

**Příručka
pro průběžnou evaluaci
prioritních os 1 a 2
(Anglická verze)**

Contents

- 1. Introduction.....3
- 2. Evaluation Approach5
- 3. Role of Evaluators and Qualification Requirements 12
- 4. The Role of the OP RDI Managing Authority 14
- Annex 1: Basic Eligibility Requirements and Selection Procedure for Evaluators 15
- Annex 2: Guidance for the Completion of the Final Report21
- Annex 3: Final Report Template23
- Annex 4: Template and associated Guidance notes for completion of the self-assessment report37
- Annex 5: Declaration of Impartiality and Confidentiality of the Expert Evaluators of projects supported under the Priority Axes 1 and 2 OP RDI.....44
- Annex 6: The OP RDI Code of Ethics.....45
- Annex 7: Document destruction.....49

1. Introduction

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

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

Hierarchy of objectives

Purpose

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

Results and expected impacts

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

Activities

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

Overview of the evaluation exercise

Evaluand

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

Methodology

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

The evaluation exercise will be based around a set of evaluation questions using the following approach:

- An evaluation methodology/framework containing standardised questions for all projects (see Annexes 2 and 3)
- A set of bespoke evaluation questions developed separately for each project.

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

Outputs

The evaluation exercise will generate the following outputs:

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

Main users of evaluation results:

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

¹ Overview of Evaluation Methods for R&D Programmes, Rosalie Ruegg, TIA Consulting, Inc. Gretchen Jordan, Sandia National Laboratories, 2007

2. Evaluation Approach

i. General Remarks

The project evaluation has three distinct elements. The first element evaluates the current state of project implementation. The second assesses the prospects for the project achieving its planned objectives and its sustainability. The final element comprises the evaluators' recommendations for future action, both for the project beneficiary as well as the MA.

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

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

ii. Detailed Description of the Evaluation Process

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

Within two weeks of the conclusion of the evaluation mission the expert team will submit their evaluation report, which should correspond to the evaluation questions given in Annex 3. This phase of the evaluation will be completed by a de-briefing and

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

presentation of the evaluation report by at least one member of the evaluation team, with the participation of representatives of the beneficiary and MA OP RDI.

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

Step A: Individual preparation for the evaluation

Generally three months prior to the commencement of the on-site evaluation phase (evaluation mission) the beneficiary will be notified by the Evaluation Unit of the the MA OP RDI that their project is to be the subject of evaluation. This will be followed up by a visit of MA representatives to the beneficiary to explain the purpose of the evaluation and gain the beneficiary's support for the exercise. Once the visit is completed, the beneficiary will be provided with the template of the self-assessment report by the MA and will be expected to commence its drafting immediately thereafter. This report should be drafted in English (see Annex 4 for copy of report template). The beneficiary returns the completed report to the MA OP RDI within six weeks of receiving the template.³ The purpose of the self-assessment report is to provide detailed information on the performance of the project from the perspective of implementer (the beneficiary).

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

Based on this documentation the evaluators will prepare a list of indicative 'bespoke' evaluation questions and submit them to the MA OP RDI at least two weeks prior to the evaluation mission. This will be based around the evaluation questions contained in the evaluator's Final report template (see Annex 3), but should target themes that the evaluators judge to be key, based on the information provided and also on their expert knowledge of the sector or project type. Once received, the MA OP RDI may choose to edit the list of questions or add further points for consideration. The MA will submit the final list of evaluation questions to the members of the evaluation team no later than one week before the start of the evaluation mission.

³ Upon submission of the self assessment report (SAR) the MA OP RDI will conduct quality control to ensure that the report conforms to the parameters set in the SAR template (See Annex 7 for quality control assessment document template). In those cases where the SAR is found to contain inadequacies, it will be returned to the beneficiary with a request to provide additional information or for its redrafting.

Step B: Evaluation Mission (On-site visit)

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

The actual evaluation at the location of the project's implementation (on-site visit) starts with a meeting of the evaluation team with the management of the project (beneficiary) and a presentation of both the evaluation team and the project under evaluation. This will be followed by a tour of the facilities/laboratories of the R&D centre with the assistance of project staff, and an in-depth inspection of the site. The mission should primarily include individual visits of selected locations where the project is being implemented, interviews or discussion with various levels of employees (centre managers, scientists and researchers both senior and junior, PhD students, users etc.). The evaluation mission will be concluded by a short pre-briefing session with the management of the beneficiary institution to present them with their preliminary findings. The evaluation mission itself should last a maximum of three calendar days from start to finish. Once completed the formal evaluation mission will be followed by a report drafting session led by the evaluators with the participation of the representatives of the MA. This session will involve identifying the key issues that have emerged throughout the course of the evaluation process and potential recommendations for action, and ensuring that the evaluation structure will correspond to the guidance provided in the template provided in Annex 3. This will happen immediately following the formal end of the evaluation mission and last one half day.

Step C: Drafting of the evaluation report

Upon completion of the evaluation mission, the evaluation team will be required to draft the evaluation report. They should do this in close cooperation with each other and in a consensual manner. The evaluation team will have a lead evaluator who will be appointed by the MA OP RDI in the preparatory phase of the evaluation and be responsible *inter alia* for drafting the Final report, the presentation of its final version at the debriefing. as well as all direct communication with the MA OP RDI.

