

Ex-post Evaluation of the 2015 European Capitals of Culture

Annexes
November *2016*

Culture

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General for Education and Culture
Directorate D - Culture and Creativity
Unit D2 — Creative Europe programme

Contact: Unit D2

E-mail: EAC-ECOC@*ec.europa.eu*

European Commission
B-1049 Brussels

Ex-post Evaluation of the 2015 European Capitals of Culture

Annexes

A study prepared for the European Commission by Ecorys and the Centre for Strategy and Evaluation Services (CSES)

Authors:

Tim Fox (Ecorys), James Rampton (CSES)

November 2016

Directorate-General for Education and Culture
Culture and Creativity

EN

Disclaimer

This document has been prepared for the European Commission. However, it reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers to your questions about the European Union.

Freephone number (*)**:**

00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(*) The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you).

More information on the European Union is available on the Internet (http://europa.eu).

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2016

ISBN 978-92-79-52815-6
doi: 10.2766/423054

© European Union, 2016
Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Images: © Fondation Mons2015, © Pilsen2015 Foundation

Annex One: Interviewees

Mons interviewees

No.	Name	Organisation	Role / description
Fondation Mons2015			
1.	Yves Vasseur	Fondation Mons2015	Commissaire général
2.	Philippe Degeneffe	Fondation Mons2015	Commissaire général adjoint
3.	Marie Noble	Fondation Mons2015	Commissaire adjoint artistique
4.	Anne Sophie Charle	Fondation Mons2015	Administratrice générale
5.	Jean-Paul Dessy	Fondation Mons2015	Direction Artistique Musique
6.	Pascal Keiser	Fondation Mons2015	Chef de Projets Technologies
7.	Anne André	Fondation Mons2015	Maison Folie
8.	Marie Godart	Fondation Mons2015	Institutions et villes partenaires
9.	Caroline Kadziola	Fondation Mons2015	Communication
10.	Charlotte Jacquet	Fondation Mons2015	Communication
11.	Pascal Goossens	Fondation Mons2015	Musiques actuelles
12.	Gaetan Jacquemin	Fondation Mons2015	Partnership Project Manager
13.	Philippe Kauffmann	Fondation Mons2015	Artistique
14.	Philippe Reynaert	Fondation Mons2015	Cinéma
15.	Xavier Roland	Fondation Mons2015	Pôle muséal
16.	Emmanuel Vinchon	Fondation Mons2015	Territoires

No.	Name	Organisation	Role / description
17.	Yoann Waroquier	Fondation Mons2015	Welcome Team
Government			
18.	Joëlle Kampompolé	Région wallonne (previously Ville de Mons)	Députée wallonne (previously: Conseil commun de Mons)
19.	Nathalie Brassart	Province de Hainaut	
20.	Ermeline Gosselin	Ville de Mons	Chef de cabinet de Mr Di Rupo
21.	Yves Roose	Villes flamandes	Représentant de la commune de Brugges
22.	Régine Van Damme	Villes francophones	Directrice de Culture, WAPI
Cultural operators			
23.	Laurent Fack	Orchestre Royal de Chambre de Wallonie	Directeur général
24.	Bernard Château	Musée des Arts Contemporains (MAC's)	Adjoint à la direction
25.	Sofiane Laghouati	Musée royal de Mariemont	Conservateur – Chargé de recherche
Media organisations/journalists			
26.	Eric Deffet	Le Soir	Media partner
27.	Daniel Brouyère	Radio Télévision Belge de la Communauté Française (RTBF.be)	Media partner
Business and tourism			
28.	Caroline Decamps	Intercommunale de développement économique et aménagement du territoire (IDEA)	Directrice générale
29.	Natacha Vandenberghe	Visit Mons (Office Tourisme)	
30.	François Honoré	Club entreprises GO Consult	

No.	Name	Organisation	Role / description
Education and research			
31.	Jean-Luc Depotte	Université catholique de Louvain	Professeur

Pilsen interviewees

No.	Name	Organisation	Role / description
1.	Martin Baxa	1st Deputy Mayor of the City of Pilsen, Chairman of the Board of Pilsen 2015	Pilsen City Council
2.	Jaroslav Bláha	Executive Director	Papírna Culture Centre
3.	Roman Černík	Artistic Director	JOHAN o.s. - center for cultural and social projects
4.	Petr Choura	Director	Pod lampou Theatre
5.	Markéta Formanová	Director	Puppet Museum
6.	Šárka Havlíčková	Former Programme Director	Pilsen 2015
7.	Jakub Hora	Director	Alfa Theatre
8.	Ivan Jáchim	Director	Dominik Centrum
9.	Ondřej Kašpárek	Digital Media Manager	Pilsen 2015
10.	Lenka Kavalová	Director	Pilsen Philharmonic Orchestra
11.	Daniel Konrád	Head of culture section	Hospodářské noviny
12.	Petra Kosová	Editor	Czech Radio Pilsen
13.	Zuzana Koubíková	Director	Plzeň- TURISMUS
14.	Šárka Krtková	Regio2015 Project Manager	Pilsen 2015

No.	Name	Organisation	Role / description
15.	Pavla Mášková	Sustainable Development Manager	Pilsner Urquell
16.	Josef Mištera	Dean, Member of the Board of Pilsen 2015	Ladislav Sutnar Faculty of Design and Art
17.	Roman Musil	Director	West Bohemia Museum
18.	Jiří Peňás	Director	J. K. Tyl Theatre
19.	Martin Otava	Journalist	Lidové noviny
20.	Petr Šimon	Manager of International Projects	Pilsen 2015
21.	Marek Sivák	Chairman	Pěstuj prostor Association
22.	Dagmar Škubalová	Head of the Pilsen Municipal Administration	Pilsen City Council
23.	Květuše Sokolová	Head of Department of Culture	Pilsen City Council
24.	Jiří Suchánek	Director	Pilsen 2015
25.	Jiří Sulženko	Programme Director	Pilsen 2015
26	Milan Svoboda	Manager of Evaluation	Pilsen 2015
27	Michal Vozobule	Municipal Councillor. Member of the Board of Pilsen 2015	Pilsen City Council

Annex Two: Online Survey

MONS2015 EUROPEAN CAPITAL OF CULTURE

[Email subject] Mons2015: Survey of projects

Dear Sir or Madam

We would like to invite you to participate in a survey of projects within the cultural programme of Mons2015.

