

The European Union's IPA Program for Western Balkans and Turkey

Interim and meta evaluation of the IPA

Evaluation of Multi Beneficiary Programmes

Annex 6 On-line survey dataset



This project is funded by
The European Union

A project implemented by
Ecorys

Interim evaluation and meta-evaluation of IPA assistance

Evaluation of Multi Beneficiary Programmes

Annex 6 On-line survey dataset

Client: European Commission, DG Enlargement, Unit A3

Rotterdam, 16 April 2013

About Ecorys

At Ecorys we aim to deliver real benefit to society through the work we do. We offer research, consultancy and project management, specialising in economic, social and spatial development. Focusing on complex market, policy and management issues we provide our clients in the public, private and not-for-profit sectors worldwide with a unique perspective and high-value solutions. Ecorys' remarkable history spans more than 80 years. Our expertise covers economy and competitiveness; regions, cities and real estate; energy and water; transport and mobility; social policy, education, health and governance. We value our independence, integrity and partnerships. Our staff are dedicated experts from academia and consultancy, who share best practices both within our company and with our partners internationally.

Ecorys Netherlands has an active CSR policy and is ISO14001 certified (the international standard for environmental management systems). Our sustainability goals translate into our company policy and practical measures for people, planet and profit, such as using a 100% green electricity tariff, purchasing carbon offsets for all our flights, incentivising staff to use public transport and printing on FSC or PEFC certified paper. Our actions have reduced our carbon footprint by an estimated 80% since 2007.

ECORYS Nederland BV
Watermanweg 44
3067 GG Rotterdam

P.O. Box 4175
3006 AD Rotterdam
The Netherlands

T +31 (0)10 453 88 00
F +31 (0)10 453 07 68
E netherlands@ecorys.com
Registration no. 24316726

W www.ecorys.nl

Table of contents

Overview	5
General Questions	7
Questions to the IPA MBP beneficiaries	11
Questions to NIPAC offices	31
Questions to MBP Unit in EC	39
Questions to Contractors	43

Overview


Status:	Closed	Panellist count:	87
Start date:	18-02-2013	Bounced:	0 (0%)
End date:	10-03-2013	Declined:	0 (0%)
Live:	21 days	Partial completes:	15 (42,9%)
Questions:	44	Screened out:	0 (0%)
Languages:	en	Reached end:	20 (57,1%)
		Total responded:	35 (40,2%)

General Questions

1. I am representative of (please choose from the list below):

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 NIPAC	8		23 %
2 EC Services	3		9 %
3 Beneficiary	18		51 %
4 Contractor	6		17 %
Total respondents: 35			
Skipped question: 0			

2. Please specify your country*:

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 Albania	2		8 %
2 Turkey	1		4 %
3 Kosovo	3		12 %
4 Macedonia	3		12 %
5 Serbia	5		19 %
6 Croatia	3		12 %
7 Bosnia and Herzegovina	4		15 %
8 Moldova	0		0 %
9 Island	1		4 %
10 Montenegro	4		15 %
Total respondents: 26		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	
Skipped question: 8			

* Question only to NIPACs and beneficiaries.

3. I was involved in the following MBP projects:

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1. IPA 2007 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	9		33 %
2. IPA 2008 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	8		30 %
3. 3. IPA 2009 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	9		33 %
4. IPA 2011 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	11		41 %
5. IPA 2008 MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	9		33 %
6. IPA 2011MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	8		30 %
7. IPA 2009 MBP - Training in Public Procurement in the Western Balkans and Turkey	5		19 %
8. IPA 2010 MBP - Improving Public Financial Management in the Western Balkans	5		19 %
9. IPA 2010 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	3		11 %
10. IPA 2011 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	4		15 %
11. IPA 2012 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	5		19 %
12. IPA 2010 MBP - Infrastructure Project Facility - Technical Assistance Window	5		19 %
13. IPA 2008 MBP - Regional programme to support the establishment of the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA) in South-East Europe	7		26 %
14. IPA 2009 MBP - Support to the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA)	7		26 %
15. IPA 2008 MBP- Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	3		11 %
16. IPA 2009 MBP- Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	3		11 %
17. IPA 2011 MBP- Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	4		15 %
18. IPA 2008 MBP - Support to the operational budget of the secretariat of the Regional Cooperation Council (RCC)	4		15 %
19. IPA 2010 MBP - Support to the operating expenditures of the RCC and Strengthening the RCC Secretariat	4		15 %

