



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

DIRECTORATE GENERAL

ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL AFFAIRS

Brussels,

MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE PERICLES 2020 PROGRAMME

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Background

The Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs (DG ECFIN) reports to the Commissioner for Economic and Financial Affairs, Taxation and Customs. It strives to improve the economic wellbeing of the citizens of the EU - through policies designed to promote sustainable economic growth, a high level of employment, stable public finances and financial stability.

The mission statement of DG ECFIN can be found at http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/economy_finance/organisation/mission_en.pdf

2. Pericles 2020 Programme

The Pericles 2020 programme (hereinafter 'the Programme') was established by Regulation (EU) No 331/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council on 11 March 2014 (hereinafter 'the Regulation')¹ for the period from 1 January 2014 to 31 December 2020². Pericles 2020 is an exchange, assistance and training programme aiming at promoting actions for the protection and safeguarding of the euro against counterfeiting. The budget for the Programme's implementation is approximately EUR 1 million per year.

The Pericles 2020 programme replaced the Pericles programme. The first programme was established by Council Decision 2001/923/EC of 17 December 2001 for a period of four years (1 January 2002 to 31 December 2005) and it was extended by Council Decision 2006/849/EC of 20 November 2006 until 31 December 2013.

The general objective of the current Programme is to prevent and combat counterfeiting and related fraud, thus enhancing the competitiveness of the EU's economy and securing the sustainability of public finances³. More specifically, the Programme protects euro banknotes and coins against counterfeiting and related fraud, by supporting and supplementing the activities undertaken by the Member States and assisting the competent national and European authorities in order to develop among themselves and the Commission a close and regular cooperation and an exchange of best practices, where appropriate including third countries and international organisations⁴.

¹ Regulation (EU) No 331/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2014 establishing an exchange, assistance and training programme for the protection of the euro against counterfeiting (the 'Pericles 2020') and repealing Council Decisions 2001/923/EC, 2001/924/EC, 2006/75/EC, 2006/76/EC, 2006/849/EC and 2006/850/EC, OJ L 103, 5.4.2014, p. 1.

² Council Regulation (EU) 2015/768 of 11 May 2015 extended the application of Regulation (EU) No 331/2014 to the non-participating Member States.

³ As referred to in Article 3 of the Regulation.

⁴ As referred to in Article 4 of the Regulation.

The actions in order to achieve the above mentioned objectives, as defined in Article 8 of the Regulation are:

- a. exchange and dissemination of information, through organised workshops, meetings and seminars, including trainings, targeted placements and staff exchanges of competent national authorities;
- b. technical, scientific and operational assistance including relevant studies with a multidisciplinary and transnational dimension;
- c. grants to finance purchase of equipment to be used by specialised anti-counterfeiting authorities for protecting the euro against counterfeiting.

The target group participating in the Programme's actions are among others: staff of agencies engaged in detecting and combatting counterfeiting, intelligence personnel, representatives of national central banks, mints or commercial banks, judicial officers, customs officers and other group of specialists concerned (e.g. chambers of commerce, industry etc.).

The actions under the Programme involve participation of the Commission and of other parties having relevant expertise contributing to the attainment of the Programme's objectives, including the European Technical Scientific Centre⁵, national central banks, the European Central Bank, Europol, Interpol and other specialised bodies.

Projects financed under the Programme are implemented either directly by the Commission (DG ECFIN) or in the form of grants awarded to national competent authorities⁶ in the EU (both in the euro area and non-euro area Member States). The co-financing rate for grants awarded under the Programme is 75% of the total eligible costs⁷. These projects take place both inside and outside the EU.

Within the Commission, Unit C5 in DG ECFIN – (Euro protection and euro cash) the Programme manager - is responsible for the management and the implementation of the Programme.

3. Type of evaluation, legal basis and stakeholders

Pursuant to Article 13 (4) of the Regulation, an independent mid-term evaluation of the Programme shall be carried out and presented by the Commission to the European Parliament and to the Council **by 31 December 2017**. The mid-term evaluation shall be independent of the Programme manager and an Inter-Service Steering Group (ISG) established by DG ECFIN will assist the evaluator ensuring the quality control of the evaluation.

The key stakeholders to be consulted during the evaluation include:

- Member States' national competent authorities;
- EU Institutions: the Commission, the European Central Bank (ECB), Europol and Eurojust;
- International partners: competent authorities from third countries, International Counterfeit Deterrence Centre and Interpol;
- Participants of the actions financed under the Programme.

⁵ Established by Council Decision 2003/861/EC of 8 December 2003, OJ L325, 12.12.2003, p. 44.

⁶ Bodies eligible for funding under the Programme are only national competent authorities, designated by the Member States, which are listed in the Official Journal (C 264, 12.8.2015, p. 2).