The lead evaluator is required to coordinate the work of the other expert evaluators in the team and incorporate their findings into Final Report. The lead evaluator should submit the draft report to the Evaluation Unit of the MA OP RDI within two weeks of the end of the evaluation mission. The MA will then have 2 weeks to conduct its own internal quality control on the draft report. The MA will also provide the beneficiary with the draft evaluation report, for commenting on its factual aspects. This will run concurrently with the MA's own quality control, with the beneficiary providing his

comments to the MA within 1 week of receiving the draft report. The MA will then prepare a set of consolidated comments in writing and return them to the evaluation team's rapporteur for the team's consideration and incorporation into the final report. The evaluators then have one week to incorporate the comments of the MA into the draft report and re-submit it to the Evaluation Unit of the MA OP RDI.

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

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

Step D: Presentation and debriefing

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

Step E: Follow-up

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

Step F: Focus groups

In addition to the standard project evaluation, a series of up to five focus groups will be run covering themes of particular importance or relevance to the programme. The groups will be composed of up to 8 members, who will be representatives of beneficiary projects, other key stakeholders and (potentially) international experts. The precise format of the groups as well as their themes will be defined by staff from

the MA in the first part of the evaluation exercise. The focus groups will be run in the second half of the evaluation process. A list of indicative themes is given below (please note that these will be specified in the course of the exercise).

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

Step G: Synthesis of evaluations

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

Evaluation Process – Summary Table

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

Step	Activity	Output	Week	Responsible Party
Preparatory phase				
1	Notification to beneficiary of evaluation exercise Visit to beneficiary	Agreed date with beneficiary for start of evaluation process	0	MA
2	Provision of the self-assessment report (SAR) template to the beneficiary	Beneficiary equipped to prepare SAR	1	MA
3	Selection and contracting of evaluation team	Contracted team of experts of evaluation	1-10	MA ⁵
4	Submission of self assessment report to MA	SAR	7 - 8	Beneficiary
5	Quality control of SAR	SAR usable for the purposes of the evaluation	9-10	MA, Beneficiary (where revisions are necessary)
6	Submission of evaluation report	Evaluators equipped	10	MA

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

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

	template, SAR and other supporting documents to the evaluators	with all base information needed to conduct evaluation		
7	Submission of indicative evaluation questions and list of interviewees to the MA	Key interview questions agreed by MA	12	Evaluators
8	Review and finalisation of indicative evaluation questions and list of interviewees		13	MA
9	Submission of finalised evaluation questions and interview list to the evaluators	Finalised evaluation questions and interview list	13	MA
Evaluation mission				
10	Pre-briefing on-site between evaluation team and beneficiary	Evaluation mission completed	14 Day 1	Evaluators, beneficiary
11	Full site visit			
12	Interviews with key parties		14 Day 2/3	Evaluators, representatives of the beneficiary, other persons if necessary
13	Pre-briefing with representatives of the beneficiary/MA ⁶		14 Day 2/3	Evaluators, MA representatives
Reporting/feedback phase				
14	Drafting and submission of draft evaluation report to the MA	Draft evaluation report	15,16	Evaluators
15	MA Internal quality control		17	MA
16	Quality control and commenting of draft report by the MA; Commenting by the beneficiary	Comments and proposed revisions to the draft report submitted to evaluators within 2 weeks of its reception.	18, 19	MA, beneficiaries
17	Submission of comments on the draft report from the MA and beneficiaries to the evaluators		19	MA
18	Integration of comments into final report	Final evaluation report	20	Evaluators
19	Approval of the final report	Approved evaluation report	21	MA
20	De-briefing exercise	Report debriefed, recommendations discussed and approved.	22 - 24	Evaluators, MA

Timing

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

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

Indicative timeframe

Pilot testing & Start-up	2 st Quarter 2012
Fine-tuning of methodology	2 nd – 4 th Quarter 2012
Evaluation of research centres- PA 1 & 2	2 nd Qtr 2012 – 3 rd Qtr 2015
Production of synthesis report	End of October 2015

3. Role of Evaluators and Qualification Requirements

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

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

The evaluation team will be made up of both international and local experts. Their selection will be based on assessing of their thematic focus to the project to be evaluated together with their professional experience and qualification. The experts will be taken from the OP RDI database of experts based on set of predefined requirements and the call for their selection will take place in advance of the evaluation's commencement (See Annex 1 of this Guide). The MA can involve the experts proposed by the beneficiary into the database of experts.

At least two sectoral experts (1international and 1 local) will be in the evaluation team. The size and composition of the teams will be selected on a project-by-project basis to ensure an optimal skills/expertise match. In addition to the sectoral experts, a lead evaluator will be appointed. This evaluator will be responsible for the coordination of the evaluation process of the given project (including the inputs of the sectoral experts), act as the rapporteur for the evaluation and will be responsible for the delivery of the final report, as well as all direct communication with the MA OP RDI.

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

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

RDI).