Response	Total	% of responses	%
20. IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Entrepreneurial Learning Centre	3		11 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

4. What is/was your role in the projects?

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 implementation of activities	10		37 %
2 management	12		44 %
3 other, please specify	11		41 %
Total respondents: 27 Skipped question: 0		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

Explanation:


1. Coordination of beneficiary feedback on draft projects;
2. Coordination of MB IPA programmes preparation and assisting in implementation activities;
3. programming, consultations with EC and final beneficiaries;
4. beneficiary from activities;
5. Cooperation Committee Member;
6. Programming;
7. facilitation of communication between EC and Albanian authorities;
8. coordinating activities between participants and IPA project;
9. Substitute BC member.

Questions to the IPA MBP beneficiaries

5. Was your organization consulted by DG Enlargement or NIPAC on the development of the project fiche(s)? (Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)		
Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
IPA 2007 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	4	100
IPA 2008 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	4	100
IPA 2009 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	4	75
IPA 2011 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	5	80
IPA 2008 MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	5	60
IPA 2011 MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	5	60
IPA 2009 MBP - Training in Public Procurement in the Western Balkans and Turkey	1	100
IPA 2010 MBP - Improving Public Financial Management in the Western Balkans	1	100
IPA 2010 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	1	100
IPA 2011 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	1	100
IPA 2012 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	2	100
IPA 2010 MBP - Infrastructure Project Facility - Technical Assistance Window	1	100
IPA 2008 MBP - Regional programme to support the establishment of the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA) in South-East Europe	2	100
IPA 2009 MBP - Support to the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA)	2	100
IPA 2008 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	1	100
IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	1	100
IPA 2011 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	2	100
IPA 2008 MBP - Support to the operational budget of the secretariat of the Regional Cooperation Council (RCC)	1	100
IPA 2010 MBP - Support to the operating expenditures of the RCC and Strengthening the RCC Secretariat	1	100
IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Entrepreneurial Learning Centre	1	100
Average: 1,13 — Median: 1		
1. yes 2. no		


6. Was your organisation involved in a needs assessment before project(s) started?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes - for all projects	7		58 %
2 yes- for some projects	3		25 %
3 no	2		17 %
Total respondents: 12 Skipped question: 25			

7. Did you have a clear idea of how much it would cost your organisation to take part in the project(s) at the beginning (travel costs, staff costs, any financial contribution)?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes - for all projects	6		55 %
2 yes - for some projects	4		36 %
3 no	1		9 %
Total respondents: 11 Skipped question: 25			

8. Did the cost of participating represent value for money for you?

(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
IPA 2007 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	3	100
IPA 2008 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	4	100
IPA 2009 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	4	100
IPA 2011 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	5	100
IPA 2008 MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	5	80 20
IPA 2011MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	5	80 20
IPA 2009 MBP - Training in Public Procurement in the Western Balkans and Turkey	1	100
IPA 2010 MBP - Improving Public Financial Management in the Western Balkans	1	100
IPA 2010 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	1	100
IPA 2011 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	1	100
IPA 2012 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	1	100
IPA 2010 MBP - Infrastructure Project Facility - Technical Assistance Window	1	100
IPA 2008 MBP - Regional programme to support the establishment of the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA) in South-East Europe	2	100
IPA 2009 MBP - Support to the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA)	2	100
IPA 2008 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	1	100
IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	1	100
IPA 2011 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	2	100
IPA 2008 MBP - Support to the operational budget of the secretariat of the Regional Cooperation Council (RCC)	1	100
IPA 2010 MBP - Support to the operating expenditures of the RCC and Strengthening the RCC Secretariat	1	100
IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Entrepreneurial Learning Centre	1	100
Average: 1,05 — Median: 1		
1. yes 2. no		

