaps have been presented using a multivariate analysis of the population (a.o. nursery care, unemployment), economy (a.o. entrepreneurship, remuneration level) and infrastructure (a.o. sewerage system, gas pipelines). It is recommended to include conclusions from the report in the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 diagnosis.  It is also recommended to supplement the diagnosis with information from the second report on page 113. All major cities in the voivodeship have been defined as centres with a strong concentration of negative socio-economic phenomena. It results from spatial degradation of city centres and old town regions as well as housing projects. The region ranks fourth in terms of the population of housing projects intended for revitalisation and fifth in Poland in terms of the number of post-industrial sites and the population of pre-war districts.  The region’s population is characterised by the highest percentage of people who are excluded and unemployed in Poland. The reason may the low entrepreneurship that does not generate jobs (p. 157).  **Source:** *Changes of gaps in socio-economic development of Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship in the first decade of the 21st century*, October 2012.  *Analysis of the developmental needs of Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship in the context of the new EU financial perspective 2014-2020*, IBS, October 2012. |  | **Recommendation taken into account.**  Separate priority axes to support local development driven by the community (Priority Axis 7 IP 9.10 and Priority Axis 11 IP 9.9) have been planned in the framework of the Programme. The description of the CLLD axis and of the use of CLLD in the programme has been supplemented in the draft ROP (p. 192). |
|  | **PA 14. Community-led local development**  **Problem**: One of the lowest levels of human and social capital in Poland..  **Conclusion:** The diagnosis describes the problem to an insufficient extent. | **Justification:** The SWOT analysis addresses the problem and it results from an analysis of many other phenomena, but it has not been summed up unambiguously.  **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis with data on human and social capital (*Quality of life, social capital, poverty and social exclusion in Poland*, CSO, Statistical Office in Łódź, Warsaw 2013 ) .  Human capital elements:   * Health assessment (very good and good – 58%, Poland – 55%, neither good nor bad – 29%, Poland – 32%, very bad and bad – 13%, Poland – 13%), * Using the Internet (61%, Poland – 62%), * Individual skills indicator (very low or none – 35%, Poland – 30%, low – 10%, Poland – 12%, medium – 26%, Poland – 25%, high – 21%, Poland – 24%, very high – 8%, Poland – 9%).   Social capital elements:   * People who feel connected with their city/town/village – 92%, Poland – 92%, * People who feel connected with their close and far neighbours – 79%, Poland – 80%, * Indicator of involvement in a formal network – 23%, Poland – 24%, * Indicator of good neighbourly relations – 56%, Poland – 57%, social isolation indicator – 9%, Poland – 9%.   Page 7 of the *Analysis of the developmental needs of Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship in the context of the new EU financial perspective 2014-2020*, IBS, October 2012: the region’s population is characterised by the lowest level of social capital in Poland. |  | **Recommendation taken into account.**  The description of the CLLD axis and of the use of CLLD in the programme has been supplemented in the draft ROP (p. 192). |
|  | **PA 14. Community-led local development**  **Problem**: Degradation of city and village space. | **Conclusion:** The diagnosis of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 does not address the problem, but it is commensurate with IP 9.2 Supporting physical, economic and social revitalisation of poor communities and urban and rural areas. The measures will be consistent with the objectives of the National Spatial Development Concept 2030. |  | **Recommendation taken into account.**  The description of the CLLD axis and of the use of CLLD in the programme has been supplemented in the draft ROP (p. 192). |
|  | In certain PAs gaps and inconsistencies in socio-economic trends imaging, which could have an impact on the assumptions concerning projected results, were identified. | The diagnosis should be supplemented in line with specific recommendations presented in chapter 4.4 Relevance and appropriateness of socio-economic trends analyses used in diagnosis (table 2). | operational |  |
|  | **PA 1. Building innovation of the region through R&D activity of enterprises**  **Gaps and inconsistencies in the statistical description**: No cross-cutting or dynamic data concerning the problem of poor links of the enterprise sector with the science sector and related absence of systemic solutions aimed at supporting the innovation and technology transfer system. | **Recommendation:**  It is recommended to support the proposed thesis on the problem that consists in "Poor links of the enterprise sector with the science sector and related absence of systemic solutions aimed at supporting the innovation and technology transfer system" with relevant data in this regard. |  | **Recommendation taken into account**.  ROP has been expanded with figures referring to the analysed area. However, it was largely limited to the cross-sectional data, which prevents any conclusions about the dynamics of changes in the analysed area from being drawn. |
