European Commission

Mid-Term Evaluation of
The Euro-Mediterranean Youth Programme
2001-2003
(MEI/B7-4100/IB/98/0418)

ANNEXES

December 2004

European Consulting Organisation (ECO)
Roldan & Sorensen Consulting

Evaluation Team
Esther Gelabert
Judith Neisse

ANNEX 1

[Glossary](#)

GLOSSARY

Some of the terms used in this evaluation report are specific to the EU YOUTH programme or have a specific meaning in European terms. The following are some basic definitions of the terminology:

Member States – the countries that are members of the European Union (see section B.2).

Programme countries – EU Member States, EFTA/EEA countries and pre-accession countries. They can participate fully in all YOUTH Actions (see list of countries in section B.2).

Mediterranean partner countries (MEDA) the non-EU countries on or near the Mediterranean Sea that are participating in the Euro-Mediterranean Youth Action Programme

Third countries – neither Member States of the European Union, pre-accession countries, nor members of EFTA/EEA, i.e. the Mediterranean partner countries as well as the countries from the CIS, South East Europe and Latin America listed in section B.3 They can participate in YOUTH projects under Actions 1, 2 and 5, subject to specific criteria and procedures as outlined in chapter H.

EuroMed – the Euro-Mediterranean Youth Action Programme, which involves the EU Member States and Mediterranean partner countries.

National Agencies – structures established by the national authorities in each Programme country in order to assist the European Commission with management and to assume responsibility for implementation of most of the YOUTH programme (see attached list of contact details).

National Coordinators – structures established by the national authorities in each Euro-Med partner country in order to facilitate implementation of the Euro-Mediterranean Youth Action Programme (see attached list of contact details).

Non-formal education - projects within YOUTH actively involve young people on a voluntary basis and provide them with opportunities to acquire skills and competencies outside formal education and training systems. Even though they are not part of any formal educational curriculum, YOUTH projects are characterised by a carefully planned programme of personal and social education for participants and apply methods of intercultural learning.

Young people with fewer opportunities – young people from a less-privileged cultural, geographical or socio-economic background, or with disabilities; better access for them to the activities developed within the YOUTH programme is a key priority for the European Commission.

ANNEX 2

[List of interviewees]{.underline}
Evaluation workshops
Personal interviews

ALGERIA

1. M Youssef YAKHLEF   Ministry of Youth and Sport
2. M Nouredinne SI BASHIR   National Coordinator Algeria
3. M Hamitouche BELHACOM Association pour l'Union et la Promotion de la Jeunesse (U.P.J)
4. M Amar MERABTENE   Association des Activités de Loisirs et Echanges de Jeunes
5. M Hamid TESSA   Association des Activités de Jeunes Tiwizi
6. M Hakim FOURALI   Association de Volontariat Touiza Wilaya d'Alger
7. Ms Lynda ZERKANI   Association ANCEJ
8. M Rihab OUATAS   Association ANCEJ
9. Ms Farah ASBAI   Association Nationale pour l'Entreprise et le Travail (ANET NOOR
10. Association de Développement des Initiatives Citoyennes et européennes (ADICE)
11. Fondation pour le Développement des Etudes et Recherches Médicales (FOREM)
12. Ms Amel HADJI   Association Nationale Santé Jeunes
13. M Ouiza KEBBAS   Ligue de Prévention et de Sauvegarde de la Jeunesse et des Sports
  deTizi Ouzou
10. M Omar TADJADIT   Association Culturelle pour le Développement et
              l'Epanouissement de la Jeunesse Algérienne (ACDEJA)
14. M Djamel ZHARI   Sauvegarde Jeunesse M'doukal
15. M Farid BELLAZOUZ   Ligue de Voile Wilaya d'Alger
16. Ms Latifa LAKER   Club Vert
17. 10 participants of a project run by Association de Volontariat Touiza Wilaya d'Alger
18. Ms PINHERO   Delegation of the European Commission

BELGIUM

1. Ms Fatima LAANAN   Agnece Québec Wallonie Bruxelles pour la Jeunesse

EGYPT

1. Ms Gehad Galal Amer   National Coordinator Egypt
2. Dr. Ali El Dinhellal,   Minister of Youth
3. Ms Sally Salem,   EVS, long-term volunteer
4. M Hassan ALI FAHMI   El Oroba Youth Center
5. Ms Nadia EL GOHRY   El Oroba Youth Center
6. Ms Youssra MOUSA   El Oroba Youth Center
7. M Sami Shaeen   El Oroba Youth Center
8. M Ramez ReFAAT   El Oroba Youth Center
9. Ms Mervet ADEL   El Oroba Youth Center
10. Ms Nora SALEM   El Oroba Youth Center
11. J.E.E.P.C
12. Terre des Hommes
13. A.D.E.W.
14. Music and Culture
15. Future Youth Club
16. Ms Nehad ABU EL KOSAM Egyptian Center for Wommen's rights