9. Was your organization able to provide any necessary funds to take part in the project(s)?
(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
IPA 2007 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	3	33 67
IPA 2008 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	3	33 67
IPA 2009 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	4	50 50
IPA 2011 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	4	50 50
IPA 2008 MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	5	20 20 60
IPA 2011 MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	5	20 20 60
IPA 2009 MBP - Training in Public Procurement in the Western Balkans and Turkey	1	100
IPA 2010 MBP - Improving Public Financial Management in the Western Balkans	1	100
IPA 2010 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	1	100
IPA 2011 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	1	100
IPA 2012 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	1	100
IPA 2010 MBP - Infrastructure Project Facility - Technical Assistance Window	1	100
IPA 2008 MBP - Regional programme to support the establishment of the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA) in South-East Europe	2	50 50
IPA 2009 MBP - Support to the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA)	2	50 50
IPA 2008 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	1	100
IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	1	100
IPA 2011 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	2	50 50
IPA 2008 MBP - Support to the operational budget of the secretariat of the Regional Cooperation Council (RCC)	1	100
IPA 2010 MBP - Support to the operating expenditures of the RCC and Strengthening the RCC Secretariat	1	100
IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Entrepreneurial Learning Centre	1	100
Average: 3,20 — Median: 4		
1. all necessary funds 2. part of the necessary funds 3. none of the necessary funds 4. no funding needed from our organisation		

10. How in general you would assess the implementation methods and approaches?

(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
IPA 2007 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	3	67 33
IPA 2008 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	3	67 33
IPA 2009 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	4	75 25
IPA 2011 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	4	75 25
IPA 2008 MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	5	20 40 40
IPA 2011MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	5	40 20 40
IPA 2009 MBP - Training in Public Procurement in the Western Balkans and Turkey	1	100
IPA 2010 MBP - Improving Public Financial Management in the Western Balkans	1	100
IPA 2010 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	1	100
IPA 2011 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	1	100
IPA 2012 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	1	100
IPA 2010 MBP - Infrastructure Project Facility - Technical Assistance Window	1	100
IPA 2008 MBP - Regional programme to support the establishment of the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA) in South-East Europe	2	100
IPA 2009 MBP - Support to the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA)	2	50 50
IPA 2008 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	1	100
IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	1	100
IPA 2011 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	2	100
IPA 2008 MBP - Support to the operational budget of the secretariat of the Regional Cooperation Council (RCC)	1	100
IPA 2010 MBP - Support to the operating expenditures of the RCC and Strengthening the RCC Secretariat	1	100
IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Entrepreneurial Learning Centre	1	100
Average: 3,10 — Median: 3		
1. poor 2. fair 3. good 4. excellent		

11.1. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2007 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme.

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

(Each respondent could choose MORE THAN ONE response.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	1		33 %
2 no- it was not necessary	1		33 %
3 no-we were not invited	1		33 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 3			
Skipped question: 20		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

11.2. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2008 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme.

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	1		33 %
2 no- it was not necessary	1		33 %
3 no-we were not invited	1		33 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 3		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	
Skipped question: 20			

11.3. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2009 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme.

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

(Each respondent could choose MORE THAN ONE response.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	1		25 %
2 no- it was not necessary	2		50 %
3 no-we were not invited	0		0 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	1		25 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 4			
Skipped question: 19			

11.4. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2011 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme.

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

(Each respondent could choose MORE THAN ONE response.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	1		25 %
2 no- it was not necessary	2		50 %
3 no-we were not invited	0		0 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	1		25 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 4		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	
Skipped question: 19			

11.5. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2008 MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey.

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	1		20 %
2 no- it was not necessary	3		60 %
3 no-we were not invited	1		20 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 5			
Skipped question: 18			

11.6. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2011MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey.

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

(Each respondent could choose MORE THAN ONE response.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	1		20 %
2 no- it was not necessary	3		60 %
3 no-we were not invited	1		20 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 5		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	
Skipped question: 18			

11.7. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2009 MBP - Training in Public Procurement in the Western Balkans and Turkey.