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

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

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

- Always ensure that findings and conclusions are substantiated and based on evidence.
- The evaluation report should be of appropriate length i.e. of sufficient length to cover all required areas of the evaluation without being so long as to undermine its readability.
- The evaluation should be based on the information received in documentary form and in the course of the evaluation mission. Any other forms of speculation or opinions that cannot be verified should not be considered by the evaluators or included in the report.
- The report should contain a series of recommendations that can be utilised in the course of further cooperation between the MA OP RDI and the beneficiary. These recommendations should be very clear and concrete. They should not be retrospective i.e. what should have been done better at some point in the past. They should be clearly focused to the future, and outline specific measures that address issues of importance identified in the report findings. The recommendations should be presented as a separate section in the evaluation report.
- The evaluators should not be unduly cautious in their conclusions and recommendations. If there are issues of concern that need to be addressed, the evaluators should feel free to raise them in their report and propose solutions (even potentially radical ones) in their recommendations.

4. The Role of the OP RDI Managing Authority

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

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

Annex 1: Basic Eligibility Requirements and Selection Procedure for Evaluators

A: Evaluation team

The evaluation teams will be made up of both international and local experts. The evaluation team will be composed of at least two scientific experts with experience in the area of research relevant to the project under evaluation and a “lead evaluator”. The lead evaluator will be responsible for the planning of the evaluation process (in close cooperation with MA representatives and the beneficiary), allocation of tasks between team members, leading the evaluation mission, drafting of the Final Report as well as the presentation of its final version at the debriefing. The lead evaluator is required to coordinate the inputs of the expert evaluators and the incorporation of their findings into the Final Report. The selection of the individual team members will be based on assessing of their professional experience with the evaluation as well as of their qualification in the area of R&D&I. The process for their selection is outlined in section B of this annex.

At least two experts (1 international and 1 local) will be in the evaluation team under the leadership of the lead evaluator. The actual size and composition of the teams will be selected on a project-by-project basis to ensure an optimal skills/expertise match.

Key eligibility requirements for experts:

Experts are expected to meet all these criteria:

International experts

1. Experience in the management of a research centre i.e. occupying a senior or middle management function (minimum 5 years)
2. Experience evaluating research and development projects⁷ and/or; Experience evaluating research organisations (minimum 3 years)
3. Experience with research and innovation activity in the given area of expertise, relevant to the project(s) to be evaluated (minimum 5 years)

National experts

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

⁷ Please note that the term ‘Project’ is used in the context of the OP RDI to refer to research centres, innovation centres and all other types of institutions that are supported within the framework of the OP RDI.

Lead Evaluators

Mandatory

1. Experience of evaluation of EU-funded interventions (projects or programmes) using basic evaluation criteria⁸ - minimum 10 years experience as either team leader or evaluation expert. Evaluations upon which the expert has worked must have been conducted in at least 2 EU member states.
2. Fluency of written and spoken English. The evaluator should have demonstrable proficiency of evaluation report writing in English. The evaluator will be requested to submit at least 3 examples of evaluation reports – written in English - in which he/she was the author or co-author.

Optional

3. Professional background or experience in the area of research, development and innovations. The evaluator will ideally have an academic background in related scientific field or have worked in this field in a professional capacity. Finally, the evaluator will ideally have conducted an evaluation of a research centre or similar institution.

Assessment of expert's suitability

The MA OP RDI will assess the potential candidate for their suitability of the expert profile using a scoring system outlined below.

International experts

Maximum point score – 100

Mandatory

1. Experience in the management of a research centre i.e. occupying a senior or middle management function (minimum 5 years)
 - 25 points for meeting a minimum criteria.
 - An additional 2 points for every additional year of experience up to a maximum of 10 points (5 extra years).
2. Experience evaluating research and development projects⁹ and/or; Experience evaluating research organisations (minimum 3 years)
 - 20 points for meeting a minimum criteria.
 - An additional 2 points for every additional year of experience up to a maximum of 6 points (3 extra years).
3. Experience with research and innovation activity in the given area of expertise, relevant to the project(s) to be evaluated (minimum 5 years)

⁸ For the purpose of this evaluation, basic evaluation criteria means **relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability**. For more details see for example <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationofdevelopmentprogrammes/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

⁹ Please note that the term 'Project' is used in the context of the OP RDI to refer to research centres, innovation centres and all other types of institutions that are supported within the framework of the OP RDI.

- 20 points for meeting a minimum criteria.
- An additional 2 points for every additional year of experience up to a maximum of 10 points (5 extra years).

Optional

4. Experience with evaluation of projects submitted under Priority Axis 1 and OP RDI (above described type evaluation process)
 - An additional 3 points for every evaluation conducted up to a maximum of 9 points (3 evaluations conducted).

National Experts

Maximum point score – 100

Mandatory

1. Experience with research and innovation activity in the given area of expertise, relevant to the project(s) to be evaluated (minimum 5 years)
 - 25 points for meeting a minimum criteria.
 - An additional 2 points for every additional year of experience up to a maximum of 10 points (5 extra years).
2. Experience in the management of a research centre i.e. occupying a senior or middle management function (minimum 3 years)
 - 20 points for meeting a minimum criteria.
 - An additional 2 points for every additional year of experience up to a maximum of 6 points (3 extra years).
3. Experience of evaluating research and development projects or experience evaluating research organisations (in either case a minimum 3 years)
 - 20 points for meeting a minimum criteria.
 - An additional 2 points for every additional year of experience up to a maximum of 10 points (5 extra years).