17. M Mostapha SELGINDI   El Oroba Youth Center
18. Social Rehabilitation Association
19. Future Generation Foundation
20. Egyptian Association for Comprehensive Development
21. Egyptian Voluntary Club
22. Upper Egypt Association
23. Le Club du Francophone
24. Scouts and Girls Guides Federation
25. Elmashrek Association for Development
26. Alashanek Ya Balady Association
27. Tourist Friends Association Cairo
28. Models for Economic and Political Sciences
29. Nasr City
30. Gezira Youth Center
31. E.F.D. Technology
32. Shark Elmansoura Youth Center
33. Tourist Friends Association
34. Biblioteca Alexandrina
35. Elwafaa Association for Social Rehabilitation
36. Elanfoshy Youth Center
37. Sustainable Development Association
38. Friends of Environment Association
39. Rotar Act - Cosmo Politan
40. Abo Elreish Albahary Center
41. Horizon International Agency
42. Future Youth Foundation
43. Jesuit's And Brothers Association
44. Y.M.C.A.
45. Minya (A) Youth Center
46. Talah Youth Center
47. Qenna Youth Administration
48. Al-Maris Youth Center
49. Cedi Abd El-Rehim
50. Egyptian Association for Environmental Development
51. Sharm El Shiekh Y.C.
52. Faraskor Y.C.
53. Marsa Matrouh Y.C.
54. Dessouk Y.C.
55. Portsaid Y.C.
56. Naser Y.C.
57. M Mohammed RAMEZ   Egyptian Federation of boys and girls guides Scouts
58. Dr FAKHRI   Egyptian Federation of boys and girls guides Scouts
59. Ms Claudia FISCHER   Counsellor - Social Affairs European Union

ISRAEL

1. Dr David KRAUZS   National Coordinator
2. Ms Pnina EL-AL   Minister – Counsellor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
3. M Benjamine KRESSEL   Director of the EU Desk, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
4. M Shmulik LAHAR   Municipality of Holon
5. M Shabi MICHAELI   Israeli Youth Forum Ashabd

6. Ms Françoise KAFRI   Municipality of Jerusalem
7. M Dani WOLLNER   Local Council of Kfar Vradim
8. M Ahmad GHANAIM
9. M Roshdi ALMADI   El-Badiya
10. M Meir MALKA   Belh Shewesh
11. M Michal LAVETTLER   Massawa Centre
12. M Renau SHORER
13. Mitzpe Ramon
14. M Hangar ADAMA
15. M Mohammed ABDL HAKIM   Friendship Village
16. Ms Noga ZOHAR   Green Course
17. M Claudio KOGON   Matan Cente
18. Ms Aviva BAR RAPHAE   Israel Youth Board
19. M Kobi ASHKENAZI
20. M Ilan MAMMANE   Ashdod Municipality
21. Ms Anat EISIK   Topaz
22. M Ameen KASSEM   The Bedouin heritage centre
23. M Benjamin ESCAIG   Counsellor at the Delegation of the European Commission

JORDAN

1. M Mahmoud Qadam AL-SERHAN   Ministry of Youth and Sport
2. M Aref ISHAKAT   The Higher Council for Youth-Jordan
3. Ms Sahar Faiz   National Coordinator Jordan
4. M Ziad ALAWNEH   Land and Human To Advocate Progress
5. Ms Nisreen GOUSOS   Friends of Culture Jordanian Forum (ASHAB)
6. M Mohamad ABU ALGHANAM   Friends of Culture Jordanian Forum (ASHAB)
7. Ms Layla HAMARNEH   Arab Women Organization
8. M Fadi SHRIHEA   Jordan Royal Ecological Diving Society
9. Ms Samah GOUSOUS   Young Women Christians Association
10. Ms Susan SHAMALI   Young Women Christians Association
11. M Ramzi QADOMI   Al-Hassan Youth Award
12. Ms Elham IRHAEIL   Abdel Rahman Bin Aewf Association
13. M Samer AL KASEEH   Jordan University Alumni
14. M Mohamad OBIDAT   Jordan University for Science and Technology
15. Ms HANAN   Haya Cultural Center
16. Ms Dina AL-JAMAL   Princess Basma Youth Center
17. Ms Nadia AL-ALOUL   The National Society for the Enhancement of Freedom and Democracy
18. M Anas Abadi   Friend of Culture Jordanian Forum
19. M Mahmoud NABILSI   Haya Cultural Center
20. M Mahmoud AL TAYEB   CARDNE
21. M Tala JBOUR   Arab Society For Public Awareness From Dangerous Drugs and Narcotics
22. M Samer TARAWNEH   Enhanced Productivity Center
23. M Raed HADEED   Jordan Red Crescent
24. M Ramzi GHANEM   Catholic Scouts and Guides
25. M Thaer AYASH   IBN Batota Scouts
26. M Abdel Aziz HOMSI   Jerash Youth Center
27. M Rasha MUSMAR   Friend of Culture Jordanian Forum
28. M Zaid HISHAM   Mount Nebo Association

29. M Mahmoud QUTEISH   Salt Cultural Forum
30. M Haneen ODEH   Mount Nebo Association
31. M Ali MURAD   Mount Nebo Association
32. M Talal Qudah   Community Center
33. M Bruno NETO   Volunteer, Portugal
34. Ms Ragda Zawaydeh   Madaba Youth Center for Girls
35. M Samer Zabaneh   Junior International Trainer
36. M Waleed Zyoud   Forum Youth and Culture
37. Ms Reem Qaraman   Youth Exchange Trainer
38. M Firas Assaf   Jreds
39. M Aziz HAMSI   Jerash Youth Center
40. M Fotouh Yones   Amman Center for Human Rights
41. M Enas Jbour   EVS in Denmark
42. M Muueer Bani Yonnes   AL-HASSAN Youth Award
43. Ms Amira El Ras   Desk Officer, Delegation of the European Commission, Amman
44. Ms Sopie Borel   Desk Officer, Delegation of the European Commission, Amman