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

(Each respondent could choose MORE THAN ONE response.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%				
1 yes	0		0 %				
2 no- it was not necessary	1		100 %				
3 no-we were not invited	0		0 %				
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %				
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %				
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%				
Total respondents: 1							
Skipped question: 22		0%20%40%60%80%					

11.8. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2010 MBP - Improving Public Financial Management in the Western Balkans.

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

(Each respondent could choose MORE than one response.)


Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	0		0 %
2 no- it was not necessary	1		100 %
3 no-we were not invited	0		0 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 1		0%20%40%60%80%	
Skipped question: 22			

11.9. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2010 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI).

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

(Each respondent could choose MORE THAN ONE response.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	0		0 %
2 no- it was not necessary	1		100 %
3 no-we were not invited	0		0 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 1			
Skipped question: 22			

11.10. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2011 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI).

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

(Each respondent could choose MORE THAN ONE response.)


Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	0		0 %
2 no- it was not necessary	1		100 %
3 no-we were not invited	0		0 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 1			
Skipped question: 22			

11.11. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2012 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI).

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

(Each respondent could choose MORE THAN ONE response.)


Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	0		0 %
2 no- it was not necessary	1		100 %
3 no-we were not invited	0		0 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 1			
Skipped question: 22			

11.12. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2010 MBP - Infrastructure Project Facility - Technical Assistance Window.

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

(Each respondent could choose MORE THAN ONE response.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	0		0 %
2 no- it was not necessary	1		100 %
3 no-we were not invited	0		0 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 1			
Skipped question: 22			

11.13. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2008 MBP - Regional programme to support the establishment of the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA) in South-East Europe.

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	1		50 %
2 no- it was not necessary	1		50 %
3 no-we were not invited	0		0 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 2 Skipped question: 21			

11.14. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2009 MBP - Support to the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA).

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)


Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	1		50 %
2 no- it was not necessary	1		50 %
3 no-we were not invited	0		0 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 2 Skipped question: 21			

11.15. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2008 MBP- Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans.

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

(Each respondent could choose ONE or ALL responses.)


Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	0		0 %
2 no- it was not necessary	1		100 %
3 no-we were not invited	0		0 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 1			
Skipped question: 22			

11.16. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2009 MBP- Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans.

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

(Each respondent could choose MORE THAN ONE response.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	0		0 %
2 no- it was not necessary	1		100 %
3 no-we were not invited	0		0 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 1			
Skipped question: 22			

11.17. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2011 MBP- Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans.

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

(Each respondent could choose MORE THAN ONE response.)


Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	1		50 %
2 no- it was not necessary	1		50 %
3 no-we were not invited	0		0 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 2			
Skipped question: 21			

11.18. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2008 MBP - Support to the operational budget of the secretariat of the RCC.

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)


(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	0		0 %
2 no- it was not necessary	1		100 %
3 no-we were not invited	0		0 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 1			
Skipped question: 22			

11.19. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?

IPA 2010 MBP - Support to the operating expenditures of the RCC and Strengthening the RCC Secretariat.


(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	0		0 %
2 no- it was not necessary	1		100 %
3 no-we were not invited	0		0 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 1 Skipped question: 22			

11.20. Does/Did your organization participate in all activities planned in the project fiche?


IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Entrepreneurial Learning Centre.

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	0		0 %
2 no- it was not necessary	1		100 %
3 no-we were not invited	0		0 %
4 no-we were not interested	0		0 %
5 no-it was not possible for us	0		0 %
no-other reason, please specify	Total	% of total respondents	%
Total respondents: 1 Skipped question: 22			

12. Do you think your organization should participate in all activities planned in the project fiche(s)?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)


Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	5		50 %
2 no, please explain	5		50 %
Total respondents: 10 Skipped question: 22			

Explanation:

- only the once that are relevant for our institution and level of our current development;
- only at part which is of interest;
- participate in only necessary activities;
- some of the planned activities are dedicated to other institutions, such as Accreditation board, Institute for Standardization, Metrology Institute etc.;
- it is not an organisation involved directly in the project fiches.


13. How would you assess the management capacity of the following parties with regard to the implementation of MBP projects?