⁷ Pursuant to Article 10(4) of the Regulation, in exceptional and justified cases the co-financing might increase up to 90% of the eligible costs.

4. Objectives and scope of the mid-term evaluation

The mid-term evaluation will provide an assessment of the implementation of the Programme to date. This assessment will be supplemented by a short analysis of how the recommendations of previous evaluations were taken on board in the implementation of the current Programme and what impact they had on the current Programme, as well as by an outlook on the future activities of the Programme, based on the performance to date and the current and evolving need that exists.

The overall objective of the mid-term evaluation is to assess:

- a. the achievements of the objectives of all actions (at the level of results and impacts);
- b. the efficient and cost-effective use of resources and its added value to the EU;
- c. the internal and external coherence, the relevance of all objectives and the contribution of all actions to the EU's priorities;
- d. the scope for simplification; and
- e. the sustainability of the Programme's effects.

The evaluation will cover the different type of actions committed or implemented under the Programme in 2014, 2015 and 1st semester of 2016.

The mid-term evaluation report should reach robust and reliable conclusions and recommendations that may possibly be used to support future decision making on a proposal to renew, modify or suspend the measures (types of actions financed) under the Programme.

The mid-term evaluation report shall also take into account evaluation results on the long-term impact of the predecessor actions⁸ such as the overall added value⁹ and the prospects of sustainability of the Programme¹⁰.

5. Methodology

The contractor should determine the most appropriate methods to be used to gather and analyse information that will inform the evaluation. A clear rationale for the proposed methods must be provided. In reaching a determination, the contractor must take account of the following:

- The evaluation must be based on recognised evaluation techniques;
- The choice and a detailed description of the methodology must form part of the offer submitted;
- The approach proposed by the contractor shall clearly indicate data to be collected, implementation strategy and the analysis to be conducted.

6. Inter-Service Steering Group (ISG)

The evaluator will work in close cooperation with the members of an ISG. The ISG will have the following main responsibilities:

⁸ Please refer to the Evaluation of the Pericles programme (SWD(2013) 304 final) and the Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and to the Council concerning the implementation and the results of the Pericles programme for the protection of the euro against counterfeiting 2006-2013 (COM(2014) 550 final), Annex B and C respectively.

⁹ Annex B: see section 4, p. 46.

¹⁰ Annex B and C: see section 4, p. 48 and section 4, p. 6 respectively.

- facilitating access to information;
- advising the evaluator during the planning and implementation of the evaluation;
- supporting the evaluator by providing comments on the inception report, on questionnaires for stakeholders' consultation, on questionnaires for participants in the actions of the Programme and on the draft evaluation report;
- assessing the quality of the final report;
- contributing to the dissemination of the report.

7. Quality control

The evaluator will send the draft mid-term evaluation report to the members of the ISG. The ISG will then advise the evaluator on further distribution of the draft report to stakeholders for comments, if deemed necessary.

The evaluator may or may not accept the comments and/or the proposals for changes received during the above consultation process. However, when comments/proposals for changes are not agreed by the evaluator, he/she should clearly explain the reasons for his/her final decision.

The ISG will assess the quality of the final report, including the comments made by the different stakeholders and the way in which the evaluator has handled these comments.

8. Evaluation questions

The mid-term evaluation shall focus on answering the following questions:

Relevance:

1. To what extent is there still a need to protect the euro against counterfeiting and related fraud?
2. To what extent is the Programme still relevant to meet this need and any possible evolution of this need?
3. To what extent are the specific objectives of the Programme relevant to achieve its overall objective?
4. To what extent are the Programme actions and target groups relevant to achieve its overall and specific objectives?

Efficiency:

5. To what extent do the coordination (with Member States, ECB, Europol and other stakeholders), management and administrative structures currently in place, ensure an economic and efficient use of resources in the achievement of the Programme outputs, results and impacts?
6. To what extent are the actions and outputs of the Programme delivered at a reasonable cost?
7. To what extent is the co-financing rate appropriate?

Effectiveness:

8. To what extent have the specific objectives of the Programme been achieved?

9. What have been the qualitative and quantitative effects of the intervention, within the meaning of Article 4 of the Regulation?
10. To what extent have the actions financed under the Programme contributed to achieving its specific objectives?
11. To what extent have all objectives of the Programme contributed to the EU's priorities of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth and on improving the efficient functioning of the Economic and Monetary Union?

EU added value:

12. To what extent does the Programme provide EU added value, within the meaning of Article 2 of the Regulation?

Coherence:

13. To what extent have the coordination and cooperation mechanisms in place for the Programme ensured consistency and complementarity with other relevant EU programmes and activities?
14. To what extent have the coordination and cooperation mechanisms in place for the Programme ensured consistency and complementarity with existing actions implemented by Member States, the ECB and Europol, with the view to achieving the overall objective of protecting the euro against counterfeiting?

