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Executive summary

Project Definition

The Managing Authority of the Integrated Operational Programme (MA the IOP) ordered an elaboration of a project “Evaluation of the communication and promotional activities of the IOP” with the following goals:

* to check **the current state of awareness about the IOP Communication Plan (CoP) of the IOP target groups**;
* and **to evaluate the real impact** of the CoP implementation including the efficiency of the informational and promotional tools in fulfilling the communication goals of the IOP.

The evaluation outcome assesses the current state of the CoP goals fulfillment and proposes measures for enhancing the efficiency of the prospective communication activities and communication strategy for the Integrated Operational Programme.

Subject of evaluation were the communication **activities carried out in the 2008-2010 period by the IOP Managing Authority** (Ministry of Regional Development, Department of the Operational Programmes Management) and by the **intermediate body(IB)** of the IOP:

* Ministry of Interior
* Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs
* Ministry of Health
* Ministry of Culture
* Center for Regional Development of the CR

Project Methodology

The evaluation utilizes the following data and sources:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| DATA | SOURCE[[1]](#footnote-2) |
| Data at the level of the CoP communication activities **impacts** (especially awareness, knowledge and positions of the target groups towards the IOP) | * Quantitative research – “Inquiry on awareness of the Integrated Operational Programme among publics” (Naviga4, 2011)
* Quantitative research – “Inquiry on awareness of the Integrated Operational Programme among applicants and recipients of the IOP”
* Quantitative research – „Inquiry of the implementation subjects of the IOP“
* Information on the course of the IOP implementation–Monthly monitoring reports on the course of structural funds, cohesion fund and national resources withdrawing in the programming period 2007-2013 (MMR, NOK)
 |
| Data at the level of **inputs, outputs and outcomes** of the realized activities of the CoP IOP | * Analysis of the data about material and financial progress of the general CoP and the annual the CoPsIOP and from the annual CoPs evaluation
 |
| **Qualitative** data related especially to the management of the communication process and the execution quality of the selected communication activities. | * In-depth interviews with the implementation structure representatives.
* Expert criteria assessment of the communication activities
 |
| Analysis of the IOP **media coverage** | * Quantitative and content analysis of the media coverage of the IOP in 2010
 |
| Secondary analysis of **the data significant in terms of context** of the CoP IOP implementation (i.e. attitudes and opinions of the target groups to the issues related to the IOP content from the material point of view, which can potentially influence the impact and efficiency of the realized communication activities) | * Public opinion research, data from databases, statistics
 |

* + 1. Structure of the Report

The above mentioned sources were used by the evaluator for the analysis elaboration within the following structure:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Chapter | Methodic Description |
| Analysis of the initial conditions | Provides structured analysis of the most significant data relevant for the further evaluation of the IOP communication activities. It is based primarily on the quantitative data. It analyzes:* available data at the level of **impacts** of the CoP activities (especially awareness, knowledge and attitudes of the target groups towards the IOP);
* available data on the CoP realization at the level of **inputs, outputs and outcomes** (it analyzes the available data on realized communication activities of the CoP IOP)
* available (especially quantitative) **data significant in terms of context** of the CoP IOP realization (e.g. attitudes and opinions of the target groups to the issues related to the IOP content from the material point of view which can potentially influence the impact and efficiency of the implemented communication activities) and the data significant in terms of prospective recommendation
 |
| Criteria evaluation of the CoP realization | Criteria evaluation of the CoP IOP realization presents a close evaluation of the **execution quality** of the selected **communication tools** utilized within the IOP communication activities and the evaluation of its contribution to the communication goals of the programme.It provides a close look on each of utilized communication tools and its evaluation in terms of **3E evaluation criteria** * **Effectiveness**
* **Efficiency**
* **Economy**

Each tool evaluates according to the given criteria with use of:* outcomes of the Analysis of the initial conditions ;
* extends the Analysis data with a qualitative views on concrete communication outcomes based on the outcomes of qualitative research;
* quantitative and qualitative data are supplemented with the point of view of the expert assessment which takes into account practical experience and trends of actual commercial and non-commercial marketing communication
 |
| Answers on the evaluation questions | Answers on the evaluation questions represent the statements of the evaluator based on the synthesis of the data of the previous parts of the paper in the structure defined by the submitter.  |
| Recommendation for the IOP communication activities 2011-2015  | Chapter presents a set of the evaluator’s recommendations in terms of management and implementation of the communication activities in the second half of the programming period. It is especially connected with the chapter Criteria evaluation of the CoP realization.It includes:* recommendations for the communication strategy for the rest of the programming period.
* projection of the communication strategy proposals into the IOP annual communication plan for the year 2011
 |

