

International Evaluation Conference

WHAT'S NEW AND WHAT WORKS IN THE EU  
COHESION POLICY 2007–2013:  
DISCOVERIES AND LESSONS FOR 2014–2020

3-4 March 2011, Vilnius, Lithuania

Call for papers



## CALL FOR PAPERS

### INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION CONFERENCE

#### **WHAT'S NEW AND WHAT WORKS IN THE EU COHESION POLICY 2007–2013: LESSONS FOR 2014–2020**

3-4 March 2011, Vilnius, Lithuania

The Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Lithuania regularly organises international conferences dedicated to evaluation of EU Structural Fund programmes. The conference held on 3–4 March 2011 in Vilnius is already the fourth event of this type. The aim of this conference is twofold: to take stock of EU Structural Fund evaluations analysing the implementation of instruments, methods and interventions newly introduced in the 2007–2013 period *as well as* to discuss whether evaluation is already being used as an integrated programme management tool.

Since 2007, EU Structural Fund management authorities have undertaken a range of evaluations examining the implementation of programmes at both a strategic and an operational level. It is important that findings from these evaluations are disseminated and reflected on when developing investment strategies and priorities for 2014–2020. Even though it is still too early to evaluate the results or the impact of the programmes which are still at the half-way stage in their implementation, it is worth discussing to what extent new instruments, methods and processes work. The conference theme was chosen deliberately so that it could feed into discussions surrounding the preparation for the new programming period.

Against this background, the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Lithuania invites EU Structural Fund management authorities, EU institutions and evaluators to discuss what's new and what works in the EU Cohesion Policy for 2007–2013 by sharing findings from the ongoing evaluation activity, consider lessons that should be taken into account when programming support for 2014–2020 and reflect on how evaluation can be put to even better use in future.

The document herein presents conference themes and objectives and includes a *draft* programme. It also provides important information for those who would like to make a presentation at the conference: we specify what papers we are looking for and how you can submit your proposals. Please note that the conference is dedicated to evaluation of EU Structural Fund programmes, therefore the papers proposed should deal with evaluation issues in one way or another, for instance presenting evaluation findings or experience in carrying out and using evaluation.

**We hope that the proposed conference themes will catch your interest and encourage you to share your experience and ideas concerning evaluation of EU Structural Fund programmes.**

Please note that participants of the conference will have an opportunity to enjoy unique Lithuanian folk arts and crafts fair *Kaziukas Fair* – an annual event held in the very beginning of March. The fair has a long history – it has been running for more than 400 years! Today the *Kaziukas Fair* is a three-day celebration of folk art, crafts, music and dance, attracting hundreds of craftspeople not only from Lithuania, but from neighbouring countries as well.

## **CONFERENCE HOST**

The conference is organised by the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Lithuania.  
The event is funded by the European Social Fund and co-funded by the Republic of Lithuania.

## **TARGET GROUP**

The conference intends to bring together representatives of EU Structural Fund administrations, the European Commission, evaluators, representatives of the academic sector and other experts with an interest in the EU Cohesion Policy and evaluation.

The conference organisers expect around 150 participants to attend the conference.

## **DATE AND VENUE**

The conference takes place on 3–4 March 2011 in Vilnius, Lithuania.  
The venue of the conference will be specified later. The updated information will be published on the website at <http://www.esparama.lt/2007-2013/lt/vertinimas>.

## **WORKING LANGUAGES**

The working languages of the conference will be Lithuanian and English.

## **INFORMATION FOR SPEAKERS AND OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

If you would like to attend the conference as a speaker, please see the information presented in Section III “*Guidelines on Paper Proposal Submission*” of this document.

If you would like to attend the conference as a participant, please follow the information on the website at <http://www.esparama.lt/2007-2013/lt/vertinimas>. The registration of participants will start in December 2010.