Sustainability:

15. To what extent are the results achieved (or likely to be achieved) sustainable?

The evaluation report shall also take into account evaluation results on the long-term impact of the predecessor actions including the overall added value and the prospects of sustainability of the Programme.

The evaluation questions may be further defined and streamlined during the inception phase.

9. Process and deliverables

The contractor will deliver an inception report, an intermediate report, a draft final report and a definitive final report, including supporting annexes. Details on each stage of the process are provided below:

Inception Report

This phase will commence with the signing of the contract; the kick-off meeting shall normally be held no later than **2 weeks** after the signing of the contract. During the inception period the contractor will develop a thorough understanding of the activities to be evaluated and draw up a fully operational evaluation method that allows the evaluation questions to be answered. This phase will draw to a close with the delivery of an inception report.

The **inception report** will contain an analysis of the key elements of the Programme activity being evaluated and the context in which the Programme operates. It will include a review of the intervention strategy, its rationale and its connections with other policies. On the basis of this analysis, any additional criteria, indicators or data sources to address the Evaluation Questions will be developed and detailed in the report. A fully operational evaluation method

taking into account the aforementioned elements will be provided. Data collection tools and analysis tools will be presented in detail including draft interview guides, questionnaires, case study protocols, etc.

a. Data collection and initial analyses

This phase will start once the inception report is deemed satisfactory. It will consist of the first stage of fieldwork involving the collection and analysis of Programme data, and the conducting of initial analysis. This phase will terminate with the delivery of an intermediate report.

The **intermediate report** will provide the results of initial analysis of data collected in the field and eventually a first draft of preliminary answers. This report will also include a progress report on the implementation of the evaluation.

b. Close of data collection, final analyses and judgment

Any outstanding fieldwork will continue after the intermediate meeting with the ISG. It will be followed by a full analysis of data collected, the drawing of conclusions and the formulation of preliminary recommendations. This phase will culminate in the production of a draft final report.

The **draft final report** will contain:

- A succinct description of the rationale, design and implementation of the activity and the context in which it was implemented.
- A succinct description of the evaluation methodology employed, the data used, and any limitations experienced.
- Complete answers to all evaluation questions, including conclusions accompanied by a preliminary set of recommendations. Conclusions will be clearly underpinned by the results of analysis, and the aforementioned recommendations will respond directly to issues raised in the conclusions.

c. Finalisation and feedback

After the delivery of the draft final report, the contractor will deliver the definitive final report and executive summary. The **final report** will take into account the observations and comments of the ISG on the draft final report, insofar as they do not impinge on the independent judgement of the evaluator. It will be accompanied by an executive summary. The summary will present a synthesis of the conclusions and recommendations found in the main body of the report.

Appended to the final report will be a series of annexes presenting in detail the methodology, along with any relevant supporting background information.

The final report will be delivered both in electronic (Word and PDF) and paper form (10 copies).

d. Meetings

It is anticipated that four meetings will take place in Brussels between the ISG and the contractor. This may be supplemented by one or more video/teleconferences. The meetings and / or teleconferences will coincide with the key deliverables as follows:

- kick-off meeting;

- meeting to discuss the way forward outlined in the inception report;
- meeting or video/teleconference to discuss the first findings and any issues encountered by the contractor during the field work outlined in the interim report;
- meeting or video/teleconference to discuss the draft final report and initial conclusions and preliminary recommendations.

Additional meetings may be called when significant revisions to reports are required.

10. Indicative timetable

Preliminary field work	June 2016
Kick-off meeting	July 2016
Inception report	October 2016
Field work	November 2016 – February 2017
Interim report	Beginning of January 2017
Draft report	March – April 2017
Final report	May 2017

11. Point of Contact

All correspondence throughout the duration of the contract should be sent to ECFIN-PERICLES@ec.europa.eu. All communication and each report should be in English.

11. Exploitation of the Results

The European Commission retains all rights relating to the evaluation report produced under this contract and to its reproduction and publication. Any document based in full or in part on the work carried out under the contract may be disseminated or published only with the European Commission's permission.

Publication of the final report or its results will be accompanied by a quality assessment of the evaluation by the Commission's staff.

Annexes:

- Regulation (EU) No 331/2014
- Evaluation of the Pericles programme – SWD(2013) 304 final
- Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and to the Council concerning the implementation and the results of the Pericles programme for the protection of the euro against counterfeiting 2006-2013 - COM(2014) 550 final
- Annual report on the implementation and results of the Pericles programme for 2014 - COM(2015) 507 final
- Overview of the Pericles actions for 2015
- Pericles actions in 2016