The survey is part of an evaluation of the European Capitals of Culture undertaken on behalf of the European Commission by the Centre for Strategy and Evaluation Services (CSES).

The survey is supported by the Fondation Mons2015.

The purpose of the survey is to collect:

- information on the characteristics and effects of your project;
- your opinions of participants regarding the overall effects of Mons2015.

The survey will take no more than 15 minutes to complete. Your responses will be treated in confidence.

Please click on your preferred language to enter the survey.

English | Français

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE

Centre for Strategy and Evaluation Services
Contact: mons2015@cses.co.uk

Survey welcome page

Welcome to the survey of projects within the cultural programme of Mons2015.

The Centre for Strategy and Evaluation Services (CSES) is currently evaluating the European Capitals of Culture 2015 on behalf of the European Commission. As part of the evaluation, we are inviting projects within the cultural programme of Mons2015 to provide us with:

- information on the characteristics and effects of their projects;
- their opinions of participants regarding the overall effects of Mons2015.

The results of the survey will be analysed by CSES. They will inform the final report of the study, which will be completed later in 2016.

Your responses will be treated in confidence. Individual respondents will not be identified in the final report of the study.

If you have any questions about the survey or the evaluation or if you would like to complete the survey by email or post, please contact us at mons2015@cses.co.uk.

For other queries about the European Capitals of Culture please contact:

- European Commission
- Fondation Mons2015

To enter the survey, please click on the button below.

Next

About your organisation

1	How was your organisation involved in Mons2015 European Capital of Culture	
	Lead organisation in a project within Mons2015	
	Partner in a project within Mons2015	
	Other involvement within Mons2015, please specify:	
	None of the above	

2	In which country is your organisation mostly based?			
	Austria	Belgium	Bulgaria	
	Croatia	Cyprus	Czech Republic	
	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	
	France	Germany	Greece	
	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	
	Latvia	Lithuania	Luxembourg	
	Malta	Netherlands	Poland	
	Portugal	Romania	Slovakia	
	Slovenia	Spain	Sweden	
	United Kingdom	Other, please specify		

FILTER FOR NEXT QUESTION: ONLY RESPONDENTS IN BELGIUM

3	Where is your organisation based?	
	Mons	
	Hainaut Provence (except Mons)	
	Wallonia Region (except Hainaut Provence)	
	Brussels-Capital Region	
	Flanders Region	
	Other, please specify	

4	Please state the name of your organisation	

5	What type of organisation is it?	
	Public cultural organisation	
	Municipality	
	Provincial authority	
	Regional authority	
	National authority	
	Other public organisation	
	Non-profit-making cultural association	
	Private company in the cultural sector	
	Other private company	
	Private individual	
	Don't know	
	Not applicable	
	Other, please specify	

6	In which cultural sector(s) does your organisation mostly operate? (Please select all that apply)		
	Cultural Heritage	Visual arts	
	Music	Dance	
	Theatre	Audio-visual	
	Literature, Books and Reading	Architecture	
	Design, Applied Arts	Education, training or research	
	Youth	Don't know	
	Not in the cultural sector	Other cultural sector, please specify	

About your project

7	Please state the name of your project	

8	Did your project exist before 2015?	
	Yes – at same scale as in 2015	
	Yes – at smaller scale than in 2015	
	No	
	Don't know	
	Other, please specify	

9	How was your project selected for inclusion in the Mons2015 programme?	
	Open call for projects	
	Directly commissioned by Fondation Mons2015	
	Don't know	
	Other, please specify	

10	How useful was the support provided by the Fondation Mons2015 for your project?	
	Very useful	
	Useful	
	Not useful	
	Not at all useful	
	Not applicable (we did not need any support)	
	Don't know	

11	Did the EU logo feature in the marketing and communication materials of your project?	
	In all materials	
	In some materials	
	Not at all	
	Don't know	

12	Did your project involve cultural organisations or artists in other countries? (please select all that apply)	
	Yes - performers from other countries took part	
	Yes - works from other countries were featured	
	Yes - performers from Belgium performed in other countries	
	Yes - works from Belgium were exhibited or performed in other countries	
	Yes - in the form of international cultural exchanges	
	Yes - we collaborated with non-cultural organisations/people	
	Yes – Other, please specify	
	None of the above	

13	In which other countries are those organisations/artists located? (Please select all that apply)			
	Austria	Belgium	Bulgaria	
	Croatia	Cyprus	Czech Republic	
	Germany	Denmark	Estonia	
	Spain	Finland	France	
	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	
	Italy	Lithuania	Luxembourg	

13	In which other countries are those organisations/artists located? (Please select all that apply)			
	Latvia	Malta	Netherlands	
	Poland	Portugal	Romania	
	Sweden	Slovenia	Slovakia	
	United Kingdom	Other, please specify		

14	Was it a new collaboration?	
	Yes – we collaborated with all partners for the first time	
	Yes - we collaborated with some partners for the first time	
	No - we had worked with all partners previously	
	Don't know	
	Other, please specify	

15	Will this cooperation continue after the end of 2015?	
	Yes – and there will be more co-operation in future	
	Yes – there will be a similar level of co-operation in future	
	Yes – but there will be less co-operation in future	
	No further co-operation	
	Don't know	

16	Did your organisation establish new collaboration with organisations and/or artists in Belgium? Please mark all the relevant answers.	
	Yes – with cultural organisations/artists in our core disciplines	
	Yes – with cultural organisations/artists in different cultural fields	
	Yes – with organisations/people outside the cultural sector	
	None of the above	

17	Will this new cooperation continue after the end of 2015?	
	Yes – and there will be more co-operation in future	
	Yes – there will be a similar level of co-operation in future	
	Yes – but there will be less co-operation in future	
	No - there will be no further co-operation in future	
	Don't know	

18	Did your project seek to promote or highlight any of the following? (please select all that apply)
	Awareness of cultural diversity
	Intercultural dialogue and mutual understanding
	Common or shared elements of European culture
	Themes of relevance or significance across Europe
	If so, please provide more information on the theme addressed

	.....

19	Was your project specifically targeted at any of the following groups? (Please select all that apply)
	Children and young people
	Older people
	Poor or disadvantaged communities
	Minority ethnic groups
	People with disabilities
	Other groups (please specify) .....

20	What steps did you take to reach different audiences or groups? (Please select all that apply)
	Involved partner organisations working with specific audiences or groups
	Implemented activities frequented by specific audiences or groups
	Provided free entry
	Reduced ticket prices
	Project was accessible or attractive to specific audiences or groups
	Involved specific audiences or groups in the development and implementation of the project
	Other method (please specify) .....