Optional

4. Experience with evaluation of projects submitted under Priority Axis 1 and OP RDI (above described type evaluation process)
 - An additional 3 points for every evaluation conducted up to a maximum of 9 points (3 evaluations conducted).

Lead Evaluators

The MA OP RDI will assess the potential candidate for their suitability of the expert profile using a scoring system outlined below. Maximum possible points score is 100.

Mandatory

1. Experience of evaluating EU interventions - Maximum possible points score – 60 points.
 - 40 points for meeting the minimum criteria.
 - An additional 2 points for every additional year of experience up to a maximum of 10 points (5 extra years).
 - An additional five points for every extra EU member state where the

expert has conducted evaluations up to a maximum of 10 points (2 extra member states).

2. English and report-writing skills – Maximum possible point score - 25 points.
 - 15 points for meeting the minimum criteria.
 - An additional 5 points for each additional report submitted that meets the selection criteria (a maximum of 10 extra points for 2 more evaluation reports)

Optional

3. RDI experience/background – Maximum possible point score - 15 points.
 - 5 points for an academic background in scientific field (NOT social sciences), to at least bachelors' level OR minimum 3 years related professional experience
 - 5 points for conducting at least one evaluation of a research centre or comparable institution working in the area of RDI. An additional 5 points for conducting more than one evaluation of this type (maximum 5 extra points).

Those experts with the highest points score will be invited to declare their availability to work on the evaluation of projects in the period 2013- 2016. The employment will be based on the *call works contract* system – Agreements will be conducted annually for max. 300 hours per year. The MA OP RDI anticipates the selection of up to 8 evaluation experts, who will be selected for individual project evaluations based on their availability and suitability for the respective evaluation.

All experts must submit their professional CV, completed form with questions to the required qualifications and the sworn affidavit confirming the accuracy and veracity of the provided information.

B: Selection Process for External (Expert) Evaluators

Evaluation Process

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

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

Definition

An "external evaluator" is an external expert from whom an independent assessment of any project can be requested by the MA OP RDI. The external evaluator can be

either an international expert (non-Czech) or national expert (Czech).

Recruitment of external evaluators

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

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

After the expiry of the one month waiting period, the Evaluation Unit of the MA will draw up a 'long list' of experts – both international and national - who have expressed an interest and who possess relevant experience for the projects to be evaluated in the upcoming cycle. This list will contain details of the expert's experience, qualifications, as well as their previous work record with the MA OP RDI, if any. This list will be reviewed jointly by the Head of Department 452 (who is responsible for the whole evaluation exercise), the department's evaluation officer and at least one of its external evaluation advisers. Their task will be to check the list for its consistency with the objectives of the evaluation exercise and projects to be evaluated.

The composition of the evaluation teams for the individual projects will be done as follows:

- The long list of evaluators will be screened by the authorized employees of the MA OP RDI to identify experts with experience directly pertaining to the project in question e.g. nanotechnology. Those experts who meet the specific criteria will be placed on a short list. At this stage the experts will be separated into two categories – international and national experts – to reflect the evaluation methodology.
- The authorized employees of the MA OP RDI will assess point score of individual candidates based on the fulfillment of requirements given in section A of this Annex. The rank of international and rank of national experts will be set according to the point score achieved. Those of experts with the highest point score will be invited to confirm his/her participation in the evaluation

process of the project under evaluation. In case of equality of points at the first place of the rank (either in the group of international, or the national experts), expert will be selected by a random draw of name.

- Should the selected external evaluator(s) not be available to participate in the project evaluation as required, the evaluator in question will be removed from the team and will be replaced by the evaluator, who is next in order.

The MA is expected to engage limited number of Lead evaluators, who will be selected for evaluation of individual projects according their actual time availability and suitability for the given evaluation. The MA assumes long-term cooperation with the leading evaluators, therefore they will be selected from the above mentioned group *ad hoc* for individual projects.

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

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

Annex 2: Guidance for the Completion of the Final Report

Introduction

This annex provides an evaluation framework that evaluators should follow when conducting their project assessment and drafting their evolution report as part of the assessment of projects funded under Priority Axes (PA) 1 and 2 of the Operational Programme Research and Development for Innovation (OP RDI). It is supported by a template for the final evaluation report that is included in annex X of this document. The use of this guidance as well as the report template should be considered by the evaluators as **mandatory** i.e. the final report should not deviate from them in either its content or structure.

The evaluation template is based around the 5 DAC/OECD criteria i.e. Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability. Each criterion has its own chapter and contains a series of evaluation questions that the evaluators are required to answer. These questions, along with the accompanying guidance notes in blue text boxes, provide both a clear guide to the issues that the evaluators must analyse and also ensure that the evaluation reports are consistent in content and structure.

Each chapter contains a table of recommendations which the evaluators should complete. They should relate to the project's current or future performance as well as to any related issues relevant to the beneficiary or the Managing Authority (MA) of the OP RDI. These recommendations will form the basis of the de-briefing that will conclude the evaluation exercise. When drafting recommendations, the evaluators will be required to follow the following guidelines:

- The recommendation should explicitly state what the relevant issue is and what measure(s) need to be taken to address it
- The recommendation should not be retrospective i.e. what should have been done better at some point in the past.
- The recommendation should be numbered and cross-referenced with the relevant finding in the text using the paragraph number(s)
- A deadline for the implementation of the recommendation should be stated.
- The evaluators are not obliged to provide recommendations for every section, although if none are given, this should be consistent with the presented findings.