The participation in the conference is free of charge.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I. CONFERENCE THEME AND OBJECTIVES .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. DRAFT CONFERENCE PROGRAMME.....</b>	<b>1</b>
OPENING SESSION .....	9
STRAND 1. EVALUATING EVALUATION – DO WE USE IT AS A PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT TOOL? 9	
STRAND 2. TAKING STOCK OF EVALUATIONS: SHARING INSIGHTS ON WHAT'S NEW AND WHAT	
WORKS IN 2007–2013.....	11
2.1. <i>ASSESSING INNOVATIVE FORMS OF ASSISTANCE</i> .....	11
2.2. <i>ASSESSING CHANGES IN THE AREAS OF SUPPORT</i> .....	14
CLOSING SESSION: EU COHESION POLICY AFTER 2013.....	16
<b>III. GUIDELINES ON PAPER PROPOSAL SUBMISSION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>ANNEX 1. SUBMISSION FORM .....</b>	<b>1</b>

## **I. CONFERENCE THEME AND OBJECTIVES**

Member States of the European Union (hereinafter – the EU) receive assistance from the EU Structural and Cohesion Funds to tackle structural economic and social problems and to promote the development. One of the requirements for beneficiary countries is to carry out evaluations of EU funded interventions, analysing their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and utility. Evaluations aim to improve the quality, effectiveness and consistency of the assistance from the Funds and the strategy and implementation of operational programmes. Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 stipulates that evaluations shall be carried out before, during and after the programming period. Evaluations may be of a strategic nature in order to examine the evolution of a programme or group of programmes in relation to Community and national priorities. Evaluations may also be of an operational nature in order to support the monitoring of an operational programme.

The Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Lithuania, in attempt to encourage more widespread and better use of evaluation as a management tool, regularly organises international conferences dedicated to evaluation-related organisational and methodological issues. The 4<sup>th</sup> international evaluation conference is held in the interesting and intensive period. The implementation of operational programmes for 2007–2013 has reached half-way, first results are emerging, and problems are being addressed. At the same time, preparation for the programming period 2014–2020 is intensifying: the future of the Cohesion Policy has been the topic of discussion for several years now and the work on the 2014-2020 Financial Framework has started. Member States are also holding discussions on the priorities for Structural Fund investments in 2014–2020. All of this takes place in the context of economic turmoil.

So far it has been mostly lessons from the previous programming periods that could be taken into consideration when discussing the future of the Cohesion Policy as the current generation of programmes are only at the halfway point in their implementation. Empirical evidence and interesting insights concerning results and effectiveness of Structural Fund investments may be found in ex post evaluations of Cohesion Policy programmes 2000–2006<sup>1</sup> commissioned by the European Commission, reports on economic and social cohesion<sup>2</sup> and other analysis, for example, Barca Report<sup>3</sup> presenting independent evaluation and recommendations on the reform of the Cohesion Policy. Member States have also initiated ex post evaluations at a national and/or regional level, which feed into discussions on the use of Structural Funds after 2013.

However, while results and lessons learnt from previous programming periods are highly important, they are not sufficient. The development of new generation programmes for 2014-2020 should also take account of experience gained in the implementation of programmes 2007–2013, especially considering the fact that important changes have been introduced in this period. There have been changes in the management of Structural Fund programmes, delivery instruments, intervention areas. For instance, for 2007–2013 programming round there is a greater strategic approach to the delivery of the Funds, rural development funds are no longer a part of the Structural Funds framework, funding of certain new priorities is allowed. Furthermore, alternative means of investing are promoted – it is possible to allocate a part of the Structural Funds for financial engineering

---

<sup>1</sup>Available on the website of the European Commission's Directorate General for Regional Policy: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/rado2\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/rado2_en.htm)

<sup>2</sup> Available on the website of the European Commission's Directorate General for Regional Policy: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docoffic/official/repor\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/repor_en.htm)

<sup>3</sup> Barca Report. An Agenda for a Reformed Cohesion Policy. // [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/policy/future/barca\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/policy/future/barca_en.htm)

purposes in areas providing support for SMEs and micro-enterprises (JEREMIE) or for urban development (JESSICA). The approach to evaluation has also been modified – there was a shift away from mid-term evaluations towards a more flexible approach of on-going evaluations, driven by the needs of decision-makers. The list of aforementioned differences from earlier periods is, of course, non-exhaustive.

Do new instruments, methods and interventions introduced in the Structural Fund framework for 2007–2013 work? Should they “travel” to the next programming period? What lessons should be taken into account to make certain instruments more effective in 2014–2020? Is there anything that was unjustifiably given up in this period and therefore should be “re-discovered”?