|  | **PA 2. Digital development**  **Gaps and inconsistencies in the statistical description**: Lack of regional data on the use of ICT in enterprises and lack of data reflecting the degree of digitisation of public administration makes it impossible to fully examine the situation in Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship. | **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the description of PA 2 and the relevant parts of the diagnosis with data thematically related to a given area, concerning Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship (e.g. disaggregation of CSO data). |  | **Recommendation partially taken into account**.  The description of PA 2 was completed to a limited extent and data related thematically to the use of ICT in enterprises has been added to the relevant parts of the diagnosis. Information on the degree of digitization of public administration is, however, missing. |
|  | **PA 2. Digital development**  **Gaps and inconsistencies in the statistical description**: Lack of regional data on the use of ICT in enterprises and lack of data reflecting the degree of digitisation of public administration makes it impossible to determine the trend vector. | **Recommendation:** It is recommended not only to supplement the description of PA 2 and the relevant parts of the diagnosis with current data thematically related to a given area, concerning Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship, with historical data and projections, if possible. The purpose is to allow determining the trend vector and, ultimately, to improve the diagnosis and suggest remedial actions. |  | **Recommendation partially taken into account**.  Supplemented information relates only to the use of ICT in enterprises and does not include data reflecting the degree of digitization of public administration. What is more, in-depth historical information or forecasts are missing. |
|  | **PA 4. Energy efficiency and low-carbon economy in the region**  **Gaps and inconsistencies in the statistical description**: Lack of statistical data reflecting the condition of the voivodeship in terms of renewable energy and low-carbon economy. Information included in the Programme diagnosis describe the situation of the region (strengths, competitiveness of the region), but do not describe its weaknesses. Relevance of data (data from the Energy Regulatory Office from September 2013) is an advantage, but the range of data for one year does not reflect the dynamics of changes in the region in terms of using/generating energy from RES. There are no statistical data to confirm the grounds for selecting individual measures/PIs in this thematic area. | **Recommendation:** It is recommended to supplement the diagnosis with a description of the condition of the voivodeship in terms of renewable energy and low-carbon economy along with statistical data to reflect its weaknesses, the diagnosed problems and their changes in subsequent years (dynamics). |  | **Recommendation taken into account**.  The diagnosis has been supplemented with a description of the region in terms of renewable energy and low-carbon economy, together with statistical data reflecting the weaknesses, diagnosed problems and their changes over the years. |
|  | Analysis of alternative scenarios for PA 5 supports the viability of increasing allocations to projects related to development of small-scale water retention forms.  There is a lack of measure on equipping emergency service personnel with systems for monitoring and warning against natural disasters. | It is recommended to increase allocations to projects related to development of small-scale water retention forms.  A new type of intervention should be added: equipping emergency service personnel with systems for monitoring and warning against natural disasters. | operational | **Recommendation partially taken into account.**  A measure relating to equipping emergency service personnel with systems for monitoring and warning against natural disasters has been introduced. In the draft from February 2014, EUR 12.3 million are allocated to TO5. In the draft from October 2013 the allocation for IP 5.2 amounted to EUR 13.3 million; this means that the allocation has been reduced. |
|  | IP 8.10 is risky due to low sustainability of prevention and rehabilitation programmes for which the major part of funds is allocated. The concentration of allocation on activities, which will be completed upon the expiry of the programming period, does not seem to be a cost-effective solution.  Furthermore, the scope of diseases contributing to absenteeism and the loss or restriction of the region’s inhabitants ability to work corresponds with national statistics. Therefore there is a risk of overlapping of the results of activities carried out at the national level under prevention programmes. | The allocation for IP 8.10 should be reduced. | strategic | **Recommendation not taken into account**.  Not only has allocation for IP 8.10 not been reduced, but it has been increased (EU support provided for in version 2.0. of ROP amounted to EUR 15,017,200.00, while in version 3.3 it was EUR 18,562,868.23). |
|  | PA 8: Training measures addressed to entrepreneurs to be implemented at the national level may generate sufficient demand for such services among enterprises and lead to the demand being met in the commercial market without the need for direct support from the EU funds. | This category of intervention should be used only as a tool supporting the maintenance of employment in the SME sector, with the funding under IP 8.9 focused on retraining programmes for employees and on outplacement support. | strategic | There are no clear provisions for evaluating to what extent recommendations have been taken into account. |