21	Will the activities of your project continue after 2015?	
	Yes – all activities will continue	
	Yes – some activities will continue	
	No	
	Don't know	

22	To what extent has your European Capital of Culture project(s) strengthened the capacity of your organisation to undertake future cultural events?	
	Greatly strengthened	
	Strengthened	
	Neither / was not important to strengthen our capacity	
	Weakened	
	Significantly weakened	
	Don't know	

23	Would like to provide additional information on your project and its achievements?	

Your views on Mons2015

24	**Overall, did Mons2015 present a cultural programme of high artistic quality?**	
	High artistic quality	
	Reasonable artistic quality	
	Low artistic quality	
	No artistic quality whatsoever	
	Don't know	

25	**How much artistic independence did the Fondation Mons2015 have? (To what extent was the Fondation Mons2015 able to resist political or commercial pressures when developing the cultural programme?)**	
	High level of artistic independence	
	Reasonable level of artistic independence	
	Low level of artistic independence	
	No artistic independence whatsoever	
	Don't know	

26	**How effective was the marketing and communications activity undertaken by the Fondation Mons2015?**	
	Very effective	
	Effective	
	Neither	
	Ineffective	
	Very ineffective	
	Don't know	

27	**Overall, how effective was the Fondation Mons2015 in managing the European Capital of Culture 2015?**	
	Very effective	
	Effective	
	Neither effective nor ineffective	
	Ineffective	
	Very ineffective	
	Don't know	

28 How visible was the European Capital of Culture 2015?

	Highly visible	Visible	Neither / Don't know	Not visible	Not at all visible
In local media	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
In regional media	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
In national media	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
In international media	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
In other media, please specify	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

29 How successful was European Capital of Culture in attracting visitors and audiences?

Visitors and audiences from:	Very successful	Successful	Neither / don't know	Unsuccessful	Very unsuccessful
Mons	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Rest of Hainaut Province					
Rest of Wallonia	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Flanders and Brussels-Capital Region					
Other countries	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

30 To what extent will the cultural life of Mons be more vibrant after 2015 as a result of the European Capital of Culture?

- Much more vibrant
- Slightly more vibrant
- About the same as before
- Less vibrant
- Much less vibrant
- Don't know

31 To what extent has the European Capital of Culture 2015 improved the image of Mons in:

	Greatly improved	Improved	No difference / about the same	Deteriorated	Greatly deteriorated	Don't know
Mons	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Rest of Hainaut Province						
Rest of Wallonia	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Flanders and Brussels-Capital Region	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other countries						

32	To what extent do you think that the following have improved as a result of the European Capital of Culture 2015?

	Greatly improved	Improved	No difference / about the same as before	Deteriorated	Greatly deteriorated	Don't know
Governance and administration of culture in Mons	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local cultural infrastructure (facilities, buildings, support, structures)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Urban environment and infrastructure	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

33	Overall, how successful was Mons2015 European Capital of Culture?
	Very successful
	Successful
	Neither successful nor unsuccessful
	Unsuccessful
	Very unsuccessful
	Don't know

34	Would like to make any other comments about Mons2015 (e.g. cultural programme, impact on the city)?

Click here to view your responses or click 'Finish' to submit

Annex Three: Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Ex-post evaluation of the two 2015 European Capitals of Culture

Contracting Authority: European Commission

1. CONTEXT 2
   1.1 Background on the European Capital of Culture EU Action 2
   1.2 Objectives of the Action 2
   1.3 Description of the Action for the year 2015 5
2. TASK SPECIFICATION FOR THE ASSIGNMENT 8
   2.1 Evaluation questions 8
3. REPORTING AND DELIVERABLES 13
   3.1 General reporting requirements 13
   3.2 Inception Report 13
   3.3 Initial Bulletin 13
   3.4 Interim Report 13
   3.5 Draft Final Report 14
   3.6 Final Report 15
4. ORGANISATION, TIMETABLE AND BUDGET 16
   4.1 Organisation 16
   4.2 Meetings 17
   4.3 Timetable 17
   4.4 Budget 17
5. REFERENCES 18
   5.1 Action documents 18
   5.2 Background and reference documents 18
6. REQUIREMENTS 19
   6.1 Methodology 19
   6.2 Quality assurance 20
   6.3 Resources 20

1. CONTEXT

1.1 Background on the European Capital of Culture EU Action

The initial scheme of 'The European City of Culture" was launched at an intergovernmental level in 1985.[1] In 1999, Decision 1419/1999/EC of the European Parliament and the Council gave the scheme the status of a Community Action under the name of "European Capital of Culture" (hereafter referred as "the Action")[2]. The Decision introduced new selection procedures and evaluation criteria. Member States were ranked in a chronological order of entitlement to host the event each year. This Decision was amended by Decision 649/2005/EC in 2005 in order to integrate the ten new Member States which joined the EU in 2004. In 2006, it was replaced by Decision 1622/2006/EC[3], which kept the principle of a chronological order of Member States but further refined the objectives of the Action and introduced new selection and monitoring arrangements.

1.2 Objectives of the Action

1.2.1 General objectives

In accordance with Article 1 of Decision 1622/2006/EC, the overall aim of the Action is to highlight the richness and diversity of European cultures and the features they share, as well as to promote greater mutual understanding between European citizens.

1.2.2 Specific objectives

In accordance with Article 4 of Decision 1622/2006/EC, this Action should fulfil the following criteria.

As regards '*the European Dimension'*, the Action shall:

- Foster cooperation between cultural operators, artists and cities from the relevant Member States and other Member States in any cultural sector;
- Highlight the richness of cultural diversity in Europe;
- Bring the common aspects of European cultures to the fore.

---

1 Resolution of the Ministers responsible for Cultural Affairs, meeting within the Council, of 13 June 1985 concerning the annual event 'European City of Culture' (85/C 153/02), on the initiative of the former Greek Culture Minister, Melina Mercouri.

2 Decision 1419/1999/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 May 1999 establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2005 to 2019 (OJ L 166, 1.7.1999). That Decision was amended by Decision 649/2005/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ L 117, 4.5.2005)

3 Decision 1622/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 2006 establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2007 to 2019 (OJ L 304, 3.11.2006).

As regards *'City and Citizens'* the Action shall:

- Foster the participation of the citizens living in the city and its surroundings and raise their interest as well as the interest of citizens from abroad;

- Be sustainable and be an integral part of the long-term cultural and social development of the city.