Even though it is still too early to evaluate the results or the impact of programmes which are still running, it is worth discussing to what extent new instruments, methods and processes work. Interesting evidence and certain answers to questions can be provided by on-going evaluations.

The aim of this conference is twofold: to take stock of EU Structural Fund evaluations analysing the implementation of instruments, methods and interventions newly introduced in the 2007–2013 period as well as to discuss whether evaluation is already being used as an integrated programme management tool.

Hence, the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Lithuania invites EU Structural Fund management authorities, EU institutions and evaluators to discuss what’s new and what works in the EU Cohesion Policy for 2007–2013 by sharing findings from the ongoing evaluation activity, consider lessons that should be taken into account when programming support for 2014–2020 and reflect on how evaluation can be put to even better use in future.

## II. DRAFT CONFERENCE PROGRAMME

The conference will be organised around two key strands:

**Strand 1 – Focus on Evaluation as a Management Tool.** The first strand of the conference will revolve around the question of whether and to what extent evaluation is used as a management tool to assist in the implementation of current programmes in different stages of their lifecycle. The session will touch upon issues related to organisation, methodology and use of evaluation as well as discuss the role foreseen for evaluation in the upcoming programming period.

**Strand 2 – Sharing Evaluation Findings.** Sessions under the second strand will take stock of EU Structural Fund evaluations and discuss “what works, what does not and what is lacking in 2007–2013” specifically focusing on the innovative forms of support as well as areas of support where there have been changes compared to 2000–2006.

In addition, the **Closing session** of the conference will deal with issues related to the future of EU Cohesion Policy after 2013.

### DRAFT CONFERENCE PROGRAMME AT A GLANCE

- **OPENING SESSION.** Welcome speeches and introduction to the conference.
- **STRAND 1. EVALUATING EVALUATION – DO WE USE IT AS A PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT TOOL?**
- **STRAND 2. TAKING STOCK OF EVALUATIONS: SHARING INSIGHTS ON WHAT’S NEW AND WHAT WORKS IN 2007–2013.**
  - **2.1. Assessing innovative forms of assistance**
    - 2.1.1. Are EU Cohesion Policy instruments suitable for the achievement of policy objectives? The case of innovative measures.
    - 2.1.2. Financial engineering – a new and better way to use EU Structural Funds?
  - **2.2. Assessing changes in the areas of support**
    - 2.2.1. EU Structural Fund support to public sector institutional and administrative capacity - what results can be expected?
    - 2.2.2. EU Structural Fund support to innovation: to what extent, when and what investments are effective? Insights from evaluations.
- **CLOSING SESSION.** EU Cohesion Policy after 2013.

Each of the conference sessions is described in more detail below. The description includes questions which should guide your submissions in case you decide to contribute to the conference by presenting a paper.

**NB!** Please note that the conference programme as presented in this document is still a *draft*. The final programme will depend on the number, focus and quality of the submissions received.



## OPENING SESSION

**Purpose of the session.** The purpose of this session is to welcome participants and give an introductory overview of the conference theme and objectives.

**Who is invited to submit paper proposals?** This session is not open for submissions.

## STRAND 1. EVALUATING EVALUATION – DO WE USE IT AS A PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT TOOL?

### Focus on Evaluation as a Management Tool

**Introduction to the theme.** The requirement to evaluate Structural Fund programmes has always been part of the Cohesion Policy framework. Successive Cohesion Policy reforms gradually institutionalised and strengthened the role of evaluation. As far as it concerns evaluation, 2007–2013 programming period is interesting as it has introduced important changes in the evaluation approach. The Regulation 1083/2006 provides for a shift from a concept of mid-term evaluation driven by regulatory imperatives towards a more flexible, demand-driven approach to evaluation during the programming period: on-going evaluation.<sup>4</sup> As a part of the move towards a more flexible and needs-based approach to evaluation, the European Commission has encouraged the Member States and regions to develop evaluation plans to guide their evaluation activities. The purpose of the new framework for on-going evaluation was to ensure that it was effectively used and integrated as a management tool during the implementation phase.<sup>5</sup>

While Regulation 1083/2006 provides for flexible arrangements with regard to the on-going evaluation, there are specific cases in which Member States are obliged to carry it out. Evaluation shall be undertaken where the monitoring of operational programmes reveals a significant departure from the goals initially set and when operational programme revisions are proposed. The latter provision was amended in 2010, laying down that Member States should provide an *analysis* justifying the revision of an operational programme instead of an evaluation.