|  | The evaluations show that certain conditions for long-term employment efficiency of grants for self-employment (in particular with identified risk factors) and sustainability of subsidized jobs should be undermined. | Repayable instruments should be used or the target groups should be limited to disadvantaged groups. | strategic | **Recommendation not taken into account**.  The scope of Investment Priorities under the PA 8, including the use of financial instruments, has not changed. Similarly, no clear statement has been introduced to indicate that subsidies to self-employment or subsidized jobs would be aimed exclusively at disadvantaged groups. |
|  | Some forms of support under IP 9.4 and IP 9.7 overlap. For example: the support for community care for the disabled under IP 9.4. overlaps with the tasks of an assistant of a disabled person under IP 9.7. | The detailed provisions of individual types of intervention under PA 9 should be reconstructed to avoid overlapping of the scopes of intervention. | operational | **Recommendation taken into account**.  Demarcation has been introduced between IP 9.7 and 9.4. |
|  | Diagnosis included in ROP K-PV 2014-2020 does not have a territorial dimension. Some issues are presented in a spatial dimension (maps from page 12, figures 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11), but their content does not correspond to the structure and spatial scope of intervention under PA.  The diagnosis of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 builds on the voivodeship strategy, where the territorial dimension is more pronounced (e.g. under the strong metropolis priority), but the analyses carried out under this strategy were not utilised in the framework of ROP K-PV 2014-2020. Diagnosis is inconsistent with subsequent selection of priorities, e.g. it does not include the diagnosis of urban issues, while PA 12 is largely devoted to this issue. | Diagnosis should be supplemented with a territorial dimension of analysed social and economic phenomena.  A separate chapter should be devoted to the discussion of urban issues, since they have such a significant impact on the development of the voivodeship (separate PA 12). This in turn would allow to define subjects/areas/problems in ROP K-PV 2014-2020 that require spatial differentiation of intervention and/or suprasectoral and multilateral cooperation, i.e. an integrated territorial approach. This would prompt reflection on territorial differentiation of intervention under axes 1-11 or at least provide the material for such reflection. | operational | **Recommendation partially taken into account**.  The diagnosis has not been expanded with a spatial dimension of the described social and economic phenomena.  Although no separate chapter has been devoted to urban issues, it should be emphasized that it has translated into the new architecture of the system of priority axes, in relation to which the recommendation submitted earlier is no longer valid. |
|  | There are plans to use ITI and CLLD. The references to ITI and CLLD are very general and repeat well-known information gathered at the national level; they reflect the regional specificity only to a very small degree. | The rules of supporting CLLD and ITI, taking into account the specific conditions of the region, should be developed and included in ROP K-PV 2014-2020. | operational | **Recommendation taken into account**.  Taking into account of recommendations encompasses the indication of principles (many of them quite general) on the basis of which CLLD and ITI shall be supported considering the region’s internal situation. |
|  | The lack of a vertical and horizontal coordination mechanism for the ROP K-PV 2014-2020 implementation, which would take into account the territorial and integrated approach. The management of priority axes 12, 13 and 14 is centralised. | The estimated allocation of the ESF and the ERDF for CLL should be specified in line with the Partnership Agreement. The procedure for selection of LAGs to implement LDS should be introduced. The criteria for selection of innovative projects under CLLD should be defined. According to the *Template*…, Section 4.1. should include the arrangements on preparatory support for CLLD.  The LAGs should be authorised to perform necessary verification and controls to decide about the eligibility of the given operation for financing.  ROP K-PV 2014-2020 in its current form needs a mechanism ensuring coordination of results of PA 12, 13 and 14 with the results of other axes, established within the MA. | operational | **Recommendation taken into account**.  At this programming level of ROP, the description of the CLLD axis and of the use of CLLD in the programme has been expanded (p. 192).  An integrated territorial approach to eight PA was introduced and the idea of creating separate axes dedicated to territorial policies has been abandoned. |
|  | Europe 2020 strategy is mentioned in several parts of the Programme, but the issue of cohesion of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 with the aims of the strategy is not discussed. Furthermore, there is no separate subchapter discussing the issue of external cohesion, i.e. cohesion with the most important European strategic documents and national and regional documents (such subchapter was included in the draft from June 2013). | Subchapters on external cohesion should be included in ROP K-PV 2014-2020 or subchapter on cohesion with national and regional documents provided for in the draft from June should be restored and supplemented with national and regional documents. The Programme should include a separate table summary presenting the links between the PAs and the objectives and flagship initiatives of the Europe 2020 strategy. | operational | **Recommendation not taken into account**.  ROP K-PV 2014-2020 does not include a subsection on the cohesion of the act with the most important national and regional strategic documents. |