1.2.3 Intervention logic

The figure below presents the hierarchy of objectives against which the 2015 ECOC shall be evaluated. This hierarchy is based principally on the 2006 Decision (as this Decision provided the legal basis for the 2015 ECOC), but is also complemented by information in the new legal basis for ECOC post 2019[4] in order to reflect the evolving requirements and expectations for ECOC:

[4] Decision 445/2014/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014 establishing a Union action for the European Capitals of Culture for the years 2020 to 2033 and repealing Decision No 1622/2006/EC (OJ L 132, 3.5.2014).

General objective			
Safeguard and promote the diversity of cultures in Europe, highlight the common features they share, and foster the contribution of culture to the long-term development of cities			
Specific objectives (SO)			
SO1: Enhance the range, diversity and European dimension of the cultural offer in cities, including through transnational co-operation	SO2: Widen access to and participation in culture	SO3: Strengthen the capacity of the cultural and creative sector and its links with other sectors	SO4: Raise the international profile of cities through culture
Operational objectives			
Stimulate a diverse range of cultural activities of high artistic quality Implement cultural activities promoting cultural diversity, dialogue and mutual understanding Implement cultural activities highlighting the diversity of cultures in Europe and European themes Involve European artists, promote cooperation with different countries and transnational partnerships Combine traditional art forms with new types of cultural expression	Create new and sustainable opportunities for a wide range of citizens to attend or participate in cultural events Involve local citizens, artists and cultural organisations in development and implementation Provide opportunities for volunteering and foster links with schools and other education providers	Improve cultural infrastructure Develop the skills, capacity or governance of the cultural sector Stimulate partnership and co-operation with other sectors	Attract the interest of a broad European and international public

1.3 Description of the Action for the year 2015

1.3.1 The selection of the two European Capitals of Culture 2015

Under Decision 1622/2006/EC, Belgium and the Czech Republic are the two Member States entitled to host a European Capital of Culture in 2015. According to the arrangements of the Decision, the competition is managed by the relevant authorities of the Member State concerned, usually the Ministry of Culture, which publishes a call for submission of applications six years before the ECOC-year. The selection is in two phases: a pre-selection phase, at the end of which a shortlist of applicant cities is drawn up, and then a final selection nine months later. A panel of thirteen independent members, six of whom appointed by the Member State concerned and the other seven by European Institutions, examines the cities' bids on the basis of the criteria laid down in the Decision.

In the Czech Republic, three candidate cities responded to the call published by the Czech Ministry. Two (Ostrava and Plzeň) were pre-selected in 2009, and the panel finally recommended in 2010 that the ECOC title be given to Plzeň. In Belgium Mons was the only candidate city. It was preselected in 2009 and finally recommended in 2010 for the ECOC title. The Council of Ministers of the European Union formally designated Mons and Plzeň as the two 2015 European Capitals of Culture respectively in November 2010 and May 2011.

1.3.2 The monitoring of the two European Capitals of Culture 2015

Decision 1622/2006/EC lays down a monitoring phase, applying from the 2010 title onwards.

During this phase between the designation of cities as ECOC and the actual ECOC-year, the progress in the cities' preparations is monitored and guided by a monitoring and advisory panel, composed of seven independent experts appointed by the European Institutions.

The role of this panel of experts is to:

- assess the progress made in the preparations,
- give guidance on the implementation of the event and
- check compliance with the programme and the commitments on the basis of which the cities were selected (particularly as regards meeting the "European Dimension" and "City and Citizens" criteria).

For this purpose, representatives from the cities are invited by the Commission to meet the monitoring and advisory panel twice:

- The first meeting takes place two years before the event;
- The second meeting takes place at the latest eight months before the event.

Ahead of each of these meetings, the city concerned sends a progress report. After the meeting, the panel draws up a monitoring report, which is made public. The report related to the final monitoring meeting also includes a recommendation to the Commission as to whether to award the Melina Mercouri prize. The prize is awarded provided that the designated cities have honoured the commitments made in the selection phase and acted on the recommendations of the panels during the selection and monitoring phases. This prize, to be awarded no later than three months before the event, rewards the quality preparation of the event. It consists of 1,5 million EUR under the EU Creative Europe programme and has a great symbolic value often triggering complementary sponsoring. Both 2015 European Capitals of Culture were awarded the Melina Mercouri Prize in 2014.

Regarding Mons and Plzeň, the two monitoring meetings took place in November 2012 and April 2014. The panel's reports are available at the following address:

- http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/documents/ecoc/2015/first-monitoring_en.pdf

- http://ec.europa.eu/culture/news/2014/documents/2015-ecoc-2nd-monitoring-report-final_en.pdf

On the basis of the panel's recommendation, the Commission awarded the Melina Mercouri Prize to Mons and Plzeň during the second half of 2014.

1.3.3 Description of the two European Capitals of Culture 2015

1.3.3.1 Plzeň

The programme of Plzeň 2015 is articulated around the slogan "Opening up" and contains four main programme streams, namely "Art and Technologies", "Relationships and Emotions", "Transit and Minorities" and "Stories and Sources".

"Art and Technologies" is focused on creating sustainable jobs in the creative and cultural sector and enforcing the image of the city in a European context in this respect.

"Relationships and Emotions" focuses on public space in general – the transformation of the physical public space together with the citizens, officers and architects, but also on moderating debate on European issues.

"Transit and minorities" showcases the power of diversity and interculturality with projects on minorities, a series of moderated debates and open workshops as well as other artistic events.

"Stories and Sources" aims to foster tourism based on iconic personalities. It also draws attention to the Plzeň region, with the ambition to make a better use of the area's vast baroque heritage to further develop tourism.

Programme highlights are scheduled on a monthly basis, starting with the Opening Ceremony in January. It includes outdoor projects during the summer and a closing ceremony in December.

According to the information in the second monitoring meeting, Plzeň 2015 has a total operating funding allocated of 20.884.044 €, of which 14.099.726 € are devoted to the programme, amounting to 68% of the total. The remaining budget is allocated to promotion (13%) and

administration (19%). 92% of the budget comes from public funding (20% from National Government, 60% from the City, 10% from the region and another 10 % from the EU, including the Melina Mercouri prize). The private sector contributes with 8% of the budget for an amount of 1.582.654.

Further to this, capital expenditures of more than 82MM € have been invested in relation with the European Capital of Culture.