**Purpose of the session.** The purpose of this session is to discuss whether promises of and expectations related to on-going evaluation are being met in practice, to what extent EU Structural Fund administrations use evaluation as a programme management tool and share ideas about the role of evaluation in 2014–2020.

**Format of the session.** Paper session.

**What issues will potentially be covered in the session?** Presentations on the following aspects and issues are welcome:

---

<sup>4</sup> The New Programming Period 2007–2013. Indicative Guidelines on Evaluation Methods: Evaluation during the programming period. *Working Document No 5* //

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docoffic/2007/working/wd5\\_ongoing\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/2007/working/wd5_ongoing_en.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> The New Programming Period 2007–2013. Indicative Guidelines on Evaluation Methods: Evaluation during the programming period. *Working Document No 5* //

[http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docoffic/2007/working/wd5\\_ongoing\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/2007/working/wd5_ongoing_en.pdf)

Sub-theme	Issues
Ongoing evaluation in theory and practice – views from the Member States and the European Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is the on-going evaluation approach understood and implemented in the EU Member States? What are the benefits, achievements and challenges related to the new approach to evaluation? Are expectations related to the on-going evaluation being met? Do investments in evaluation activity pay off? Have evaluations become more “decision-making oriented”, timely and “usable” with the introduction of evaluation planning? What was the input of evaluations to strategic reports in 2010? Whether and what additional steps need to be taken to ensure that evaluation is used as a programme management tool?</li> <li>• To what extent evaluations are being used to substantiate and justify the proposed revisions of operational programmes? What are the examples of evaluations which were used to substantiate operational programme revisions? Have evaluations been useful in re-orienting and better targeting Structural Fund interventions? What are the examples of evaluations that proved to be useful in refocusing the assistance in the face of the economic crisis? Is evaluation <i>per se</i> a useful tool to justify the revision of operational programmes? The paragraph 3 of Article 48 of Regulation 1083/2006 was amended in 2010 - what are the (potential) consequences of this amendment?</li> <li>• What is considered a significant departure from the initial goals? What are the examples of evaluations carried out as a result of a significant departure from the initial goals? What results have they revealed and how have they helped tackle problematic issues?</li> <li>• What are the examples of innovative and methodologically interesting on-going evaluations?</li> </ul>
Input of evaluation into the development of new generation programmes 2014–2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the use and “expiration period” of the ex post evaluation of programmes for 2000–2006? To what extent findings from ex post evaluations can feed into the preparation of new programmes, taking into account the fact that the economic situation has changed and / or the fact that results will be influenced by programmes for 2007–2013 that are still under implementation?</li> <li>• What evaluations Member States have undertaken or plan to undertake in the context of preparation for 2014–2020 programming period?</li> </ul>
Organisation of evaluation in 2014–2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will (should) the ex ante evaluation of programmes for 2014–2020 be organised? What will be changed in organisation and methodology of the ex ante evaluation compared to the previous periods?</li> <li>• How should evaluation be organised and carried out in the forthcoming programming period? When organising evaluation in the context of the Structural Funds, is there something to be learnt from the evaluation practice in other EU policies (e.g. evaluation of EU assistance to rural development, etc.)?</li> </ul>

**Who is invited to submit paper proposals?** Representatives from the EU Structural Fund administrations, the European Commission, evaluators and academicians.

## STRAND 2. TAKING STOCK OF EVALUATIONS: SHARING INSIGHTS ON WHAT'S NEW AND WHAT WORKS IN 2007–2013

### Sharing Evaluation Findings

#### 2.1. ASSESSING INNOVATIVE FORMS OF ASSISTANCE

2.1.1. Are EU Cohesion Policy instruments suitable for the achievement of the policy objectives? The case of innovative measures.

**Introduction to the theme.** One of the instruments which hasn't been kept in 2007–2013 is innovative measures. During the previous programming periods Member States could allocate a part of the Structural Funds for innovative actions – studies, pilot projects, exchange of experience, etc. Innovative actions were specifically designed to give regions the opportunity to experiment and provided regional actors with the risk space needed to test responses to the challenges encountered.