Implemented Activities of the CoP IOP 2008-2010

Within the framework of the **communication tools categories** specified in the CoP and from the point of view of **qualitative fulfillment of the communication plan**, the following tasks were implemented:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Implemented communication activities | Number | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2008-2010 |
| Controlled Publicity |
| Promotional films | actions[[2]](#footnote-3) | 0 | 1 | 1 | **1** |
| On-line Communication |
| Web actualization | portals[[3]](#footnote-4) | 9 | 10 | 11 | **11** |
| Direct Communication |
| Seminars, trainings, workshops | actions[[4]](#footnote-5) | 30 | 95 | 93 | **218** |
| persons[[5]](#footnote-6) | 1 397 | 3 620 | 2 261 | **7 278** |
| Conferences | actions | 5 | 11 | 9 | **25** |
| persons | 2 690 | 3 039 | 2 941 | **8 670** |
| Fairs, public events | actions[[6]](#footnote-7) | 4 | 5 | 3 | **12** |
| Publication Activities |
| Newsletters | types | 3 | 3 | 6 | **12** |
| Handbooks, manuals, publications, maps | types | 3 | 9 | 7 | **19** |
| Leaflets, prospectus, posters | types | 2 | 5 | 3 | **10** |
| Other Tools |
| Promotional lectures | creation[[7]](#footnote-8) | yes | yes | yes | **yes** |
| Medialy-coordinated Publicity |
| Press releases(news about the OP) | news | 55 | 255 | 2 | **312** |
| Printed advertising | actions | 8 | 22 | 20 | **50** |
| On-line advertising | actions | 1 | 0 | 0 | **1** |
| PR articles | articles | 3 | 6 | 13 | **22** |

Since not all the communication activities have been entirely quantified in the annual communication plans of the IOP, the CoP fulfillment is observed at thelevel of **the defined output and outcome indicators**.

With the exception of the indicator of outcome ***481900 Number of trained persons****[[8]](#footnote-9)***, all indicators, were fulfilled to 70% and more.** Only the activities financed from the TP IOP were included into the comparison and the **real extent of fulfillment is in fact higher. The planned values of the indicators in the annual CoP are set so that they could be realistically fulfilled.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Code inthe National Code-list | Indicator of Outcome/Output | Indic. Goal 2015[[9]](#footnote-10) | 2008-2010 | RCoP Fulfillment | CoP Fulfillment |
| **Plan** | **Real.** |
| 480700 | **Number of created methodical and technical-informational materials** | 84 | 128 | 90 | **70 %** | **107 %** |
| 480800 | **Implemented cooperation with the media and the communication with public** | 30 | 55 | 63 | **115 %** | **210 %** |
| 480900 | **Number of organized informational and promotional activities** | 32 | 87 | 73 | **84 %** | **228 %** |
| 481100 | **Number of trainings, seminars, workshops, conferences** | 70 | 50 | 38 | **76 %** | **54 %** |
| 481600 | **Number of the persons who participated on the educational courses - in total.**[[10]](#footnote-11) | - | 6 015 | 5 830 | **97 %** | **-** |
| 481900 | **Number of trained persons** | 1 100 | 364 | 186 | **51 %** | **17 %** |

CoP IOP Financing in 2008-2010

**138 mil. CZK in total** has been allocated for the 2007-2015 period within the TP IOP for the informational and promotional activities of the MA and theIBs, which have been implemented as a part of the CoP.

**More than 45mil. CZK was invested into the awareness and publicity in the respective period.** Almost **43mil. CZK was covered by the IOP technical support. On the average, 62% of the planned budget was used for the communication activities annually in the given year.** Especially **t**he following factors could influence the level of budget drawing: some activities were not implemented; estimated implementation costs were too high; significant cost savings were achieved during the activities implementation. 31% of cumulative allocated budget was drawn.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Costs(in CZK) | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2008-2010 |
| Planned (annual CoPs) | 16 244 183 | 27 584 900 | 25 168 356 | **68 997 439** |
| Implemented in total | **10 930 510** | **14 337 514** | **20 287 131** | **45 555 155** |
| *Covered by the TP the IOP* | *10 930 510* | *11 607 991* | *20 287 131* | ***42 825 632*** |
| *Funded from other sources* | *0* | *2 729 523* | *0* | ***2 729 523*** |
| RCoP budgets withdrawn | **67 %** | **42 %** | **81 %** | **62 %** |
| Cumulative CoP budget drawning | 8 % | 16 % | 31 % | **31 %** |

CoP IOP Implementation Impacts 2008-2010

*Increasing the Number of Submitted Project Applications*

**Applicant's interest in the IOP subsidies exceeded the possibilities of the programme given by the allocation for each year of the respective period.** Between 2007-2010 7,5 thousand subsidy applications in total amount of 48mil. CZK which represents 2% higher amount than the allocation for the whole period (in other words: it represents approximately two times higher amount allocated for the respective period)