The evaluators should aim to provide no more than 10 main recommendations in the whole report. They should therefore ensure that those recommendations given address issues of key importance to the project and are unambiguous, realistic and implementable.

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

the report should aim to draft a report that has the following characteristics:

- It should be analytical. The report should provide a series of findings and conclusions based on an analysis of the facts established in the evaluation process. The evaluators should avoid merely presenting facts that they have found out during the evaluation.
- It should be concise. The report will need to cover all the areas outlined in the template. At the same time, it should not be over-long or present excessively detailed findings unless required. The evaluators to aim to produce a main report of no more than 20 pages.
- It should therefore be focused and relevant. The evaluators should target their report at those issues that they judge to be of most importance and relevance to its readers (principally the beneficiary and the MA), and which influence the successful performance of the project.
- Finally, it should be readable. Aside from being concise and relevant, the report should be written in a style that is easy to read and presented in a logical and (preferably) attractive way. It should also contain a short executive summary.

The evaluators are expected to make full and appropriate use of both primary and secondary sources of information for their assessments. These sources include:

- The beneficiary's self-assessment report
- The Technical Annex of the project itself
- Information from other secondary sources and documentation
- Own observations and impressions from the site visit
- Discussions and interviews with project staff
- Discussions and information obtained from other relevant parties, including MA staff, project users, supervisory and advisory boards and foreign partners of the beneficiary

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

Report structure

A template for the evaluation report is provided in Annex 3.

Annex 3: Final Report Template

Disclaimer

The views expressed herein are those of the authors of the report and do not necessarily reflect those of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic.



Executive Summary

(This section should be maximum 2 pages in length)

1. Evaluation background (1 paragraph)
2. Evaluation findings
 - a. Relevance
 - b. Efficiency
 - c. Effectiveness
 - d. Impact
 - e. Sustainability
3. Key recommendations

Introduction

Here the evaluators should state the following:

- Basic details of the project under evaluation
- Evaluation team
- Sources of information used during evaluation (with reference to list of interviews in annex)
- Period during which the evaluation was carried out and the cut-off date for the report findings¹⁰

Notes on Formatting of the report

- Font to be used: Chapter headings – Arial 16 green (as used in the template). Main body text - Arial 12
- Starting from the Relevance section, each paragraph should be numbered sequentially i.e. 1, 2, 3 etc.
- Cross-references should be used where appropriate in the following format: See paragraph 63. These should be checked for consistency before submission of the draft report for quality control

Notes on the recommendation table in each section of the report

- Each evaluation section contains a recommendation table, which the evaluators should complete as appropriate. The format is given below.
- The recommendation should explicitly state what the relevant issue is and what measure(s) need to be taken to address it
- The recommendation should be numbered and cross-referenced with the relevant finding in the text using the paragraph number(s)
- A deadline for the implementation of the recommendation should be stated.
- The evaluators are not obliged to provide recommendations for every section, although if none are given, this should be consistent with the findings presented.
- The evaluators should aim to provide no more than 10 recommendations in the whole report. They should therefore ensure that those recommendations given address issues of key importance to the project and are unambiguous, realistic and implementable.

¹⁰ The cut-off date is the date after which the evaluators did not take into account any further information i.e. the date at which the findings in the report are valid.

Relevance

Relevance needs to be considered from two perspectives – Its relevance to the above elements at the time of its approval (as per the Technical Annex) and as it stands now (as reflected in the self-assessment report). Central to this issue is the design of the project.

The evaluators should answer the following questions:

1. To what extent does the project, as it is currently designed, correspond to;
 - the objectives of the OP (check the technical annex and OP)?
 - the needs of the sector (Please use your knowledge of the sector as the starting point to assess this)?
 - the needs of beneficiary? (is there evidence that the beneficiary actually wants the project i.e. ownership, and that it is able to use the assistance – does it have the capacity to use the project results?)
2. Has the project design been changed since its approval (i.e. does it differ from that given in the technical annex)?
 - If so, to what extent have these changes improved the project’s relevance? How has it done so?
 - Have these changes negatively affected its relevance to these stated needs? If so, how?
3. What measures are needed to further strengthen the relevance of the project to these needs? (link to recommendations table below)
4. To what extent will the project, as it is currently designed, lead to the achievement of its planned objectives?
5. Are there any other issues relating to the design of the project that impinge on its relevance?

Best practice

Are there examples of best practice from your own administration/centre/institute that could help improve the relevance of the intervention under evaluation? If so, give details in this text box.

Recommendations for this section

No.	Recommendation	Relevant paragraph(s)	Addressee	Date for action

Efficiency

Instructions for evaluators when writing this section

This section focuses on many of the areas covered in the beneficiary's Self Assessment Report (SAR) and it is likely to be the biggest single section in the whole evaluation report. The experts should bear the following in mind during its drafting: Firstly, they are expected to provide an analysis of these areas, based on the information presented in the SAR, information gathered during the evaluation mission, plus their own expert insights into the project's specific field of research. The experts should NOT repeat information given in the SAR, nor describe these elements in any detail.