(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)




14. Do you think the EU Delegations should be more involved in the MBP?

(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)



15. How often do/did you encounter the following problems related to implementation of MBP?

(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)



16. How are you satisfied with the outputs delivered/results achieved?
(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)


Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
all outputs delivered	10	50 40 10
the quality the deliverables is good	10	40 50 10
outputs delivered on time	10	30 50 20
outputs useful	10	60 30 10
trainings useful	10	70 20 10
other, please specify	3	33 67
Average: 1,42 — Median: 1		
1. yes - fully 2. yes-partially 3. no - N/A		

17. How would you assess MBP assistance contribution to the improvement in the following areas:
(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
capacity of your country/organization in the area of support	10	20 60 20
new manuals/ tools in your country/organization in the area of support	10	20 70 10
legislative changes in your country in the area of support	10	20 50 10 20
practices in your organisation/country in the area of support	10	20 60 20
cooperation with other participating countries	10	50 50
cooperation with EU institutions	10	30 30 40
fulfilment of the acquis requirements and EU accession	10	20 60 20
other, please specify	1	100
Average: 3,06 — Median: 3		
1. poor 2. fair 3. good 4. excellent - N/A		

18. Please evaluate the added value of the MBP to your organization compared to similar assistance delivered through IPA national programmes?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
exchange of experience with other institutions/countries	9	 67 33
introduction of common approaches	9	 78 22
creation of multi country networks	9	 11 44 44
other, please specify	3	 67 33
Average: 3,28 — Median: 3		
		

19 Do you use the outputs from the MBP assistance?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 all of them	4		44 %
2 some of them	3		33 %
3 only few of them	2		22 %
4 none of them	0		0 %
Total respondents: 9		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	
Skipped question: 19			

20 Please explain why you do not use (all) deliverables?

(Each respondent could choose MULTIPLE responses.)

(Each respondent could choose MORE THAN ONE response.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 we do not need them	1		20 %
2 we need them but have no capacity/staff to use	2		40 %
3 we need them but have no financial resources to operate/maintain	1		20 %
4 other, please specify	1		20 %
Total respondents: 5			
Skipped question: 19			

Explanation:

- It is a public organisation which plays only a facilitating role in communication among EC, Albania and other regional countries.

21. Do you maintain contacts with your colleagues from the other participating countries and EU institutions/regional organisations?

(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
other participating countries	9	44 56
EU institutions	9	22 44 22 11
regional organisations	9	33 33 11 22
Average: 1,75 — Median: 2		
1. yes - regularly 2. yes - from time to time when needed 3. no - N/A		

22. How would you assess the resources and support available in your country to sustain the results achieved?

(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
financial resources	8	38 63
human resources	8	25 75
technical resources	8	38 63
political support	8	38 38 13 13
relevant legislation in place	8	13 75 13
other, please specify	1	100
Average: 2,75 — Median: 3		
1. poor 2. fair 3. good 4. excellent - no idea		

23 In your opinion should the Commission in the future initiate more MBP projects?

(Each respondent could write multiple open-ended responses of maximum 255 characters.)

(Each respondent could write multiple open-ended responses of maximum 255 characters.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
yes (please explain)	7		100 %
no (please explain)	0		0 %
Total respondents: 7 Skipped question: 20		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

Explanation:

- yes it is a great opportunity to be involved and to keep track of the development in the specific area.
To share experience and learn faster;
- yes because of improving cooperation among countries;
- yes but for specific sectors within QI;
- yes Since harmonisation with the EU acquis is a dynamic process and needs long term approach. Past experience revealed the success and importance of regional and multi beneficiary approach;
- yes it is of extreme importance since some of the assistance cannot be provided through national projects.
Good example is so called proficiency testing schema. This activity requires existence of number of laboratories to participate in;
- yes due to the huge need for more MBP projects;
- yes very useful for the exchange of information, good and bad practice.