*EU Funds Awareness*

* **EU funds awareness has been gradually growing among public.** In the time of the CoP IOP preparation 57% of population heard about them[[11]](#footnote-12), in March 2010 it was already 68% of public[[12]](#footnote-13), in January 2011 it was 80% of population[[13]](#footnote-14) and in February **86% of general public heard about them**[[14]](#footnote-15)**.**
* **General public perceives the structural funds positively - almost 93% of public considers the SF financial help important.**[[15]](#footnote-16)

*Awareness of General and Expert Publiconthe IOP Existence*

* **Spontaneous knowledge of the IOP in the CZ population is very low (less than 1%). However, it is not significantly less than in case of the other OPs. Almost 8% of public knows the IOP with prompt.** Functional knowledge of the IOP does not practically exist, almost nobody knows the mission of the programme.
* **Expert public (applicants and recipients) have average awareness on supported fields of the IOP.** With the exception of the field of **modernization and electronization of the public service (54%), the rest of activities are not considered as the supported IOP fields.**
* Public generally **knows some concrete investments** supported from the IOP. The larger part of population is aware of panel estates revitalization (65%), Czech point (63%), revitalization of significant cultural landmarks (63%), system of data boxes (57%) and acquiring of modern hospital equipment (57%). Public is also **significantly less aware of the fact that these investment have been supported from the EU funds / the IOP.** Moreover, regarding very low spontaneous knowledge of the names of programmes, it is likely that a part of discovered knowledge (of the EU funds financing) must be attributed to the experience with similar grant programmes (e.g..Zelená úsporám).

*Information Sources*

* General as well as expert public learnt about the IOP especially from **the Internet** - general public also from **television.** A half of general public searches the information about the IOP through the **OPs' web pages** or **through the implementation structure.**
* **The best known sources of information about the IOP on the Internet for the general public are the sectional web pages on Strukturálnífondy EU portal.** From the web pages which include information on the IOP the best known are **Strukturální fondy EU portal** ([www.strukturalni-fondy.cz/the IOP](http://www.strukturalni-fondy.cz/IOP); **5 %**) and **the Center for Regional Development web pages** ([www.crr.cz](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Ccapanda.filip%5CDownloads%5Cwww.crr.cz); **4 %**).
* Expert public assesses the information sources on the IOP rather average. As the best source**is, in all respect, considered the individual consultation** and, on the contrary, the worst are the mass media. Provided information corresponds with the IOP support recipients.

*IOP Media Image*

* During the year 2010 the IOP was mentioned in 447 articles. Media coverage of the IOP was mainly of the **neutral character. Regional media** informed on the IOP most often.
* The biggest space in **national media** was given to the **ministry representatives** (ministers, deputy ministers, employees, experts) – 62% of the total quotations in national media. **Regional media** naturally quoted most often **the representatives of cities and municipalities** – 43% of quotations.

Recommendations

* + 1. Communication Planning 2011-2013
* The communication plan of the IOP should define **a clear and measurable goal at the level of desired impact of the communication activities.** Too generally set indicators of outcome of the current CoP have no clear linkages on the communication goals, they are hardly measurable and, therefore, do not allow to find out whether and how successfully were the goals fulfilled.
* The managements of MAs, which specify “how we and our work are to be perceived by the public” should be involved in defining the communication goals and set thus **the OP image in the eyes of the public.**
* Goals of the annual communication plans should be determined and additionally in ideal case also qualified in relation with indicators of impact defined at the end of the programming period.
* With regards to the current state of the IOP implementation the goals and indicators should be drawn up **not only considering the quantity** “Enhancement of the awareness of the target groups on ERDF, or the IOP”; “increase of the number of submitted projects” but **also considering the qualitative aspect of the knowledge and attitudes of the target groups towards the programme implementation.**
* The communication plan for the year 2011 and the following years should more systematically focus on addressing the target group general public. Therefore, it is necessary to integrate the activities of the respective subject of the implementation structure.
	+ 1. Monitoring and Assessment of the CoP 2011 – 2013
* With regards to the current state of the IOP implementation the goals and indicators should be drawn up **not only considering the quantity** “Enhancement of the awareness of the target groups on ERDF, or the IOP”; “increase of the number of submitted projects” but **also considering the qualitative aspect of the knowledge and attitudes of the target groups and the programme withdrawn.**
* Qualitative assessment can, for example, work with the following variables:
	+ knowledge of message and contribution of the programme
	+ perception of quality and accomplishment of the informative service of the implementation structure subjects
	+ satisfaction with informative and consultancy service of the potential applicants
	+ amount of eliminated applications for the reason of inconsistence with the acceptability criteria, error rate in the applications, reports etc.
* Current state of the additional CoP indicators should be reassessed. Indicators in the current state represent more an administrative burden connected with their assembly than a reliable guidance for effective management of the communication activities.
* Communication plans and the respective communication activities should be systematically assessed at all levels – **continuous, annual** and **summative** (2013). It is the only way how to assess a contribution of the communication activities for successful programme implementation and, at the same time, to react on the negative events in time.
	+ 1. Management of the Communication Activities 2011-2013
* In the field of coordination and direction of the communication activities of the subjects of the IOP Implementation structure **the evaluator recommends integrating the communication activities of MA and IB** focused primarily on the chosen target group – **general public.** Enhanced cooperation in this field brings potentially the highest added value from the point of view of achieving the communication goals of the programme. Integration, nevertheless, means neither centralization nor unification. The goal should be **the communication of the common publicly understandable concept of the IOP, which the subjects of the implementation structure fill with content they dispose of.**
* **Strengthen the perception of the communication task within the implementation structure –** the programme perception among the target groups is formed by every deed, statement, attitude, event which the target group members connects with the programme, planned and unplanned communication (including the negative one). Effective communication won’t be accomplished by only the focused activities included in the CoP. Each unit and employee including the subject of implementation structure management should be aware of co-creating the image of the programme in the eyes of public (general and expert).
* **Creation of the creative and strategic supervisor position –** short–term employment of the expert for change in the marketing communication who would methodically lead the members of the working group and help them to enforce a new thematic concept, see 1.6.4.
	+ 1. Recommendation for theCoP 2011-2013 Revision
* The proposed communication strategy includes a coordinated approach towards the target group **general public**. The evaluator proposes first two steps for gradual application of the concept:

*Integrated on-line interface* – in accordance with a long-term trend of using Internet as a prime communication mean.

*Regional events for public* – based on MA’s good experience and at the same time on positive experience of foreign stakeholders with publicity and promotion of the EU funds. Moreover, it respects the public trends of behavior in the process of information sources and advertisement consummation.

* Evaluator proposes to work with a presentation of thematic concept **“a quality of life”** as a basic unifying communication goal of the IOP. In that way it would be possible to reach unified influence on the target group and to create thus a precondition for a higher communication impact.

Thematic concept is supported by so called **“Integrated approach” – to come out of what exists and works within the respective IB and to bring it to a common communication line.** The goal and the contribution of the integrated approach is especially to enforce the identity of the Integrated Operational Programme, to clearly and uniformly formulate and present essence of the IOP interventions and their intended contribution and to weaken its possible mismatch with the other OPs which support different fields.

1. For more information on the particular tools see chapter 2.3. – Sources, or chapter 3.5. – Analysis of the public attitudes towards the problematic of public service and regional development [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. In 2009 Ministry for Regional Development (MRD) made one promotional film which was distributed on DVD also in 2010. Value of the column "2008-2010" equals to 1 promotional film. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Number of the web portals actualized by the intermediate bodies in the given year (not the number of actualizations). Value of the column "2008-2010“ describes the situation at the end of the year 2010. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. In case of CRR it is the number of events which CRR did not directly organized but participated on. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. In case of CRR it is the number of participants on the events which CRR did not directly organized but participated on. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Especially participation on fairs but not their organization. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. A detailed quantification of produced types and pieces of the promotional items does not represent the information essential for the assessment of the communication activities. The main task of the promotional items in the communication mix rests especially in a support of efficiency of the other communication tools. Promotional items themselves have little ability to fulfill the communication goals. Therefore, the types and the numbers of the produced items are not counted in the assessment. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. In this case it depends more on the participation of the training applicants than on the number of realized trainings. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Values quoted in the CoP IOP (p. 56). Their achievement is expected by the end of 2015. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Indicator of outcome 481600 *Number of persons who participated on educational courses - in total* was not defined in the CoP IOP and, therefore, its indicative goal for the year 2015 was not quantified (indicator was supplemented through the indicators optimalization in 2009). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Data actual for October 2006.Source: Povědomíčeskéveřejnosti o strukturálníchfondech. STEM (10/2006) [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. Source: Průzkumpovědomí o Integrovanémoperačnímprogramumeziširokouveřejností. NAVIGA 4 (01–02/2011) [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Source: Informovanostveřejnosti o strukturálníchfondecha OP LZZ. GfK Czech pro NAVIGA 4 (01/2011) [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Source: Průzkumpovědomí o Integrovanémoperačnímprogramumeziširokouveřejností. NAVIGA 4 (01–02/2011) [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Source: Průzkumpovědomí o Integrovanémoperačnímprogramumeziširokouveřejností. NAVIGA 4 (01–02/2011) [↑](#footnote-ref-16)