1.3.3.2 Mons

The programme is articulated around the theme of the "Metamorphosis", where technology meets culture, understood as a bridge for citizens to move from new technologies to art. It intends to question the European citizen on the management of digital technology skills, social networking, European identity, local and European connectivity, digitisation of heritage and preservation of digital heritage. Activities are distributed among four themes: Images, Sounds, Words and Memory. As part of Mons 2015 the city's inhabitants and visitors are also invited to discover five new museums as well as a series of urban installations.

Finally Mons 2015 is an element of a wider development strategy aiming to transform part of the industrial Hainaut region into a digital valley with a strong focus on the creative and digital economy.

Programme highlights include:

- Major exhibitions such as Van Gogh in the Borinage, with art works coming from various galleries around Europe and beyond; the Myth of St George in European Art, that evidences the common roots of European History and Culture; Metro IT, with virtual underground lines as a basis of a series of urban trails where each station offers a technological experience or Atopolis, focusing on the phenomena of circulation, exchange and transfer of artistic cultures and practices.

- Citizens' projects such as the Grand 8, eight weeks of festivals for local inhabitants including citizens' planning meetings to establish the theme and programme for each event; the Grand Ouest, with a similar structure over 12 weekends; the Autumn Festival featuring exclusively local artists.

Other major events include Café Europa, providing convivial spaces equipped with technology enabling contact with people from other European cities and partners; Street re-review, recreating through digital technologies 10 km of fake "Street view" in Mons City centre with the help of its inhabitants; Lassus and the European Renaissance, a week of meetings and concerts centred on the flourishing of polyphonic music in Mons and the region; or "Home and Away", a series of week-ends with programmes mixing cultural performances and residences, concerts and gastronomy events of European and non-European host cities.

In total, Mons 2015 will feature a very large number of events, in all cultural sectors: 36 in Festivities and gastronomy, 52 in Theatre and Dance, 103 in Festivals & Others, 18 in Fashion & design, 62 in Art in the city and trails, 73 in Exhibitions & museums, 56 digital events, 23 in Literature and 76 in Music

According to the information in the second monitoring meeting, Mons 2015 has a total operating funding allocated of 68.262.650 € €, of which 45.546.750€ are devoted to the programme,

amounting to 67% of the total. The remaining budget is allocated to promotion (14,65%) and administration (18,63%). 80,51% of the budget comes from public funding (43,95% from the Community, 21,97% from the Region, 6,00 % from the province 6,39 from the cities and 2,2% from the EU, including the Melina Mercouri prize). The private sector contributes with 19,49% of the budget for an amount of 13.306.625 €. Mons has implemented a very effective sponsorship strategy, including a large pool of small contributions from local businesses under the Club Mons 2015.

1.3.4 Evaluations carried out by the two European Capitals of Culture 2015

On top of the independent evaluation carried out for the European Commission in line with Article 12 of Decision 1622/2006/EC, many European Capitals of Culture carry out their own evaluation reports.

The contractor will liaise with Plzeň 2015 and Mons 2015 to see whether they have commissioned such evaluations and, of so, to which extent the results of such evaluations can feed into the contractor's own evaluation without extra costs for the Commission.

2. TASK SPECIFICATION FOR THE ASSIGNMENT

2.1 Aims of the evaluation

This evaluation is launched according to Article 12 of the current Decision 1622/2006/EC: "Each year the Commission shall ensure the external and independent evaluation of the results of the European Capital of Culture event of the previous year in accordance with the objectives and criteria of the Action".

It shall cover the two 2015 European Capitals of Culture Action, Mons and Plzeň.

The aim is to better understand how the two 2015 European Capitals of Culture contributed to the objectives of the Action, whether they have broadly achieved their objectives and whether implementation has proceeded in line with their original application.

The evaluation should also contribute to reinforcing the existing evidence-base on the ability of the Action to produce cultural, social and economic impact.

Finally the evaluation should draw lessons from the implementation of the two 2015 European Capitals of Culture that may be useful for future ECOC or cities wishing to bid for the ECOC title.

2.2 Evaluation questions

The contractor must provide answers to the evaluation questions (EQ) listed below.

The contractor will nonetheless be called upon to use their knowledge and experience to refine and elaborate these questions and, where appropriate, propose others to the Commission with the aim of improving the focus of this evaluation. The contractor should note that the sub-questions

proposed under some of the evaluation questions do not necessarily cover the entire aspect of the questions concerned. The sub-questions deal with issues the Commission is particularly interested in and which the contractor therefore should address, in addition to any other issues which the evaluator may see as requiring attention in the case of each evaluation question.

With respect to each of the evaluation questions, the evaluation is expected to provide concrete recommendations particularly on how future European Capitals of Culture can address any deficiencies and/or gaps identified by the evaluator. As far as the conclusions for the two evaluated ECOC allows recommendations should also be made – if appropriate –for the future design of the Action.

Relevance

EQ1: To what extent were the objectives of each ECOC relevant to the objectives of the Action?

- What was the main motivation behind the city bidding to become a European Capital of Culture?
- What was the process of determining objectives? Was there a process of consultation in each city to define aims and objectives?
- What were the objectives of the city in being ECOC? What was the relative importance of each objective?
- To what extent were the objectives consistent with the Decision and with the ECOC's own application? (special focus on the European dimension)
- Have any specific objectives of the ECOC event been related to social impacts?
- In this connection, did the objectives of the ECOC event include reaching out to all groups of society, including the excluded, disadvantaged, disabled people and minorities?

EQ2: To what extent were the ECOC's cultural programmes and associated activities relevant to their own objectives?

- To what extent were the activities consistent with the ECOC's own objectives? (special focus on the European dimension)
- To what extent have the specific themes/orientations of the cultural programme proved to be relevant to the objectives defined?
- How was the European dimension reflected by the themes put forward by the ECOC event and in terms of cooperation at European level? How did the Capitals of Culture seek to make the European dimension visible? To what extent did the two ECOC cooperate?

Efficiency

EQ3: How did the management arrangements of each ECOC contribute to the achievement of outputs, results and impacts?

- How have the organisational models of the formal governing Board and operational structures played a role in the European Capital of Culture? What role have the Board and operational structures played in the ECOC event's implementation? At what stage were

these structures established? How did it improve management of culture in the city during the event?