LEBANON

1. M Ibrahim MENASSA   Ministry of Youth and Sport
2. Ms Elisa Aslanian   National Coordinator Lebanon
3. Ms Carine ASSOUAD   Offre Joie
4. Ms Vicky ABOU SLEIMAN   Offre Joie
5. M Fady WAKIM   Caritas Liban
6. Ms Rita BAROUD   Y.M.C.A.
7. Ms Fabiola DINA   Freelance Trainer
8. M Mazen GHRAIZI   Progressive Youth Organization (P.Y.O.)
9. M Rayan ASHAR   Progressive Youth Organization (P.Y.O.)
10. Ms Maria GHATMI   Progressive Youth Organization (P.Y.O.)
11. Ms Rola HAIDAR   Progressive Youth Organization (P.Y.O.)
12. M Malek TAKIEDDINE   Center for Conflict Resolution and Peace Building
    (C.C.R.P.)
13. Ms Rola TAKIEDDINE   Center for Conflict Resolution and Peace Building
    (C.C.R.P.)
14. M Nizar GHANEM   Center for Conflict Resolution and Peace Building
    (C.C.R.P.)
15. Ms Jana EL HARR   Center for Conflict Resolution and Peace Building
    (C.C.R.P.)
16. M Khalil TAUUM   Secours Populaire Libanais
17. Ms Samar HAMDAN   Progressibe Youth Organization (P.Y.O.)
18. M Ziad NASR   Progressibe Youth Organization (P.Y.O.)
19. M Hassan KHALIL   Secours Populaire Libanais
20. M Pierre Fatalini,   Former counsellor for the Directorate of Youth
21. Roy ABOU HALIL   YMCA
22. Ms Sibylle BIKAR   Delegation of the European Commission

MOROCCO

1. M Yacine Bellarab   National Coordinator Morocco
2. M El Mounabih Alami   Directeur de la Jeunesse, Ministère de l'Education

3. M Hamid Moutaouakkil   C.J.V.
4. M Sabik Salaheddine   Association Rencontre Maroc
5. M Samorah El Mostafa   Association Socio Culturelle ALMADINA
6. M Zniber Mohammed   Chantiers Sociaux Marocains
7. M Amouri Mohammed   ACT(amitié coopération tolérance)
8. M Garfaoui Abdelaziz   ACT
9. M Abdelakbir Mohajiry   Association pour la vocation et l'éducation sociale.
Complexe
10. Ms Touria Sekkate Maarif   Association pour la vocation éducative
11. M Reda Elmoulabbi   CEJE
12. Ms Najat Basou   Maison des jeunes Meknes-maroc
13. M Yassine Isbouia   Club Zilis Théâtre des Jeunes
14. Ms Elamine Nouzha   Secretatiat d'Etat chargé de la Jeunesse
15. Maison des jeunes Zerktouni
16. Maison des jeunes Assilah
17. Maison des jeunes El Mariniyuire
18. Hakim Mouafek   Association Chouala
19. Lahcen Elomrani   Association INAACH
20. Asso Karnaval delegation d'etat
21. M. Abdel Fanan   Federation nationale de scoutisme
22. Thaqafat association
23. Mouvement de jeunes pour la paix
24. Ben Taibi RACHID   Cadre au Secretatiat d'Etat chargé de la Femme
25. Taouaf SAID   Delegation Jeunesse et Sport
26. Ms Alicia MARTIN   Desk Officer, Delegation of the European
Commission Morocco
27. M Louis DAY   Desk Officer, Delegation of the European
Commission Morocco

PALESTINE

1. M Salah TAAMARI   Minister of Youth and Sport
2. M Muharram BARGHOTHI   Ministry of Youth and Sport
3. Duaa QUREI   Candidate to the post of National Coordinator
4. Ms Heba TIBI   Euro-Med Responsible
5. M Mazen JABARI   Youth Development Department
6. Ms Maali   Youth Development Department
7. M Mazen ISSA   Palestinian Youth Union
8. M Sameh KHADER   Independence Youth Union
9. M Mais ZUHAIKA   Youth Development Department in Orient House
10. M Uriab JABER
11. M Rema
12. M Nance SADIK
13. Ms Nancy SADIQ   Panorama
14. M TILMANN   Volunteer from DE
15. M. ROGER   Volunteer from ES
16. Ms. SONYA   Volunteer from FR
17. Ms CAROLINE   Volunteer from BE
18. M Francis OLBRECHTS   Counsellor Cooperation Coordination European Union
19. Ms Raffaella IODICE de WOLFF   First Secretary of European Union
20. Ms Fadia NAHAS   Counsellor Cooperation Coordination European Union

21. M Jean BRETECHE   Head of the Counsellor Cooperation Coordination
European Union

SYRIA

1. M Amjad SHAABBAN   Damascus
2. M Kinan SMANDAR   Damascus
3. M Sulyman KORJ   Syrian Youth Club for Scientific and Informatic
4. M Homan MOKAYED   Syrian Youth Club for Scientific and Informatic
5. M Faisal AL-SALEH   Youth Revolutionary Union (Y.R.U.)
6. M Lamar ALYAN   City (2) Center - Tartons
7. M Samaher AL-ALI   Omyaid Center - Damascus
8. M Luoi IBRAHEM   City (2) Center - Tartons
9. M Kinda SAAD   Malky - Aleppo
10. M Michael HESWANI   Yabrood - Damascus
11. M Ali KADOOR   Jolan - Aleppo
12. M Waseem AL-HUSEIN   Izrad - Daraa
13. Ms Rama HATAB   Moneer Maaroof - Lattakia
14. M Hanaa AL-HASAN   Hameda - Raggra
15. M Wisam SABAANEH   Jafra - Damascus
16. M Fadi SHARKAWI   Jafra - Damascus
17. Ms Nemat TUIER   Youth Revolutionary Union (Y.R.U.)
18. M Saleh AL RASHED   Youth Revolutionary Union (Y.R.U.)
19. M Fares KALLAS   Spacetel Syria
20. M Saleh AL RASHED   Youth Revolutionary Union
21. M Milaz Mikdad   Syrian Youth Union
22. Ms Nemat Tuier   Syrian Youth Union
23. M Adnan ARBASH   Syrian Youth Union
24. Ms Fabienne Besson   Delegation of the European Commission
25. Ms Katerina Hacktein   Delegation of the European Commission