It can be mentioned that one of the recent criticisms of the Cohesion Policy is that it does not encourage risk-taking, policy innovation, experimentation and learning.<sup>6</sup> In this context the conference intends to “look back”, consider the experience and the results from the implementation of innovative actions and discuss whether they were abandoned “for a reason”.

**Purpose of the session.** The purpose of this session is to touch upon a more general question of whether EU Cohesion Policy instruments are suitable for the achievement of the policy objectives by specifically focusing on the experience of innovative measures.

**Format of the session.** Paper session and round-table discussion.

**What issues will potentially be covered in the session?** Presentations on the following aspects and issues are welcome:

Sub-theme	Issues and Insights from Evaluations
Assessing experience and results of innovative actions ( <i>paper session</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What are the examples of innovative actions, experience in implementing them and the results achieved (ERDF and ESF interventions) in the EU Member States from? (exchange of experience)</li><li>• What are the findings from ex post evaluations of Cohesion Policy programmes 2000–2006 concerning the effectiveness and utility of innovative actions?</li></ul>
Are EU Cohesion Policy instruments suitable for the achievement of policy objectives? ( <i>round-table</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What was the reason for discontinuing innovative actions in 2007-2013?</li><li>• To what extent does the current framework of the Cohesion Policy encourage Member States/regions to experiment and assume risk when planning and implementing programmes? What are the capacities and motivation to experiment?</li></ul>

<sup>6</sup>For example, see *Barca Report. An Agenda for a Reformed Cohesion Policy*, 2009 ([http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/policy/future/barca\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/policy/future/barca_en.htm)), also *Thematic Evaluation of the Structural Funds' Contributions to the Lisbon Strategy*, 2005

Sub-theme	Issues and Insights from Evaluations
<i>discussion)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should innovative measures be “re-discovered” in 2014–2020? What lessons learnt should be taken into account?</li> </ul>

**Who is invited to submit paper proposals?** Representatives of EU Structural Fund administrations which have experience in implementing innovative measures, the European Commission, evaluators and academicians.

#### 2.1.2. Financial engineering – a new and better way to use EU Structural Funds?

**Introduction to the theme.** New financial engineering initiatives JEREMIE and JESSICA were launched in the context of the EU Cohesion Policy for 2007–2013. The JEREMIE initiative offered EU Member States the opportunity to use a part of their EU Structural Funds to finance SMEs and micro enterprises by means of equity, loans or guarantees.<sup>7</sup> The JESSICA initiative supports investment in sustainable urban development by combining subsidies, loans, guarantees and other financial products.<sup>8</sup> Financial engineering instruments are promoted as innovative<sup>9</sup> approach to investing Structural Funds. The use of financial engineering (as opposed to one-off grants) is encouraged not only because this allows attracting additional funding (due to the leverage effect) and recycling funds. Financial engineering instruments are also intended to provide greater flexibility and stronger incentives towards better performance. It is envisaged that financial engineering will play even more important role in the Cohesion Policy after 2013.

**Purpose of the session.** The purpose of this session is to discuss to what extent financial engineering is an innovative and better way to invest EU Structural Funds. Insights and findings from evaluations undertaken by the EU Member States and EU institutions which explore specific issues related to the implementation of financial engineering initiatives are of great interest and should feed into the discussion.

**What issues will potentially be covered in the session?** Presentations on the following aspects and issues are welcome:

Sub-theme	Issues and Insights from Evaluations
The use of financial engineering instruments in the Cohesion Policy – assessing experience and prospects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When is the transition from subsidies to other forms of assistance justified? What is the added value of the application of financial engineering measures in the Cohesion Policy?</li> <li>What are the examples of using financial engineering to invest Structural Funds in the previous programming periods (if any) – overview of experience and the results achieved</li> <li>What are the insights from evaluations analysing the planning and</li> </ul>

<sup>7</sup> JEREMIE – *Joint European Resources for Micro to Medium Enterprises*. More information about the JEREMIE initiative is available on the website of the European Commission’s Directorate General for Regional Policy [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/funds/2007/jji/jeremie\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/funds/2007/jji/jeremie_en.htm)

<sup>8</sup> JESSICA – *Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas*. More information about the JESSICA initiative is available on the website of the European Commission’s Directorate General for Regional Policy [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/funds/2007/jji/jessica\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/funds/2007/jji/jessica_en.htm)

<sup>9</sup> This term is used in Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006 laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999.