Questions to NIPAC offices

24 Was your structure consulted by DG Enlargement during the development of the project fiche?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes- for all projects	5		100 %
2 yes- in some cases/for some projects	0		0 %
3 no	0		0 %
Total respondents: 5 Skipped question: 20		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	

25. To what extent did the MBP project(s) match the specific needs of your country?
(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
IPA 2007 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	2	
IPA 2008 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	2	
IPA 2009 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	2	
IPA 2011 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	3	
IPA 2008 MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	2	
IPA 2011 MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	2	
IPA 2009 MBP - Training in Public Procurement in the Western Balkans and Turkey	2	
IPA 2010 MBP - Improving Public Financial Management in the Western Balkans	2	
IPA 2010 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	2	
IPA 2011 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	3	
IPA 2012 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	3	
IPA 2010 MBP - Infrastructure Project Facility - Technical Assistance Window	3	
IPA 2008 MBP - Regional programme to support the establishment of the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA) in South-East Europe	3	
IPA 2009 MBP - Support to the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA)	3	
IPA 2008 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	2	
IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	2	
IPA 2011 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	2	
IPA 2008 MBP - Support to the operational budget of the secretariat of the Regional Cooperation Council (RCC)	2	
IPA 2010 MBP - Support to the operating expenditures of the RCC and Strengthening the RCC Secretariat	2	
IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Entrepreneurial Learning Centre	2	
Average: 2,20 — Median: 2		
		

26. How do you assess the project budget compared to the objectives set/activities planned?
(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
IPA 2007 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	2	50 50
IPA 2008 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	2	50 50
IPA 2009 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	2	50 50
IPA 2011 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	3	67 33
IPA 2008 MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	2	50 50
IPA 2011 MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	2	50 50
IPA 2009 MBP - Training in Public Procurement in the Western Balkans and Turkey	2	50 50
IPA 2010 MBP - Improving Public Financial Management in the Western Balkans	2	50 50
IPA 2010 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	2	50 50
IPA 2011 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	3	33 67
IPA 2012 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	3	33 67
IPA 2010 MBP - Infrastructure Project Facility - Technical Assistance Window	3	67 33
IPA 2008 MBP - Regional programme to support the establishment of the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA) in South-East Europe	3	67 33
IPA 2009 MBP - Support to the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA)	3	67 33
IPA 2008 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	2	50 50
IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	2	50 50
IPA 2011 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	2	50 50
IPA 2008 MBP - Support to the operational budget of the secretariat of the Regional Cooperation Council (RCC)	2	50 50
IPA 2010 MBP - Support to the operating expenditures of the RCC and Strengthening the RCC Secretariat	2	50 50
IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Entrepreneurial Learning Centre	2	50 50
Average: 2,07 — Median: 2		
1. sufficient 2. insufficient 3. no idea		

27. How in general would you assess the implementation methods and approaches?

(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
IPA 2007 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	2	100
IPA 2008 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	2	100
IPA 2009 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	2	100
IPA 2011 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	3	100
IPA 2008 MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	2	50 50
IPA 2011 MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	2	50 50
IPA 2009 MBP - Training in Public Procurement in the Western Balkans and Turkey	2	50 50
IPA 2010 MBP - Improving Public Financial Management in the Western Balkans	2	100
IPA 2010 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	2	100
IPA 2011 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	3	67 33
IPA 2012 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	3	67 33
IPA 2010 MBP - Infrastructure Project Facility - Technical Assistance Window	3	33 67
IPA 2008 MBP - Regional programme to support the establishment of the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA) in South-East Europe	3	33 33 33
IPA 2009 MBP - Support to the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA)	3	33 33 33
IPA 2008 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	2	50 50
IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	2	50 50
IPA 2011 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	2	50 50
IPA 2008 MBP - Support to the operational budget of the secretariat of the Regional Cooperation Council (RCC)	2	50 50
IPA 2010 MBP - Support to the operating expenditures of the RCC and Strengthening the RCC Secretariat	2	50 50
IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Entrepreneurial Learning Centre	2	100
Average: 1,93 — Median: 2		
1. poor 2. fair 3. good 4. excellent		

28. Do you think the EU Delegations should be more involved in the MBP?

(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
in the design phase	5	60 40
in the implementation phase	5	80 20
Average: 1,30 — Median: 1		
1. yes		
2. no		