TUNISIA

1. M FEKIK   Ministère de la Jeuness et des Sports
2. M. Taoufiq FATHALLAH   National Coordinator Tunisia
3. M Mohammed CHAABOUNI   Association des amis de la maison des jeunes de
Metline
4. M Ayari HICHEM   Club UNESCO Ezzouhour de Tunis
5. M Hamda ANIS   Club UNESCO Ezzouhour de Tunis
6. M Philip PHIGO   Foundation EL Taller
7. M Chouchene M'BAREK   Maison des Jeunes Maghrebine Rades
8. M Rachid JANNEN   Association des Amis de la Maison de Jeunes Beni-
Khasi
9. M Sami BOUSLAMA   Association des Amis de la Maison de Jeunes Beni-
Khasi
10. M Ahmed DENNI   Association des Amis de la Maison de Jeunes de
Mehira
11. Ms Afef GUESMI   Association de Promotion des Handicapés
12. M Malek GHANNI   Association de l'Amitié des Villes Jumelées d'Hammamet
13. Ms Aida ATIRI   Comité Culturel de Rades

14. M Taoufik POUZARI   Maison des Jeunes Assilah
15. M Nourelhouda CHADLI   Mouvement des Jeunes de la Paix
16. Ms Ghizlane ZAMHOUR   Maison des Jeunes El Mariniyime
17. M Abdelkarim EL OUAZZANI   Thaqafat Association
18. Ms Bouchra TIRAFF   Maison de Jeunes Zerktouni
19. Ms Amina ARIF   Cellule Enromed
20. Ms Katharina LOSSMANN   Volunteer DE in Metline
21. M Bernard NEUVILLE   Counsellor, Delegation of the European Commission
22. M Mar PIERINI   Head of Delegation, Tunisia

TURKEY

1. Assuman GÖKSEL   Former National Coordinator Turkey

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

1. M. Pierre MAIRESSE   Head of Unit Youth
2. Ms Sylvia MORA   "Youth" Unit of DG EAC
3. Dietrich R
4. Bela MATIAS   Former Desk Officer at Aidco for Euromed Youth
5. Gregory KEHALIA   Former counsellor in charge of NC in Syria
6. Maria Antonia CALVO PUERTA   "Thematic support – Social and human development", DG AIDCO, European Commission
7. Alejandra MARTINEZ   Former Euromed Officier, DG EAC

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

1. M Marcos ANDRADEe   Coordinator, Youth Dimension, European Centre for Global Interdependence and Solidarity , North-South Centre,
2. M Rui GOMES   Council of Europe in Budapest

EUROMED YOUTH PLATFORM

1. M Giovanni BUTTIGIG   Director, Euromed Youth Platform

SALTO EUROMED RESOURCE CENTRE

1. M. Bernard ABRIGNANI   Coordinator of Euromed Salto Resource Centre

TECHNICAL ASSISSTANCE OFFICE
1. Irmeli
2. Anila

ANNEX 3

Questionnaires used for surveys

3.1. Questionnaires used for National co-ordinators

> # External Evaluation of the Euromed Youth Programme
>
> # Questionnaire Interview to National Co-ordinators

A. Identification

Name:……………………………………………………………………………………….

Institution: …………………………………………………………………………………

Position :……………………………………………………………………………………

Team :………………………………………………………………….....................

Contact details: ....………….………

B. Questions concerning the set up of the programme

1. Could you please give a brief history of Euromed Youth in your country? **……………………….…...**

2. What is your role as national co-ordinator?

☐ Represent your country in Euromed Youth
☐ Disseminate information about the programme
☐ Promoting the programme priorities and objectives
☐ To train actors about Euromed youth
☐ Advise project promoters on project preparation
☐ Assist project promoters to find local partners
☐ Assist project promoters to find international partners
☐ Assist project promoters to run their project
☐ Receive and register proposals (action 3)
☐ Pre assess application and send assessment to TAO
☐ On site visits to the projects
☐ Cooperate with EU National Agencies
☐ Promoting and recruiting participants to various Euromed events (training, workshops, conferences...)
☐ Maintaining contact with the programme structures (EC, TAO, NA, Salto, EMYP)
☐ Other:

C. Questions concerning quality indicators

1. **Questions related to pertinence and relevance**

1.1 Do you think that the objectives defined for the programme meet the real needs of your country and priorities in terms of youth policy? (target groups, specific needs not in the programme)

Overall Objective	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
1. Improve mutual knowledge, understanding and dialogue between youth in the Med and EU				
2. To stimulate young people's active citizenship, in particular young women, within their local communities.				
3. To stimulate youth NGO's contributions to their country's public life				