- Who chaired the Board and what was his/her experience? What were the key success and failure elements related to the work of the Board and operational structure used and personnel involved?
- Has an artistic director been included into the operational structure and how was he/she appointed? What were the key success and failure elements related to the work of the artistic director and personnel involved?
- What was the process of designing the programme?
- How were activities selected and implemented?
- How did the delivery mechanism contribute to the achievement of outputs?
- To what extent has the communication and promotion strategy been successful in/contributed to the promotion of city image/profile, promotion of the ECOC event, awareness-raising of the European dimension, promotion of all events and attractions in the city?
- To what extent has the communication and promotion strategy including the use of social media successfully reached the communication's target groups at local, regional, national, European and international levels?

EQ4: To what extent were the selection, monitoring and EU co-financing procedures introduced by Decision 2006/1622/2006/EC efficient?

- To what extent have the mechanisms applied by the Commission in line with Decision 2006/1622/EC for the selection of the European Capitals of Culture and the subsequent implementation and monitoring mechanisms influenced the results of the ECOC event?
- To what extent has the informal meeting following the designation as well as other advice offered by the panel and by the Commission influenced the results of the ECoC event?
- How was the Melina Mercouri Prize used?

EQ5: To what extent did the ECOC manage to raise the necessary resources?

- What was the process of securing the financial inputs?
- What was the total amount of resources used for each ECOC event? What was the final financial outturn of the year?
- What were the sources of financing and the respective importance of their contribution to the total? How much came from the European Union Structural Funds (e.g. ERDF - European Regional Development Fund, ESF – European Social Fund) or other sources of EU funding?
- To what extent did the ECOC title trigger complementary sponsorship?
- What was the total expenditure strictly for the implementation of the cultural programme of the year (operational expenditure)? What was the proportion of the operational expenditure in the total expenditure for the ECOC event?
- What proportion of expenditure was used for infrastructure (cultural and tourism infrastructure, including renovation)**?**

EQ6: To what extent were the financial and human resources secured by each ECOC appropriate and proportionate?

- Was the total size of the budget sufficient for reaching a critical mass in terms of impacts? Could the same results have been achieved with less funding? Could the same results have been achieved if the structure of resources and their respective importance was different?
- To what extent have the human resources deployed for preparation and implementation of the ECOC event been commensurate with its intended outputs and outcomes?
- As a result, could the total budget for the ECOC event be considered appropriate and proportional to what the each ECOC set out to achieve?

Effectiveness

EQ7: To what extent were the EU-level objectives achieved?

- Provide typology of outputs, results and possible impacts of the Action at different levels (European, national, regional etc.)
- To what extent has the ECOC event been successful in attaining the objectives of the Action (refer to list in the intervention logic)?
- Was the cultural programme perceived as being of high artistic quality? To what extent did the ECOC prove successful in bringing their chosen artistic themes/orientations to the fore?
- To what extent did the ECOC title contribute to an enhanced cultural offer in the cities holding the title (e.g. in terms of scope and scale) with stronger European Dimension?
- To what extent did the ECOC implementation widen access to and participation in culture in the two cities? What actions were taking to include the elderly, young people, people with special needs in the cultural activities? How accessible were the activities carried out?
- How did the ECOC programmes help strengthening the capacity of the cultural and creative sectors and its links with other sectors? Which help was available to cultural operators to extend their networks and work transnationally and internationally?
- To what extent did the Action in the two cities raise their international profile through culture?

EQ8: To what extent were the ECOC's own objectives achieved?

- What quantitative indicators (number of visitors, overnight stays, cultural participation of people, etc.) of the social, tourist and broader economic impacts of the event have been gathered by the ECOC?
- To what extent did the ECOC achieve the outputs hoped for by the city and as set out in the application?
- To what extent have specific objectives related to social impacts been met?
- To what extent were the objectives related to reaching out to all groups of society, including the excluded, disadvantaged, disabled and minorities, met?

EQ9: To what extent has the Action resulted in unintended effects?

- Are there any instances where the ECOC event has exceeded initial expectations? What positive effects has this had?
- Where expectations have not been met, what factors have hindered the development of the Action?
- Have any other unintended effects been identified?

Sustainability

EQ10: To what extent can the positive effects of the ECoC Action be considered to be sustainable?

- Which of the activities or elements of the ECOC event are likely to continue and in which form once the ECOC-year is over?
- Has any provision been made to continue and follow up the cultural programme of the ECOC event after the closure?
- How will the city continue to manage its long-term cultural development following the ECOC event?
- What will be the role of the operational structure after the end of the ECOC event and how will the organisational structure change?
- What has been the contribution of the ECOC event to improved management of cultural development in the city? (in the medium-term)
- What are the impacts of the ECOC event likely to be on the long term cultural development of the city?
- What are the impacts of the ECOC event likely to be on the long term social development of the city?
- What are the impacts of the ECOC event likely to be on the long term urban and broader economic development of the city?

EQ11: What is the EU added value of the ECOC Action?

- As far as the conclusions made for the two cities allow, what is the added value of the European Capital of Culture being an EU initiative, compared to what could be achieved if the Action was a purely national or local action?

EQ12: To what extent were the ECOC complementary to other EU initiatives?

- As far as the conclusions made for the two cities allows it, to what extent has the Action proved to be complementary to other EU initiatives in the field of culture?
- To what extent has each ECOC been reinforced by and added impetus to investments by the EU Structural Funds?
- To what extent have the two ECOC complemented other EU initiatives, e.g. European Youth Capital, European Green Capital?

3. REPORTING AND DELIVERABLES

3.1 General reporting requirements

Each report (except the final version of the Final Report) should have an **introductory page** providing an overview and orientation of the report. It should describe what parts of the document, on the one hand, have been carried over from previous reports or been recycled from other documents, and on the other hand, represent progress of the evaluation work with reference to the work plan.
The Commission will comment on all reports within maximum 30 calendar days. In the absence of observations from the Commission within the deadline the report will be considered as being approved.

Within maximum 14 calendar days of receiving the Commission's observations the Contractor will submit the report in definitive form, taking full account of these observations, either by following them precisely or by explaining clearly why they could not be followed. Should the Commission still not consider the report acceptable, the Contractor will be invited to amend the report insofar as such amendments do not interfere with the independence of the evaluator in respect of their findings, conclusions or recommendations.

All reports must be drafted in English and submitted according to the timetable below to the responsible body. The Executive Summary should be translated into French and German. Electronic files must be provided in Microsoft ® Word for Windows format. Additionally, besides Word, the Final Report must be delivered in Adobe ® Acrobat pdf format and in 3 hard copies. Authorized pictures of ECOC events 2015 will be welcome in the cover page and in the report.