|  | Category of developmental expenditure, proposed and defined in detail in the NDS, should be used in the Programme, which will automatically translate into greater focus on activities aiming at building permanent developmental capacity of the region, making it possible to strengthen cohesion between Programme objectives/priorities and the structure of its funding. | Subchapter 1.1.2 should define and refer to the developmental expenditure category. | operational | **Recommendation not taken into account**.  Subchapter 1.1.2 does not refer to the category of development expenses or their definition. |
|  | The method of taking the aims of horizontal principles into account is inadequate. Specific target groups covered by horizontal interventions have not been defined, implementation areas of horizontal objectives (IPs, intervention types) and specific intervention selection and monitoring mechanisms, along with control procedures, have not been specified. The manner in which the results of monitoring and evaluation will be utilised was not specified. | The provisions of the chapter “Horizontal rules” should be supplemented with a list of IPs and types of interventions related to individual horizontal rules, identification of target groups and specification of means of monitoring, evaluation and the methods of taking the results of monitoring and evaluation into account during the implementation of the Programme. | horizontal | **Recommendation partially taken into account**.  Types of interventions have been described and target groups have been identified without any indication of the IP in which measures dedicated to a given principle are to be implemented, and the IP in which the implementation of principles shall be horizontal (access criteria). Methods of monitoring and evaluation have been specified. |
|  | The level of employment in the MAs or ROP K-PV 2007-2013 and IB of OP HC is insufficient to carry out current and planned activities. OMKPV departments already experience the shortage of workers. In the case of the MA of ROP K-PV 2007-2013 there are currently 33 vacancies (which corresponds to 16% of the entire number of jobs), and in the case of the IB of OP HC the number of vacancies amounts to 6 (5%). | The level of employment in the Mas of ROP K-PV 2007-2013 should be increased. In the context of the new perspective this is particularly justified due to the fact that the process of closing the 2007-2013 perspective will be carried out in parallel to the process of implementing ROP K-PV 2014-2020. | operational | **Not applicable**.  The recommendation does not relate directly to the contents of ROP K-PV 2014-2020. It concerns issues that MA should take into account when making decisions about the structure of Programme implementation. |
|  | The system of indicators covered by the ROP K-PV 2014-2020, based on indicators from the CLKI, is not complete. It includes output and strategic result indicators, but it does not state the target or basis values (for strategic indicators), not does it state data sources. Identified shortcomings also concern the definition of interim objectives (2018), final objectives (2023) and KES. | Target and basis values (for strategic indicators) presented in ROP K-PV 2014-2020 should be supplemented and the lack of data sources should be addressed. | key | **Recommendation partially taken into account**.  In general, the contents of ROP K-PV 2014-2020 have been supplemented with target and basis values (for strategic indicators) as well as data sources. However, certain insufficiencies are visible, for instance on pages 183 and 184.  In version of 3.0. ROP K-PV 2014-2020 to each PI output and result indicators are assigned. The vast majority of indicators are relevant to the types of interventions and objectives of the OP.  The ratios fulfill the criteria of validity, transparency, statistical credibility, aggregation, availability, reliability of performance.  In a few cases the evaluators indicated that the ratio is not optimal, due to the fact that it does not correspond to the intended types of intervention, or they are not measurable. In some cases, there is a necessity to supplement the list of ratios.  Part of the strategic result ratios do not meet the definition mentioned in the Template PO (eg. a base value of 0).  The target values ​​of ratios were mostly rated as realistic in the context of the proposed intervention logic, including the allocated funds, taking into consideration external factors.  Their accurate assessment requires, however, analysis of the estimating methodology.  Detailed comments to the list of ratios have been developed in a separate document. |
|  | The process of monitoring and reporting, as well as the process of evaluation is described in an unsatisfactory manner in the current version of the draft ROP K-PV 2014-2020. | With regard to the *Template…* certain elements of the monitoring and reporting system (7.1.1) and evaluation system (7.1.2) should be supplemented. Detailed proposals of supplements were presented in the chapter on monitoring. | operational | **Recommendation taken into account**. |
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