Specific Objective	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
1. To provide informal intercultural learning opportunities for young people especially through exchange and trans-national voluntary services				
2. To provide training opportunities in Euromed youth work for youth leaders and workers				
3.1. To exchange experiences and good practices				
3.2. To promote the acquisition of new skills and approaches to international youth work among youth NGO's and responsible for youth work in MED and EU				
3.3 To develop capacity building at the level of youth structures and policies				
4.1. To promote the development of non-profit making structures working in the youth field				
4.2 To promote the establishment of independent and representative national youth councils in the Med partners				
5. To improve, through the youth associations, the cooperation with civil society as an element of democratic reform				
6.1. To inform youth NGO's about EU Institutions and the Euromed Partnership by strengthening the dialogue between the 27 Euromed partners				
6.2. To improve a greater understanding between their cultures and a better perception of each other				

Specific Objective	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
7. To increase participation of Med NGO's in youth NGO trans-national networks				

1.2. Do you think that the expected results are defined in a realistic way?

Expected result	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
1. Contacts, dialogue and exchanges between EU and Med youth for a better understanding as an essential factor for peace and mutual respect				
2. Strengthening of permanent networking and contacts (NA, NC, NGO's) through training, common data base, coordination meetings, regular exchanges				
3. The Euromed Forum/Platform as platform of discussion for organisations (exchange of good practices, networking				
4. Local communities hosting activities carried out by beneficiaries (specially in the field of Voluntary Service) will benefit from an increase in mutual understanding and exchange of know how				

1.3. To what extent are the activities and the intervention mechanisms well adapted to the needs of your country?

Activity/mechanism	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
1. Preparatory training and support measures (visits, seminars, training courses etc.)				
2. Networking (practitioners, beneficiaries)				
3. Multilateral youth exchanges (thematic priorities)				
4. Voluntary service exchanges (short & long term, individual & group)				
5. Experimental/innovative projects (job-creating projects)				
6. Euromed Youth Platform				
7. Salto				
8. CoE convenant				

- To what extent are other actions necessary in order to obtain those needs?**…………………………………**

1.4. Are you familiar with the objectives of the third chapter of the Barcelona Process as well as to the objectives of the Youth Programme?
1.4.1. What is the degree of complementarity of the programme with other Euro Mediterranean regional programmes and mainly in the third chapter (Euromed Audiovisual, Euromed Heritage, EIDHR ?

Regional programme	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
Euromed Audiovisual				
Euromed Heritage				
EIDHR				
Others				

1.4.2. To what extent there are synergies with other projects supported by the EU on the bilateral level ?

Project:

Comments:

1.5. To what extent is the budget appropriate for the pursued objectives?

1.5.1. Does the budget allocated take into consideration the importance of the youth population in the Mediterranean?

☐ Fully
☐ Averagely
☐ Not at all

Explain:

1.5.2. Does the budget allocated to the NC take into consideration the importance of their work?

☐ Fully
☐ Averagely
☐ Not at all

Explain:

2. <u>Questions related to effectiveness</u>

2.1. To what extend are the management instruments effective?

Instrument	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
1. Your contract				
2. the contract of the NC with the EC				
3. The work plan				
4. the Training & cooperation plan				
5. the monthly calendar				
6. The payment schedule (40% + 40% + 20%)				
7. The interim report				
8. The final report				
9. Auditing certification model				
10. Action plan for communication				

Instrument	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
12. Formal check list for the selection				
13. Assessment sheet				
14. The training session for EVS				
15 Users guide				
Others				

- Do the administrative rules harmonise with the rules of the structure in your country?

2.2. Your work as a NC needs the implementation of a work plan, what is currently the level of implementation of your working plan? (ask for documents)

☐ On schedule

☐ Slight delay
  - Difficulties encountered:

☐ Important delay
  -Difficulties encountered:

2.3. Is the Programme achieving its objectives? (This part covers the relationship between the outputs/results of the programme and the programme expected purpose/specific objectives.)

- In which way have the different actors and beneficiaries utilize the different types of actions (Actions 1, 2, and 5)?

Action	Number of projects	Number of participants	Budget	Comments
Action 1				
Action 2				
Action 5				

2.4. What are the strengths and the weaknesses of your structures?

Strength:

Weaknesses:

2.5. What are the main problems that you encounter?

Problem:

Solution proposed by you:

2.6. Did you participate in support action/training activity? If so, what type of action and in what respect it helped you to fulfil your tasks?

Action :

Comments:

2.7. Interaction and synergies with other actors involved

19

Structure	Intense	Average	None	Comments
National ministry				
EC EAC				
EC EuropeAid				
EC Delegation				
NA				
TAO				
Salto				
EMYP				
Others				

2.8. What is the intervention logic of the evaluation and selection process?

- How adequate and effective has the selection process been?

☐ Very effective
☐ Effective
☐ Purely effective
☐ Not effective

- To what extent are the procedures and criteria for project selection appropriate and have been applied uniformly as set out in the Guidelines?

☐ Very appropriate
☐ Appropriate
☐ Purely appropriate
☐ Not appropriate

- How appropriate have been the frequency and times of project selection deadlines?

☐ Very appropriate
☐ Appropriate
☐ Purely appropriate
☐ Not appropriate

2.9. Do you think that the programme is sufficiently known among the actors in your country?

Actor	Very known	Partially known	Purely known	Not at all	Comments
Ministries					
Youth organisations					
Young people					
NGO's					
Universities					
International donors					

2.10. How effective is the information and dissemination strategy?

☐ Very effective

☐ Effective
☐ Purely effective
☐ Not effective

2.11. What information and promotion mechanisms do you use?

☐ Brochure
☐ Newsletter paper
☐ Leaflet
☐ Newsletter electronic
☐ Media publicity
☐ Participation in events
☐ Workshop
☐ Dissemination of project results
☐ Conference
☐ Internet
☐ Others

3.   Questions related to efficiency

3.1. What is the relationship between the inputs (Human and financial resources) and the first outputs of the programme?

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Bad

- What are the costs per action? What is the relationship between the implementations and the costs? (please ask for documents)

3.2 Do you have a monitoring and evaluation system for your activities?

- Aspects covered (plan, budget, impact, and statistics):

- Person in charge?