3.2 Inception Report

The report should detail how the methodology proposed by the Contractor is going to be implemented in the light of an examination of the quality and appropriateness of existing data.

3.3 Initial Bulletin

The initial bulletin to be delivered early in March 2016 should provide some first messages on the two 2015 European Capitals of Culture; e.g. main attendance figures, number and scale of cultural events and key features and qualities as observed at the end of the ECOC year. The information may be used as a basis for press releases and news reports by the European Commission on the 2015 ECOC of interest to the press and the general public.

3.4 Interim Report

The report must as a minimum provide:

- An overview of the status of the evaluation project;
- A description of problems encountered and solutions found;

- A summary of initial findings and results of the data gathering (primary data collected in the field and secondary data), as well as information about the initial analyses of such data. The Contractor may be in a position to provide preliminary answers on the evaluation questions;
- An assessment of the data, whether it meets expectations and will provide a sound basis for responding to the evaluation questions;
- A conclusion whether any changes are required to the work plan, or any other solutions should be sought in order to ensure that the required results of the evaluation are achieved. If any such issues are to be identified, they must be discussed in the meeting with the Steering Group dedicated to this report;
- A proposal for the final structure of the Final Report, as well as a structure of the Executive Summary.

3.5 Draft Final Report

This document should deliver the results of all tasks covered by these Terms of Reference, and must be clear enough for any potential reader to understand. Upon authorisation of the Steering Group, the contractor shall submit this document for factual check to key stakeholders in the cities concerned.

The structure of the report should follow a broad classification into two main parts:

- **Main report:** The main report must present, in full, the results of the analyses, conclusions and recommendations arising from the evaluation. It must also contain a description of the subject evaluated, the context of the evaluation, and the methodology used (with an analysis of the latter's strengths and weaknesses). Length should not exceed 100 pages.

- **Annexes:** These must collate the technical details of the evaluation, and must include**:**

    - the Terms of Reference,

    - questionnaire templates, interview guides, full transcript of case studies, any additional tables or graphics, and references and sources,

    - a one-page statement about the validity of the evaluation results, i.e. to what extent it has been possible to provide reliable statements on all essential aspects examined. Issues to be referred to may include scoping of the evaluation exercise, availability of data, unexpected problems encountered in the evaluation process, proportionality between budget and objectives of the assignment etc.,

    - a proposal for the dissemination of the evaluation results, on the basis of the draft Dissemination Plan annexed to these Terms of Reference,

    - in case of need, a glossary of terms used.

3.6 Final Report

The Final Report follows the same format as the draft Final Report. On top of that, it will include:

- **An executive summary:** It sets out, in no more than 6 pages, a summary of the evaluation's main conclusions, the main evidence supporting them and the recommendations arising from them. It should be translated into French and German by a professional translation agency, once it has been approved by the responsible body;

- A 200-word **abstract;**

- **A summary statement:** one-page summary of the main evaluation conclusions and recommendations;

- **Best practices:** they highlight any kind of practices in terms of governance, management or work organisation which contributed to the smooth delivery of the project.

The document must take into account the results of the quality assessment of the draft Final Report and discussions with the Steering Group about the draft Final Report insofar as these do not interfere with the autonomy of the Contractor in respect of the conclusions they have reached and the recommendations made.

It should be noted that the European Parliament and the Council have adopted in 2014 a Decision covering the European Capital of Culture Action from 2020 to 2033. When drafting general recommendations about the Action, the contractor should make sure that they have not been already addressed in the new Decision.

The final version of each separate deliverable (except the one-page summary statement) must:

- respect the Commission's visual identity (see below);

- contain specific identifiers which shall be incorporated on the cover page provided by the Contracting Authority;

- include the following disclaimer: "*This document has been prepared for the European Commission. However it reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*"

The contracting authority will publish the Final Report, the Executive Summary and the annexes on the World-Wide Web.

Rules and graphic requirements of the final deliverables

Graphic requirements

All studies produced for the European Commission and Executive Agencies shall conform to the corporate visual identity of the European Commission by applying the graphic rules set out in the European Commission's Visual Identity Manual, including its logo.

For graphic requirements please refer to the template provided in Annex 2. The cover page shall be filled in by the contractor in accordance with the instructions provided in the template. For further details, you may also contact comm-visual-identity@ec.europa.eu..

Accessibility

The Commission is committed to making online information as accessible as possible to the largest possible number of users including those with visual, auditory, cognitive or physical disabilities, and those not having the latest technologies. The Commission supports the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0 of the W3C.

For full details on Commission policy on accessibility for information providers, see: http://ec.europa.eu/ipg/standards/accessibility/index_en.htm

Pdf versions of studies destined for online publication should respect W3C guidelines for accessible pdf documents. See: http://www.w3.org/WAI/

Raw data and datasets

Any final datasets should be provided as structured data in a machine readable format (e.g. in the form of a spreadsheet and/or an RDF file) for Commission internal usage and for publishing on the Open Data Portal, in compliance with Commission Decision (2011/833/EU).[5]

The data delivered should include the appropriate metadata (e.g. description of the dataset, definition of the indicators, label and sources for the variables, notes) to facilitate reuse and publication.

The data delivered should be linked to data resources external to the scope of the evaluation, preferably data and semantic resources from the Commission's own data portal or from the Open Data Portal[6]. The contractor should describe in the offer the approach they will adopt to facilitate data linking.

4. ORGANISATION, TIMETABLE AND BUDGET

4.1 Organisation

The contract will be managed by Unit D2 of the European Commission Directorate-General for Education and Culture.

[5] If third parties' rights do not allow their publication as open data, the tenderers should describe in the offer the subpart that will be provided to the Commission free of rights for publication and the part that will remain for internal use.

[6] For a list of shared data interoperability assets see the ISA program joinup catalogue (https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/catalogue/repository/eu-semantic-interoperability-catalogue) and the Open Data Portal resources.

A Steering Group will be involved in the management of the evaluation. The responsibilities of the Steering Group will include:

- providing the external evaluator with access to information;

- supporting and monitoring the work of the external evaluator;

- assessing the quality of the reports submitted by the external evaluator,

while ensuring that the Contractor's independence is not compromised;

4.2 Meetings

It is expected that the contractor participates in four meetings in Brussels with the evaluation Steering Group. The evaluation team leader and other relevant experts must participate in these meetings. For these meetings, **minutes should be drafted by the contractor** within 5 working days, to be agreed among the participants and approved and signed by the chair person, who will be appointed from Unit EAC/A4.