Sub-theme	Issues and Insights from Evaluations
	<p>implementation of JEREMIE and JESSICA initiatives? What are the initial achievements and lessons learnt? Which measures work and which do not work? Why? What are success and risks factors?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the role of financial engineering in 2014–2020?</li> </ul>

**Who is invited to submit paper proposals?** Representatives of EU Structural Fund administrations, the European Commission, evaluators, especially those who have experience in implementing and evaluating financial engineering instruments.

## 2.2. ASSESSING CHANGES IN THE AREAS OF SUPPORT

### 2.2.1. EU Structural Fund support to public sector institutional and administrative capacity – what results can be expected?

**Introduction to the theme.** ESF interventions on institutional and administrative capacity traditionally focussed on areas of employment services and education. However, for the programming period 2007–2013, the strengthening of institutional capacity is generalised and becomes one of the main ESF priorities. The need to invest in institutional capacity is recognised by the Community Strategic Guidelines for cohesion, where administrative capacity and good governance constitute one of the main priorities for the programming period. Support to the strengthening of institutional and administrative capacity in Convergence Regions and Cohesion Member States is seen as an instrument for promoting structural adjustments, growth and jobs, as well as economic development. The implementation of the new ESF priority is characterised by a more strategic approach which should lead to a comprehensive reform or modernisation of public administrations and public services.<sup>10</sup>

**Purpose of the session.** The purpose of this session is to discuss the effectiveness of support to institutional and administrative capacity building and consider methodological issues arising in evaluation of capacity building interventions.

**Format of the session.** Paper session.

**What issues will potentially be covered in the session?** Presentations on the following aspects and issues are welcome:

Sub-theme	Issues and Insights from Evaluations
Effectiveness of ESF support to public sector institutional and administrative capacity building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Revisiting intervention logic of the capacity building interventions in the public sector: to what extent, when and how good governance enhances economic development?</li><li>• What types of intervention have the highest added value and where the risk of deadweight losses is high? Which capacity building measures are more effective than others? What are the factors of effectiveness of capacity building in contributing to good governance?</li><li>• What is the sustainability of administrative capacity building results and how it can be enhanced?</li><li>• Should the ESF support to the administrative and institutional capacity building be continued in 2014–2020?</li></ul>
Evaluation capacity building interventions – methodological issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• How to assess the impact of ESF support on the improvement of administrative and institutional capacity? How to assess the ESF contribution to the development of good governance, better policy implementation and economic development?</li><li>• What are the examples of interesting, innovative or more rarely applied methods which have been applied in the specific evaluation in order to assess the effectiveness of capacity building interventions (e.g. before and after comparisons, control group approach, etc.)</li></ul>

<sup>10</sup> Public administrations and services in the European Social Fund 2007–2013 // [http://ec.europa.eu/employment\\_social/esf/fi\\_elds/public\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/esf/fi_elds/public_en.htm)



**Who is invited to submit paper proposals?** Representatives of EU Structural Fund administrations, European Commission, evaluators, especially those who have undertaken evaluations of ESF support to administrative and institutional capacity building.

**2.2.2. EU Structural Fund support to innovation: to what extent, when and what investments are effective? Insights from evaluations.**

**Introduction to the theme.** EU Structural Fund support to innovation is not something new. However, there have been important changes concerning support to innovation in the period 2007–2013. In this period, the Structural Funds are seen as a key delivery mechanism for the Lisbon strategy and thus Member States were strongly encouraged to earmark funds for investments in Lisbon priority areas, first and foremost in research and innovation. “Encouraging innovation, entrepreneurship and the growth of the knowledge economy by research and innovation capacities” has been named as one of the three priorities for the Structural Funds, receiving approximately 25% of the Cohesion Policy budget – i.e. twice as much as compared to the previous programming period.<sup>11</sup>

It is worth noting that promoting innovation will most likely remain a priority in the forthcoming financial perspective: on 17 June 2010, the European Council endorsed a new EU Strategy *Europe 2020*, which named the development of innovation and the knowledge economy as a strategic objective.<sup>12</sup> The European Council also pointed out that all EU policies, including the Cohesion Policy, must contribute to the implementation of objectives of *Europe 2020*.