Secondly, conciseness is essential when presenting the evaluator's findings under Efficiency. The section should be of sufficient length to provide a clear and comprehensive answer to each of the evaluation questions. However it should not be excessively lengthy or overly detailed. The evaluators will have to use their judgement when drafting this section – they should provide detailed analysis of those issues that they consider significant to the project, whilst for less important issues, a briefer assessment would be appropriate.

The evaluators should answer the following questions:

1. How has been the performance of the project management team?
2. Are the supervisory level institutions in place? Please assess their composition and functioning.
3. How has the performance of the project across key aspects been?

In this section the report should **succinctly** assess the project's performance. To do this, the evaluators should provide responses to the following questions:

- Human resource management: To what extent are the human resource management arrangements sufficient to ensure that the project functions properly, and that they facilitate the successful delivery of results?
 - Financial / legal management: To what extent are the financial and legal aspects of the project being properly managed?
 - Interaction with users: How successful has the beneficiary been in establishing cooperation with the application sphere?
 - Infrastructure: Is the project infrastructure and equipment in place, functioning and being utilised properly?
 - Research programme: What is the quality of the research programme?
 - Other issues: Are there any other issues not mentioned above that are relevant to the operational performance of the project?
4. What is the quality of relations with its key stakeholders and coordination of activities with them? These include the mother institution(s), the Managing Authority/Ministry (or ministries), other research institutes or centres in the Czech

Republic or abroad, Industry etc.

5. What are the risks to the success of the project? Is the management aware of them, and does it have measures in place to reduce/manage them should they materialise?

Best practice

Are there examples of best practice from your own administration/centre/institute that could help improve elements of efficiency of the intervention under evaluation? If so, give details in this text box.

Recommendations for this section

No.	Recommendation	Relevant paragraphs	Addressee	Date for action

Effectiveness

Guidance for evaluators when assessing Effectiveness

Given that the project may be still in the early stages of operation, it may be the case that only a few outputs or results are currently observable. In such a case, the evaluators will be expected to draw on their own experience and provide a balanced and measured assessment of the how they see the project developing over time and judge the extent to which the planned outputs and results are likely to be delivered. They should identify the potential bottlenecks or barriers to their delivery, both within the project itself (the internal environment) and outside it (the external environment).

An explanation of how project outputs, results and objectives relate to the evaluation criteria and related questions is given in the template annex. You are strongly encouraged to use this when assessing the delivery of outputs and results and the factors influencing them. This is also useful for assessing impact (see next section).

Outputs

1. Has the project already generated outputs? If so, what is their quality? Could they be improved, and if so, how?
2. What are the prospects of the project fully delivering its planned outputs?
3. What are the factors that influence their delivery?

Results

4. Are any results apparent at this stage? If so, what are they? Do they correspond with the results expected in the project Technical Annex? (in terms of type of result, its quality, and timeliness of delivery)
5. What are the prospects of the project fully delivering its expected results? What are the factors that influence their delivery?

Best practice

Are there examples of best practice from your own administration/centre/institute that could help improve the effectiveness of the intervention under evaluation? If so, give details in this text box.

Recommendations for this section

No.	Recommendation	Relevant paragraphs	Addressee	Date for action

Impact

Guidance for evaluators when assessing Impact

To answer these questions the evaluators will, in all probability, have to draw on their own experience and judgement to provide a measured future assessment of the sort of impact the project is likely to have once it is fully operational. This assessment should be based on the project's progress made to date, expected future performance, as well as relevant factors in the external environment, such as developments within the sector both in the Czech Republic and internationally. Please use the example given in the annex for general guidance on how to assess impact.

1. Will the project achieve its planned **objectives**?
2. What are the factors influencing their achievement?
3. Will the project contribute to the achievement of the objectives of the **Priority Axis¹¹** under which the project has been funded?

These are (for PA1):

- *Creation of a **limited number of Centres of Excellence, well equipped R&D centres with modern, sometimes unique research infrastructure, with a critical size and able to contribute to the networking and closer integration of the leading Czech R&D teams with leading international research organisations and European research infrastructures;***
- *To identify, support and strengthen the **best research teams** which will obtain the best **material conditions** for their strengthening and expansion and also the opportunity to research and explore novel topics, develop intensive contacts and strategic partnerships with the leading **international partners** (private and public).*

These are (for PA2):

- *The establishment and development of (demand-driven) R&D centres with quality equipment focused on applied research and with strong, long-term collaboration partnerships with industry (especially for contract research and provision of technological services);*

¹¹ Please reflect the objectives of the appropriate Priority axis only, delete as appropriate the objectives of other PA.

- To an increase of a pool of qualified workers experienced in cooperation with the industry;
- To deepen regional economic and technological specialisation;
- To reinforce cooperation with the application area according to the needs of the region;
- To contribute in an important way to the competitiveness of the economy of Czech regions.

4. What are the factors influencing their achievement?

Best practice

Are there examples of best practice from your own administration/centre/institute that could help improve the impact of the intervention under evaluation? If so, give details in this text box.