4.3 Timetable

The indicative starting date is **October 2015**. The contract will start after both parties have signed it. The period of execution of the contract is 10 **months**.

The following outline work plan and indicative timetable are envisaged:

Deadline	**Task**
Early October 2015	A **kick-off meeting** may be held after the signature of the contract.
November 2015	Contractor submits the **inception report** to Steering Group. At least one **Steering Group meeting** will be held in Brussels within **two weeks** after the submission.
1 March 2016	Contractor submits the **initial bulletin** to Steering Group.
15 April 2016	Desk and field research: at least 60% completion. Contractor submits the **interim report** to Steering Group. At least one **Steering Group meeting** will be held in Brussels within **two weeks** after the submission.
15 June 2016	Desk and field research completed. Analysis and drafting completed. Contractor submits the **draft final report**, to Steering Group. At least one **Steering Group meeting** will be held in Brussels within **two weeks** after the submission.
15 July 2016	Taking account of the Commission's comments contractor submits the **final report and executive summary** to Steering Group.
31 July 2016	Taking account of the Commission's comments, contractor submits the very last versions (hard copies included) of the final report and the executive summary (including the translated versions into French and German).

4.4 Budget

The estimated maximum budget for the evaluation of the Action, covering all the results to be achieved by the contractor as listed in sections 2 and 3 above, is **EUR 75 000**.

5. REFERENCES

5.1 Action documents

The following information will be made available to the contractor in the inception phase:

- The bids and progress reports of the two ECOC 2015.

5.2 Background and reference documents

- Knowledge of the following documents is required for the tender. Unless differently specified, they are available at: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/capitals/european-capitals-of-culture_en.htm:

- Decision 1419/1999/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 May 1999 establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2005 to 2019;

- Decision 649/2005/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 April 2005 amending Decision 1419/1999/EC establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2005 to 2019;

- Decision 1622/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 2006 establishing a Community action for the European Capital of Culture event for the years 2007 to 2019;

- Regulation 1295/2013/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 establishing the Creative Europe Programme (2014 to 2020) and repealing Decisions 1718/2006/EC, 1855/2006/EC and 1041/2009/EC;

- Decision 445/2014/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014 establishing a Union action for the European Capitals of Culture for the years 2020 to 2033 and repealing Decision No 1622/2006/EC;

- Conclusions of the Ministers of Culture meeting within the Council of 18 May 1992 concerning the choice of European Cities of Culture after 1996 and the 'Cultural Month';

- Resolution of the Ministers responsible for Cultural Affairs regarding the annual organization of the 'European City of Culture';

- Study about the European Cities and Capitals of Culture, and the European cultural months (1995-2004) achieved by palmer/RAE Associates;

- European Parliament study on "European Capitals of Culture: success strategies and long--term effects";

- Ex-post Evaluations of European Capitals of Culture from 2007-2013[7];
- The panel's reports concerning the 2015 titles;
- Interim evaluation of selection and monitoring procedures of ECOC 2010-2016, Ecorys, 2011[8]
- IMPACTS 08 - European Capital of Culture Research Programme http://www.liverpool.ac.uk/impacts08/
- European Capital of Culture Policy Group http://ecocpolicygroup.wordpress.com/

6. REQUIREMENTS

6.1 Methodology

The contractor will have a free choice as to the methods used to gather and analyse information and for making the assessment, but must take account of the following:

– The evaluation must be based on recognised evaluation techniques, as well as those stemming from the emerging domain of big data analytics when relevant.

– The choice and a detailed description of the methodology must form part of the offer submitted. There should be a clear link between the evaluation questions addressed and the corresponding methodology proposed. The evaluation questions can be further elaborated, e.g. by providing operational sub-questions under each question.

– Secondary data should be obtained from all existing literature relevant to the evaluation subject, including any existing robust (academic) research into the topic.

– Primary data should be obtained from the broadest possible variety of sources and should also include the views of key informants beyond those directly involved in and benefiting from the intervention.

– Considerable emphasis should be placed on the analysis phase of the evaluation. In addressing the evaluation questions, quantitative indicators should be sought and used as far as possible. The contractor must support findings and recommendations by explaining the degree to which these are based on opinion, analysis and objectively verifiable evidence. Where opinion is the main source, the degree of consensus and the steps taken to test the opinion should be given.

– Comparability of results with evaluation of ECOC 2007-2013 should be ensured.

– A set of core and preferably quantitative indicators should be proposed in the inception report. They should build on indicators developed for the ex-post evaluation of ECOC 2010

[7] Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/evalreports/index_en.htm

[8] Idem

– It is not expected that all individual projects financed during the ECOC event will be assessed, but the sample of projects examined should be drawn up in a manner suitable for each evaluation question addressed, and should be such as to enable the evaluators to draw general conclusions on the actions.

6.2 Quality assurance

The Contractor shall, as a minimum, apply the quality assurance procedures described in the Quality Plan included in their bid for Framework Contract EAC/22/2013. The offer should describe how the Quality Plan will be applied during the implementation of this specific contract.

6.3 Resources

The Contractor shall ensure that experts are adequately supported and equipped. In particular, sufficient administrative, secretarial and interpreting resources, as well as junior experts, must be available to enable senior experts to concentrate on their core evaluation tasks. For each of the main team members (team leader, quality assurance expert, report writer and other senior experts), the offer should include, preferably in their respective CVs, a list of evaluations in which they have participated, the dates of each project and their specific role in it

HOW TO OBTAIN EU PUBLICATIONS

Free publications:

- one copy:
  via EU Bookshop (http://bookshop.europa.eu);
- more than one copy or posters/maps:
  from the European Union's representations (http://ec.europa.eu/represent_en.htm);
  from the delegations in non-EU countries (http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/index_en.htm);
  by contacting the Europe Direct service (http://europa.eu/europedirect/index_en.htm) or
  calling 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (freephone number from anywhere in the EU) (*).

  (*) The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you).

Priced publications:

- via EU Bookshop (http://bookshop.europa.eu).

Priced subscriptions:

- via one of the sales agents of the Publications Office of the European Union
  (http://publications.europa.eu/others/agents/index_en.htm).

NC-02-15-855-EN-N



Publications Office

doi: 10.2766/423054
ISBN 978-92-79-52815-6