**Purpose of the session.** The purpose of this session is to discuss to what extent, when and what investments to support innovation are effective. Insights and findings from evaluations undertaken by the EU Member States and EU institutions which explore issues related to support for innovations are of great interest and should feed into the discussion.

**Format of the session.** Paper session.

**What issues will potentially be covered in the session?** Presentations on the following aspects and issues are welcome:

Sub-theme	Issues and Insights from Evaluations
To what extent, when and what investments to support innovation are effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the rationale for investments to support innovation – arguments for and/or against.</li> <li>• What are the results of Structural Fund support to innovation – what do the evaluations undertaken reveal?</li> <li>• What types, fields and forms of support to innovation are new, effective, promising and what approaches do not seem to work? (We welcome papers dealing with different funds (ERDF or ESF), intervention types and fields (e.g. support to cooperation between business and science, knowledge transfer, support to innovative enterprises, development of innovation friendly environment, etc.)</li> </ul>

<sup>11</sup> In the programming period 2000–2006, Cohesion policy instruments provided EUR 196 billion or 11% of the total budget to some investments to innovation and R&D. In 2007–2013, the priority “Encouraging innovation, entrepreneurship and the growth of the knowledge economy by research and innovation capacities” has been allocated EUR 86 billion or 25% of the total budget, of which EUR 50 billion goes to R&D and innovation in the narrow sense, EUR 8.3 billion to entrepreneurship, EUR 13.2 billion to innovative information and communication technologies, and EUR 14.5 billion to human capital. // [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/themes/research/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/themes/research/index_en.htm)

<sup>12</sup> Other priority areas include sustainable economy, high employment, social inclusion.

Sub-theme	Issues and Insights from Evaluations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the examples of new and promising forms of support to innovation? (case studies)</li> </ul>
Evaluation of support to innovation – methodological issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the challenges arising in evaluation of support to innovation and how to address them?</li> </ul>

**Who is invited to submit paper proposals?** Representatives of EU Structural Fund administrations, the European Commission, evaluators, especially those who have undertaken evaluations of support to innovation.

## CLOSING SESSION: EU COHESION POLICY AFTER 2013

**Introduction to the theme.** The future of the Cohesion Policy has been the topic of discussion for several years now and the work on the 2014–2020 Financial Framework has started. Member States are also considering priorities for Structural and Cohesion Fund investments in 2014–2020.

**Purpose of the session.** The purpose of this session is to give an overview of the strategic context surrounding and influencing preparations for the new programming period as well as briefly discuss the future direction of the policy.

**Session format.** Paper session.

**What issues will potentially be covered in the session?** Presentations in this session will cover the following key issues:

Sub-theme	Issues
EU Cohesion Policy after 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most important challenges and the EU Cohesion Policy after 2013 (e.g. limited financial resources, fiscal limitations, potential establishment of new thematic funds (for transport, energy, climate change) at the expense of the Structural and Cohesion Funds) and envisaged future direction of the policy.</li> <li>An overview of the strategic EU context surrounding preparation of new generation programmes: focus on <i>Europa 2020</i> and EU budget review.</li> <li>Regional development priorities in the EU Cohesion Policy: is there a need for funding regional priorities within the framework of EU Cohesion Policy after 2013? What regional priorities which do not fall within the <i>Europa 2020</i> strategy should be funded in our region?</li> <li>The role of macro-regional strategies in the EU Cohesion Policy after 2013.</li> <li>Enhancing territorial cohesion: instruments and possibilities.</li> </ul>
Preparing for the 2014–2020 programming period in Lithuania – an overview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An overview of strategic Lithuanian context surrounding preparation for the 2014–2020 period: focus on a long-term strategy <i>Lithuania 2030</i></li> <li>An overview of the process and the organisation of preparation for the new financial perspective in Lithuania</li> </ul>



**Who is invited to submit paper proposals?** This session is not open for submissions.

### III. GUIDELINES ON PAPER PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

#### 1. What are the requirements for conference papers?

In order for the paper to be included in the conference programme it must meet the following criteria:

- The subject and the content of the paper are clearly and directly related to at least one of the themes and the relevant issues described in the draft conference programme.
- At least some of the information presented in the paper is based on evaluation insights or findings

[Please note that *papers proposed for the session* “Evaluating evaluation – do we use it as a programme management instrument” *are not subject to this requirement; other limited exceptions are also possible*].