- Other actors involved?

- Frequency?

4.   Questions related to Sustainability

4.1. To what extent is there adequate ownership of the programme by the target groups / beneficiaries?

Question	Excellent	Good	Fair	Bad	Comments
Satisfactory understanding of the programme objectives					
Commitment to strengthening the values of the programme? (Peace, tolerance, human rights etc.)					

Question	Excellent	Good	Fair	Bad	Comments
Participation in the projects with enthusiasm and expression of a strong will for further initiatives of cooperation					

4.2. To what extent have the relevant authorities had a supportive policy during implementation of the programme?

□ Very supportive
□ Supportive
□ Purely supportive
□ Not supportive

4.2.1. To what extent was the programme successful in mainstreaming of youth policies into government policies in the countries concerned?

□ Very successful
□ Successful
□ Purely successful
□ Not successful

-Explain:

4.3. To what extent will all beneficiaries have adequate access to benefits and products during and after the programme?

Question	Very good	Good	Fair	Bad	Comments
To what extent has the programme supported the capacity building of organisations, institutions etc. in the Meda area?					
To what extent was the training crucial to attain the necessary capacity building for transforming the beneficiaries' activity into a sustainable development process?					

- How far has the programme contributed to crosscutting aspects (equality between man and women, environment) and to mainstream them into youth policies?

Question	Very good	Good	Fair	Bad	Comments
Gender					
Human rights					

Cultural dialogue					
Environment					
Disabled persons					

- Others:

5. Questions related to Impact

5.1. To what extent has the programme succeeded in busting a growing interest among the actors in your country in the Euro mediterranean cooperation in the youth field?

Question	Very good	Good	Fair	Bad	Comments
Did the number of projects and participants grow in a sensible way in comparison to the first stage?					
To what extent have barriers and handicaps been dismantled: Visa, difficult mobility, insurance etc?					
To what extent has the programme succeeded to promote a greater South-South cooperation?					
Was the establishment of network of National co-ordinators successful and to what extent were other forms of regional partnerships created?					
How big is the number of projects with a genuine regional character?					

5.2. To what extent has the programme had an effect of the beneficiaries?

Question	Very good	Good	Fair	Bad	Comments
Has the Programme enhanced mutual understanding and respect among young people from different countries?					
Has it increased the solidarity amongst young people?					
To what extent has					

the action encouraged the development of youth structures and the voluntary sector as a means to strengthen civil society in your country?					
Has the participation to the action encouraged the young people involved to increase or improve the acquired knowledge of the society of the exchange countries					

- To what extent did the financial support granted to the beneficiaries of the Programme merely substitute for support likely to have been provided from other sources anyway?

- How likely is it that the effects of the Programme would have occurred even if the Programme itself had not been launched?

C. Conclusions

Please name 5 successes of the programme:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

D. Remarks, suggestions, comments

3.2. Questionnaires used for National Agencies

External Evaluation of the Euromed Youth Programme
Questionnaire to National Agencies

A. Identification:

Name:…………………………………………………………………………

Institution:……………………………………………………...……………

Position: …………………………………………………………………………

Management of Euromed:
    ☐   Full-time
    ☐   Part-time

Other responsibilities in the Agency:
(Please indicate if there was any change since the decentralisation)
    ☐   Yes
    ☐   No

Contact details:……………………………………………………………………

B. Questions related to the set up of the programme:

1. *Could you please give a brief history of Euromed Youth programme in your country?*

2. What are the priorities of your Agency regarding Euromed Youth?

   - Is the Euromed Youth programme considered as a priority among the other actions of EU Youth?

       ☐   Yes
       ☐   No
   Comments:…………………………………………………………………...………………

   - Please, specify the priorities:

   1.
   3.
   4.
   5.

- What is your role as national coordinator? (Please number according to priority)

☐ Promote the programme priorities and objectives
☐ Represent your country in Euro-Med Youth
☐ Disseminate information about the programme
☐ Train actors about Euro-Med youth
☐ Advise project promoters on project preparation
☐ Assist project promoters to find local partners
☐ Assist project promoters to find international partners
☐ Assist project promoters to run their project
☐ Receive and register proposals
☐ Organise the selection procedure
☐ Sign the contract and follow up the projects
☐ Organise evaluation sessions with the beneficiaries
☐ On site visits to the projects
☐ Organise training sessions (TCP and others)
☐ Cooperate with EU National Agencies
☐ Cooperate with National Coordinators (Twinning scheme)
☐ Promoting and recruiting participants to various Euromed events (training, workshops conferences...)
☐ Maintaining contact with the programme structures (EC, TAO, NA, Salto, EMYP)
☐ Other

C. Questions concerning quality indicators:

2. Questions related to pertinence and relevance

1.1. Do you think that the objectives defined for the programme meet the real needs of your country and priorities in terms of youth policy? (target groups, specific needs not in the programme)

Overall Objective	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
1. Improve mutual knowledge, understanding and dialogue between youth in the Med and EU				
2. To stimulate young people's active citizenship, in particular young women, within their local communities.				
3. To stimulate youth NGO's contributions to their country's public life				