Explanation:

- Yes, in the design - In order to ensure consistency with national programmes;
- Yes, in the design - the nature of MB IPA programmes imposes more significant role of EC in coordination of programmes preparation through cooperation with NIPAC TC from the region. EU Delegation should be involved in communication related to MB IPA Programmes preparation. It is important to provide EUD with the opportunity to have insight in the interventions that are identified for financial support. This is implied by need for complementarity between national programmes (which preparation is marked by greater involvement of EUD) and multibeneficiary programmes;
- Yes, in the implementation - the need for greater involvement of EUD in the implementation phase of project cycle management arises comes from the potential problems in the implementation activities, where EUD can intervene in cooperation with NIPAC TC.

29. Do you get recommendations for improvement of the performance of the MBP projects and from where?

(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
Result Oriented Monitoring	5	60 40
EU Delegation	5	20 80
EC Services	5	80 20
other, please specify	0	
Average: 1,47 — Median: 1		
1. yes		
2. no		

30. How do you assess the contribution of the MBP assistance to the improvement in the following areas:

(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
capacity of your country in the area of support	5	80 20
manuals/ tools in your country in the area of support	5	20 60 20
legislative changes in your country in the area of support	5	60 20 20
practices in your country in the area of support	5	20 80
cooperation with other participating countries	5	80 20
cooperation with EU institutions	5	20 60 20
fulfilment of the acquis requirements and EU accession	5	20 60 20
other, please specify	0	
Average: 2,59 — Median: 3		
1. poor 2. fair 3. good 4. excellent - N/A		

31. Please evaluate the added value of the MBP compared to similar assistance delivered through IPA national programmes?

(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
exchange of experience with other institutions/countries	5	20 40 40
introduction of common approaches	5	20 20 40 20
creation of multi country networks	5	20 40 40
other, please specify	0	
Average: 2,86 — Median: 3		
1. poor 2. fair 3. good 4. excellent - N/A		

32. How would you assess the resources and support available to sustain the outputs delivered/results achieved?

(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
financial resources	5	20 40 40
human resources	5	80 20
technical resources	5	20 40 40
political support	5	80 20
legislation in place	5	80 20
other, please specify	0	
Average: 2,20 — Median: 2		
1. poor 2. fair 3. good 4. excellent - no idea		

33 In your opinion should the Commission in the future initiate more MBP projects?

(Each respondent could write multiple open-ended responses of maximum 255 characters.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
yes (please explain)	4		80 %
no (please explain)	1		20 %
Total respondents: 5		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	
Skipped question: 13			

Explanation:

- yes Although wide range of important areas are currently covered with MBP, there should be some space left for the projects initiated in the region;
- yes MB IPA, as regional aspect of IPA is very useful instrument to support needs and priorities with regional dimension. In some priority areas the regional approach is more adequate and effective and results with economy of scale;
- no MB IPA should reduce its scope. There is no need for MB IPA projects to be implemented in all sectors. Assistance should be provided only in those sectors where impact of regional approach is obvious;
- yes MBP projects are very useful;
- yes Regional projects should target shared needs.

Questions to MBP Unit in EC

34 How you will assess the participation of the national authorities in the planning process?


(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 active and adequate	0		0 %
2 active but not very adequate	1		100 %
3 not very active but adequate	0		0 %
4 not active and not adequate	0		0 %
Total respondents: 1		0% 20% 40% 60% 80%	
Skipped question: 13			


35. How in average will you assess the management capacity of the following parties with regard to the MBP?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
contractors	3	
NIPACs	3	
beneficiaries	3	
Average: 3,56 — Median: 3,50		
		

36. Do you think the EU Delegations should be more involved in the MBP?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
in the design phase	3	
in the implementation phase	3	
Average: 1 — Median: 1		
		

Explanation:

- Yes, in the design - this would avoid overlap and increase synergies between national and regional programmes;
- Yes, in the design – complementarity;
- Yes, in the design - to assure better complementarities and coherence between national and MPB support;
- Yes, in the implementation - this would improve implementation as delegation task managers have a more precise understanding of the sector and country needs;
- Yes, in the implementation - necessary to achieve higher impact;
- Yes, in the implementation - to raise the political profile of the actions and use the political dialogue to strengthen the impact of the MPB actions.