Recommendations for this section

No.	Recommendation	Relevant paragraphs	Addressee	Date for action

Sustainability

In this section the evaluators are asked to look into the future and give an assessment of the project's sustainability. They should offer a balanced judgement on the prospects for the project being sustainable once funding from the OP RDI is concluded and the factors that will define the project's ultimate fate. These include:

- The financing of the centre during and after the project
- Its future structure and staffing (e.g. the number/structure of research programmes that will be sustainable in the future, the number staff employed under the project vis-a-vis the likely numbers that will be affordable after its completion)
- Anticipated institutional support for the centre from mother organisation and other bodies Political influences on the future development of the project, its sector and/or RDI generally
- Any legal considerations for the operation and funding of research facilities (such as any issues related to state aids)

Best practice

Are there examples of best practice from your own administration/centre/institute that could help improve the sustainability of the intervention under evaluation? If so, give details in this text box.

Recommendations for this section

No.	Recommendation	Relevant paragraphs	Addressee	Date for action

Table of Acronyms

Acronym	Full name
SAR	Self Assessment Report

Acronyms should be listed alphabetically

List of interviews conducted

Name of interviewee	Position and name of organisation

Annex - Definitions and examples of DAC evaluation criteria in relation to the evaluation of projects

	OUTPUTS (EFFECTIVENESS)	RESULTS (EFFECTIVENESS)	IMPACT (PROJECT OBJECTIVES)	WIDER IMPACT (PRIORITY AXIS OBJECTIVES)
DEFINITION	<i>WHAT THE PROJECT HAS PUT IN PLACE THAT WASN'T THERE BEFORE.</i>	<i>THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE OUTPUTS ARE USED BY THE BENEFICIARIES</i>	<i>THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE RESULTS ARE USED BY OTHERS NOT DIRECTLY TARGETED BY THE PROJECT</i>	<i>THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE OUTPUTS OR THE IMMEDIATE OR INTERMEDIATE IMPACTS CONTRIBUTE TO CHANGE IN THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT</i>
EXAMPLE				
ESTABLISHMENT/ EXPANSION OF A RESEARCH CENTRE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BUILDINGS CONSTRUCTED OR REFURBISHED • EQUIPMENT INSTALLED AND RUNNING IN THE BENEFICIARY INSTITUTION • STAFF TRAINED OR EMPLOYED • FUNCTIONING MANAGEMENT 	NEW/IMPROVED RESEARCH PROGRAMME(S) OR CENTRE	IMPROVED CAPACITY FOR APPLIED RESEARCH IN TARGET REGION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEEPENED REGIONAL ECONOMIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL SPECIALISATION • REINFORCED COOPERATION WITH THE APPLICATION AREA ACCORDING TO THE NEEDS OF THE REGION; • IMPROVED COMPETITIVENESS OF THE REGIONAL ECONOMY
FACTORS INFLUENCING THEIR DELIVERY OR ACHIEVEMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LAND PURCHASED FOR CONSTRUCTION • FUNDS FOR PURCHASE OF EQUIPMENT; • APPROPRIATE BUILDING TO HOUSE EQUIPMENT; STAFF TO RUN AND MAINTAIN THE EQUIPMENT (TECHNICIANS); • STAFF AVAILABLE FOR TRAINING OR RECRUITMENT • MANAGEMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES IN PLACE AND FUNCTIONING 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FUNCTIONAL RESEARCH FACILITIES • SUFFICIENT NUMBERS OF SUITABLY QUALIFIED RESEARCH STAFF • FUNDS TO FINANCE THE CENTRE/RP OPERATIONS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LONG TERM FUNDING FOR THE RESEARCH CENTRE • SUPPORTIVE LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK • STABLE INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY • COOPERATION WITH ACADEMIC AND INDUSTRIAL PARTNERS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MACROECONOMIC CONDITIONS - BUSINESS CLIMATE - PREVAILING TRENDS IN THE RELEVANT AREA OF RESEARCH

Annex 4: Template and associated Guidance notes for completion of the self-assessment report

Operational Programme Research and Development for Innovations

Interim Evaluation of Projects Supported under Priority Axes 1 and 2

Beneficiary Self-Assessment Report Template

Name of Project:

Name of report author(s):

Date:

Introduction

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

You are therefore encouraged to provide information that corresponds as closely as possible with the requirements stated in the template - in effect, the template serves as a checklist for you to follow and we would ask you to use it as such. Should you be unable to provide information related to any point in the template, please say so and also state why it is not available.

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

Section 1 - Management of the Project

Guidance notes:

This section should not exceed 8 pages in length.

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

1.1 Overview of executive management arrangements

Specific information required:

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

1.2 Supervisory level management arrangements

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

Specific information required in relation to these boards

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

1.3 Senior management of the project

Please provide the following:

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

1.4 Risk management

Please state the following:

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

1.5 Relations with Key Stakeholders

Please state:

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

1.6 Additional analysis

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

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

Section 2 - Human Resources

Guidance notes:

This section should not exceed 6 pages in length.

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

2.1 General Human Resources Policy

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

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

2.2 Project workforce

Please provide the following information:

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

2.3 Training and professional development

Please provide the following information:

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

2.4 Additional analysis

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

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

Section 3 - Financial

Guidance notes:

This section should not exceed 5 pages in length.