Specific Objective	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
1. To provide informal intercultural learning opportunities for young people especially through exchange and trans-national voluntary services				
2. To provide training opportunities in Euro-Med youth work for youth leaders and workers				
3.1. To exchange experiences				

and good practices				
3.2. To promote the acquisition of new skills and approaches to international youth work among youth NGO's and responsible for youth work in MEDA and EU				
3.3 To develop capacity building at the level of youth structures and policies				
4.1. To promote the development of non-profit making structures working in the youth field				

Specific Objective	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
4.2 To promote the establishment of independent and representative national youth councils in the Med partners				
5. To improve, through the youth associations, the cooperation with civil society as an element of democratic reform				
6.1. To inform youth NGO's about EU Institutions and the Euro-Med Partnership by strengthening the dialogue between the 27 Euro-Med partners				
6.2. To improve a greater understanding between their cultures and a better perception of each other				
7. To increase participation of Med NGO's in youth NGO trans-national networks				

1.2. Do you think that the expected results are defined in a realistic way?

Expected result	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
1. Contacts, dialogue and exchanges between EU and Med youth for a better understanding as an essential factor for peace and mutual respect				
2. Strengthening of permanent networking and contacts (NA, NC, NGO's) through training, common data base, coordination meetings, regular exchanges				
3. The Euro-Med Forum/Platform as platform of discussion for organisations (exchange of good practices, networking				
4. Local communities hosting activities carried out by beneficiaries (specially in the field of Voluntary Service) will benefit from an increase in mutual understanding and exchange of know how				

1.3. To what extent are the activities and the intervention mechanisms well adapted to the needs of your country?

Activity/mechanism	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
1. Preparatory training and				

support measures (visits, seminars, training courses etc.)				
2. Networking (practitioners, beneficiaries)				

Activity/mechanism	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
3. Multilateral youth exchanges (thematic priorities)				
4. Voluntary service exchanges (short & long term, individual & group)				
5. TCP				
6. Euro-Med Youth Platform				
7. Salto				
8. CoE covenant				

- To what extent are other actions necessary in order to obtain those needs?

1.4. To what extent is the budget of the Euromed programme appropriate for the pursued objectives?

1.4.1. Does the budget allocated take into consideration the importance of the youth population in the Mediterranean?

- Before the decentralisation

☐ Fully
☐ Averagely
☐ Not at all

Not at all? (Explain): **…………………………**..

- After the decentralisation

☐ Fully
☐ Averagely
☐ Not at all

Explain: **…………………………………**..

1.4.2. To what extent has the decentralisation contributed to a better achievement of your objectives?

2. <u>Questions related to effectiveness</u>

2.1. To what extend are the management instruments effective?

Instrument	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
1. The contract of the NA with the EC				
2. The work plan				
3. The training & cooperation plan				
4. Assessment sheet				
5. The training session for EVS				
6. User guide				

Other				

2.2. What are the most frequent problems for which the project promoters ask your support?

Problem	Solution/support
Procedures of the programme	
Identification of partners	
Financial questions	
Visa application	
Cultural questions	
Security in the region	
Others (please specify)	

2.3. Does your work, as a NA requires the implementation of a work plan?

☐ Yes
☐ No

- Please indicate the main tracks of your Euromed work plan:

2.4. What is currently the level of implementation of your working plan for Euromed Youth?

☐ On schedule
☐ Slight delay
- Difficulties encountered:
☐ Important delay
- Difficulties encountered:

2.5. Is the Programme achieving its objectives? (This part covers the relationship between the outputs/results of the programme and the programme expected purpose/specific objectives.)

2.5.1. In which way have the different actors and beneficiaries utilize the different types of actions (Actions 1, 2, and 5). Please specify for the period 2001-2002-2003

Action	Number of projects	Number of participants	Budget	Comments
Action 1				
Action 2				
Action 5				

2.5.2 What was the impact of the decentralisation on the number of submitted and selected project and on their quality?

2.6. What are the strengths and the weaknesses of your structures?

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

2.7. What are the main problems that you encounter and especially after the decentralisation?

Problem:

Solution proposed by you:

2.8. Interaction and synergies with other actors involved

Structure	Intense	Average	None	Comments
National ministry				
EC EAC				
EC EuropeAid				
Other NA				
NC				
TAO				
Salto				
Covenant Council of Europe				
EMYP				
Others				

2.9. What is the intervention logic of the evaluation and selection process?

2.9.1.   How adequate and effective has the selection process been?
- ☐ Very effective
- ☐ Effective
- ☐ Purely effective
- ☐ Not effective

2.9.2.   How appropriate have been the frequency and times of project selection deadlines?
- ☐ Very appropriate
- ☐ Appropriate
- ☐ Purely appropriate
- ☐ Not appropriate

2.10. Do you think that the programme is sufficiently known among the actors in your country?

Actor	Very known	Partially known	Purely known	Not at all	Comments
Ministries					
Youth organisations					
Young people					
NGO's					
Universities					
International donors					

2.10. **How effective is the information and dissemination strategy of the programme?**

☐ Very effective
☐ Effective
☐ Purely effective
☐ Not effective

Explain:

2.11. **What information and promotion mechanisms do you use?**

☐ Brochure ☐ Newsletter electronic
☐ Workshop ☐ Participation in events
☐ Leaflet ☐ Media publicity
☐ Conference ☐ Dissemination of project results
☐ Internet ☐ Others
☐ Newsletter paper

4. Questions related to efficiency

4.1. What is the relationship between the inputs (Human and financial resources) and the first outputs of the programme?

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Bad

- What are the costs per action? What is the relationship between the implementations and the costs?