Explanation:

- Lack of support from national units in the commission.

38 Does the multi beneficiary approach in general leads to less cost?

(Each respondent could choose only ONE of the following responses.)

Response	Total	% of responses	%
1 yes	2		67 %
2 hardly	0		0 %
3 no	0		0 %
4 please specify	1		33 %
Total respondents: 3			
Skipped question: 7			

Explanation:

- it is not about costs but about solving problems at the most appropriate level.

Questions to Contractors

39. How do you assess the project budget compared to the objectives set?

(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
IPA 2007 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	0	
IPA 2008 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	0	
IPA 2009 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	0	
IPA 2011 Multi-beneficiary Statistical Cooperation Programme	0	
IPA 2008 MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	0	
IPA 2011 MBP - Quality Infrastructure in the Western Balkans and Turkey	0	
IPA 2009 MBP - Training in Public Procurement in the Western Balkans and Turkey	0	
IPA 2010 MBP - Improving Public Financial Management in the Western Balkans	0	
IPA 2010 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	0	
IPA 2011 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	0	
IPA 2012 MBP - Strengthening European Integration (SEI)	0	
IPA 2010 MBP - Infrastructure Project Facility - Technical Assistance Window	1	100
IPA 2008 MBP - Regional programme to support the establishment of the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA) in South-East Europe	0	
IPA 2009 MBP - Support to the Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA)	0	
IPA 2008 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	0	
IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	0	
IPA 2011 MBP - Regional Programme on Trade and Investment in the Western Balkans	0	
IPA 2008 MBP - Support to the operational budget of the secretariat of the Regional Cooperation Council (RCC)	0	
IPA 2010 MBP - Support to the operating expenditures of the RCC and Strengthening the RCC Secretariat	0	
IPA 2009 MBP - Regional Entrepreneurial Learning Centre	0	
Average: 1 — Median: 1		
1. sufficient 2. insufficient		

40. How would you assess the participation of the beneficiaries in the project activities?(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
varies from beneficiary to beneficiary	2	100
there is/was a sufficient number of participants in the activities	2	100
beneficiaries ensure(d) a sufficient number of representatives	2	100
the beneficiaries actively participate(d) in the activities	2	100
the participants are/were one and the same through the years	2	50 50
the beneficiaries' representatives change through the years	2	100
Average: 1,25 — Median: 1		
1. yes 2. no		

41. How you will assess the management capacity of the following parties with regard to the MBP?(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
Beneficiaries	2	100
NIPACs	2	50 50
EC Services	2	50 50
Average: 2,33 — Median: 2		
1. Poor 2. Fair 3. Good 4. Excellent		


42. Do you think the EU Delegations should be more involved in the MBP?(Each respondent could choose only **ONE** response per sub-question.)

Sub-questions	Resp.	% of responses
in the design phase	5	60 40
in the implementation phase	5	60 40
Average: 1,40 — Median: 1		
1. yes 2. no		

Explanation:


- No, in the design - their current level of involvement is about right;
- Yes, in the design - better coordination of MBP and Local IPA funds;
- No, in the design – adequate;
- No, in the implementation - their current level of involvement is about right;
- Yes, in the implementation - some delegations are more involved than others. Evidently that depends on the people in the delegations;

- Yes, in the implementation - better matching of grant resources for project development with grants for works implementation;
- No, in the implementation – adequate.



Explanation:

- IFI involvement and JASPERS involvement.





P.O. Box 4175
3006 AD Rotterdam
The Netherlands

Watermanweg 44
3067 GG Rotterdam
The Netherlands

T +31 (0)10 453 88 00
F +31 (0)10 453 07 68
E netherlands@ecorys.com

W www.ecorys.nl

*The contents of this publication are
the sole responsibility of Ecorys
Nederland b.v. and can in no way
be taken to reflect the views of the
European Union.*

Sound analysis, inspiring ideas