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

Please provide the following information by years:

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

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

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

3.3 Generated income

Please provide a brief overview of the following issues:

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

3.4 Additional analysis

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

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

Section 4 - Research programme

Guidance note:

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

4.1 Progress to date

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

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

4.2 Additional analysis

The author is requested to provide the following additional information;

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

Section 5 - Interaction with application sphere/users

Guidance notes:

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

It may be the case that your project has not yet produced significant results, and that interaction with users is still in the early stages of development. In these cases the beneficiary should outline (a) what has been achieved, (b) the extent to which this

corresponds with obligations laid out in the project's Technical Annex (TA) and (c) expected results in the short to medium term (6 – 12 months from the time of the preparation of this report).

The author should provide an overview of the following issues:

5.1 **Planned and actual results**

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

5.2 **Technology transfer & Intellectual Property Rights**

- Technology transfer strategy;
- Policy towards use of IPR and know-how management;
- Successes and difficulties to date.

5.4 **Business policy/strategy**

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

5.5 **Additional analysis**

The author is requested to provide the following additional information;

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

Section 6 - Infrastructure and equipment

Guidance note:

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

The beneficiary should report on the following:

6.1 **Buildings**

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

6.2 **Equipment**

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

6.3 Use of equipment and facilities

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

6.4 Additional analysis

The author is requested to provide the following additional information;

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

Section 7 - Other comments, concerns, issues

Guidance note:

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

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

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

Annex 5: Declaration of Impartiality and Confidentiality of the Expert Evaluators of projects supported under the Priority Axes 1 and 2 OP RDI

- 1) I herewith represent that
 - a) I am not aware of any connection between myself and organisations implementing projects funded from the OP RDI ('beneficiary institutions'), nor am I aware of any facts that would or could influence my execution of the role of evaluator when evaluating projects of these beneficiary institutions. (A connection to a beneficiary institution shall be understood to mean any family, working, business or similar relationship that could jeopardise evaluator independence in the evaluation process);
 - b) I have in no way participated in the preparation or implementation of any of the projects that I shall be evaluating, nor do I have a personal interest in its/their execution.
 - c) I acknowledge that if any reason should arise leading to my loss of impartiality while performing a task / evaluation, I will be obliged immediately to report this fact to the OP RDI Managing Authority.
- 2) I further pledge that while performing the work of an evaluator, and after this work is completed, I will maintain confidentiality with respect to all facts and information disclosed to me in connection with the evaluation of projects and that I will neither intentionally nor unintentionally provide to third parties confidential information that I have obtained in connection with the OP RDI project evaluation process.

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

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

I acknowledge that any breach of the provisions of this declaration could give rise to entitlement to compensation of damage. I acknowledge that such damage may include damage to the reputation of the Ministry of Schools, Youth and Sport.

In on

.....

Name of evaluator Signature

Annex 6: The OP RDI Code of Ethics

Validity

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

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

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

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

General Principles

1. The Code provisions are considered to be part of the set of binding documents in accordance with which the Member is obliged to act and which the Member is obliged to respect.
2. In performing their obligations, Members are governed by the principles of the legality, quality, effectiveness and ethics of work, in particular through adherence to the principles of fairness and equality.
3. The OP RDI Managing Authority contributes to the application of these principles and thereby to an effective OP RDI implementation process by creating a challenging work environment and giving preference to cooperation, fairness and the promotion of ethical work practices.

Principles of Legality

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

Principle of Quality and Effectiveness

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

Principle of Ethical Work and Fairness

12. The Member is obliged to work in the interest of OP RDI implementation responsibly, honestly, conscientiously and in compliance with the mission and objective of this operational programme.
13. The Member shall perform the work with the utmost propriety, understanding, willingness and adherence to the general rules of ethical communication.
14. In respect of the public, in particular OP RDI support applicants or recipients, as well as staff of other implementation structure sections, the Member shall act in an obliging and polite manner and with the highest degree of understanding.

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

Principle of Quality and Effectiveness

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

Conflict of Interest and Reporting of Interest

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

Gifts and Benefits

24. The Member shall not request or accept gifts, favours, or any other benefits that could influence decision-making or prejudice his/her impartiality.

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

Notification of Impermissible Activity and Control

28. Should a Member learn of damage caused by the negligent, fraudulent or corrupt behaviour of another Member or any person outside the implementation structure, which could violate the transparency, fairness and principle of non-discrimination of the OP RDI implementation process, he/she shall immediately report this fact to the OP RDI Managing Authority or control or audit section.
29. The OP RDI Managing Authority shall investigate any suspected violation of Code of Ethics provisions at the suggestion of a Member or private citizen. The resultant findings are reported to the OP RDI Monitoring Committee and the documents are archived. In the event of an affirmative finding, it shall proceed pursuant to the valid legislation and ensure that the implementation process is corrected and continues without undue interruption.
30. The Member acknowledges that in the event of a finding of gross violation of the Code, the OP RDI Managing Authority and control mechanisms may sanction this violation as a breach of obligation of the Member connected with his/her team position.
31. The Member acknowledges that a violation of the Code can cast doubt on the entire course of OP RDI implementation, which may result in the non-allocation or suspension of a contribution from the European Fund for Regional Development.

Efficiency

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

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

Annex 7: Document destruction

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

In on

.....

Name of evaluator

.....

Signature

For the OP RDI MA

.....

Name

.....

Signature