- Papers should be of approximately 20–25 minutes long.
- The paper is written and presented either in English or Lithuanian.
- The paper proposal is submitted by filling in the submission form (included in Annex 1 to this document) and by the deadline set (see Point 3 below).

#### 2. How can I submit my paper proposal?

If you would like to submit paper proposal, please fill in the submission form provided in Annex 1 to this document.

#### 3. What is the deadline for submission of paper proposals and whereto should I send mine?

Submission forms should be sent by **1 December 2010** at e-mail [estep@estep.lt](mailto:estep@estep.lt).

#### 4. When will I know if the paper proposed by me is included in the conference programme?

The conference organisers will consider all the paper proposals received. We will inform you of the decision in the middle of December 2010.

#### 5. If my paper is included in the conference programme, what is the deadline for the submission of PowerPoint presentation?

If your paper is included in the conference programme, we will ask you to send us PowerPoint presentation by **4 February 2011**.

#### 6. Is there any participation fee?

Participation in the conference is free.

#### 7. Are travel and accommodation costs reimbursed?

Unfortunately, the conference organisers do not have additional budget to reimburse speakers' travel and accommodation costs. However, catering during the conference is free of charge.

#### 8. Who should I contact in case of any questions?

Information about the conference is published and constantly updated at <http://www.esparama.lt/2007-2013/lt/vertinimas>. Should you have questions, please contact Ms Laura Indriliunaite, Head of Public Administration Group, “European Social, Legal and Economic Projects (ESTEP)”, at tel. 370-5-269 0 121 or e-mail [estep@estep.lt](mailto:estep@estep.lt).

## ANNEX 1. SUBMISSION FORM

If you are interested in making a presentation at the international evaluation conference “[What’s New and What Works in The EU Cohesion Policy 2007–2013: Lessons for 2014–2020](#)”, held on 3–4 March 2011 in Vilnius, Lithuania, please fill in this submission form.

### CLOSING DATE FOR SUBMISSIONS

The submission forms should be sent no later than **1 December 2010** at e-mail [estep@estep.lt](mailto:estep@estep.lt).

### INFORMATION ABOUT THE SPEAKER

First name	
Last name	
Organisation/ Institution	
Position	
Telephone number	
E-mail address	
Country	

### INFORMATION ABOUT THE PAPER PROPOSED

#### 1. Selection of the session in which you would like to make a presentation

The table below presents conference sessions for which you can submit your proposal. Please indicate<sup>13</sup> the session in which you would like to make a presentation. Before you choose a session, please acquaint yourself with the draft conference programme.

Strand		Session
Strand 1. Evaluating evaluation – do we use it as a programme management tool?		<input type="checkbox"/>
Strand 2. Taking stock of evaluations: sharing insights on what’s new and what works in 2007–2013		
2.1. Assessing innovative forms of assistance	2.1.1. Are EU Cohesion Policy instruments suitable for the achievement of policy objectives? The case of innovative measures.	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>13</sup> To tick the box of your preference, please double-click the left mouse button and select “checked”.

Strand	Session	
	2.1.2. Financial engineering – a new and better way to use EU Structural Funds?	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2. Assessing changes in the areas of support	2.2.1. EU Structural Fund support to public sector institutional and administrative capacity – what results can be expected?	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2.2.2. EU Structural Fund support to innovation: to what extent, when and what investments are effective? Insights from evaluations.	<input type="checkbox"/>

## 2. Information on the paper proposed

Please provide more information about your paper in the table below.

Title of the paper*		
What is the purpose of the presentation? What key problems and questions will it explore?*(describe in 150–300 words)		
Please, explain how your presentation relates to the themes/sub-themes/issues of the session? What aspects of the theme will the paper explore?*		
Will the paper draw on the findings or insights from evaluation of EU Structural Fund programme?*	Yes	No
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other comments		

\*Mandatory information