3.2 Do you have a monitoring and evaluation system for your activities?

- Aspects covered (plan, budget, impact, statistics)

- Other actors involved?

- Frequency?

4. Questions related to Sustainability

4.1. To what extent is there adequate ownership of the programme by the target groups / beneficiaries?

Question	Excellent	Good	Fair	Bad	Comments
Satisfactory understanding of the programme objectives					
Commitment to strengthening the					

values of the programme? (Peace, tolerance, human rights etc.)					
Participation in the projects with enthusiasm and expression of a strong will for further initiatives of cooperation					

4.2. To what extent have the relevant authorities had a supportive policy during implementation of the programme?

- ☐ Very supportive
- ☐ Supportive
- ☐ Purely supportive
- ☐ Not supportive

- To what extent was the programme successful in mainstreaming of Euromed Youth into the government policies in your country?

- ☐ Very successful
- ☐ Successful
- ☐ Purely successful
- ☐ Not successful

Explain:

4.3. To what extent will all beneficiaries have adequate access to benefits and products during and after the programme?

Question	Very good	Good	Fair	Bad	Comments
To what extent has the programme supported the capacity building of organisations, institutions etc. in the Meda area?					
To what extent was the training crucial to attain the necessary capacity building for transforming the beneficiaries' activity into a sustainable development process?					

4.4. How far has the programme contributed to crosscutting aspects (equality between man and women, environment) and to mainstream them into youth policies?

Question	Very good	Good	Fair	Bad	Comments

Gender					
Human rights					
Cultural dialogue					
Disabled persons					
Environment					
Others					

5. Questions related to Impact

5.1. To what extent has the programme succeeded in busting a growing interest among the actors in your country in the Euro-Mediterranean cooperation in the youth field?

Question	Very good	Good	Fair	Bad	Comments
Did the number of projects and participants grow in a sensible way in comparison to the first stage?					
To what extent have barriers and handicaps been dismantled: Visa, difficult mobility, insurance etc?					
To what extent has the programme succeeded to promote a greater South-South cooperation?					

5.2. To what extent has the programme had an effect of the beneficiaries?

Question	Very good	Good	Fair	Bad	Comments
Has the Programme enhanced mutual understanding and respect among young people from different countries?					
Has it increased the solidarity amongst young people?					
To what extent has the					

action encouraged the development of youth structures and the voluntary sector as a means to strengthen civil society in your country?				
Has the participation to the action encouraged the young people involved to increase or improve the acquired knowledge of the society of the exchange countries				

5.3. To what extent there are synergies with other projects supported by the EU on the bilateral level

- Project:

- Comments:

- To what extent did the financial support granted to the beneficiaries of the Programme merely substitute for support likely to have been provided from other sources anyway?

- How likely is it that the effects of the Programme would have occurred even if the Programme itself had not been launched?

D. Conclusions

- Please name 5 successes of the programme:

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

E. Remarks, suggestions, comments

3.3 Questionnaires used for Project promoters

External Evaluation of the programme Euromed Youth Questionnaire Interview to project promoters

A. Identification

Name: …………………………………..   **Age:**…….   **Gender:**……

Organisation: …………………………………………………...………...

Function: …………………………………………………………...……..

Contact details …………………………………………………..…….

B. About your project

1. To what type of activity did you participate?

☐ Multilateral youth exchanges (thematic priorities)
☐ Voluntary service exchanges
    ○ short   ○ individual
    ○ long term   ○ group
☐ Practical training experiences (Job shadowing)
☐ Feasibility visits for the creation of new projects
☐ Contact making seminars
☐ Study visits
☐ Seminars
☐ Training courses
☐Youth information
☐Trans national partnership & Networks
☐ Support for quality & innovation

2. The duration of the activity:

3. The venue:

4. Number of country partners?   Which countries?

5. Type of partner organisations:

☐ NGO
☐ Association
☐ Government service
☐ International organisation
☐ University
☐ Local authority
☐ Others

6. What was the project theme?

☐ Active citizenship dialogue   ☐ Intercultural dialogue   ☐ Peace

☐ Cultural heritage   ☐ Equal opportunities   ☐

Youth health

☐ Youth delinquency   ☐ Social exclusion   ☐

Youth leisure

☐ Environment   ☐ Youth sports   ☐ Rural

youth

☐Urban Youth   ☐ Youth policies   ☐

Knowledge of EU

☐Anti-racism/xenophobia   ☐ Art & culture   ☐ Other

7. Did the project meet your needs?

☐ Fully
☐ Satisfactorily
☐ Very little
☐ Not at all

8. If not at all, please identify the reason:

☐ Lack of understanding of the objectives and the priorities
☐ Problems of communication in the partnership
☐ Cultural and other barriers
☐ Poor management of the project
☐ Unrealistic work plan or budget
☐ Lack of understanding of the procedures and the contractual obligations
☐ Lack of technical support
☐ Others:

9. Did you receive a support before starting with the project?

☐ Yes
☐ No

- If yes please specify the type:

☐Individual training
☐Information seminar
☐Information material
☐Others

- If yes was the preparation:

☐ Very good
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor

10. Did you receive a support during the implementation of the project?

☐ Yes
☐ No

- If yes please specify the type:

☐ Visit from National coordinator
☐ Salto
☐ EMYP
☐ TAO
☐ EC Delegation
☐ Others

- If yes was the support:

☐ Very good
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor

C. About the programme (management, procedures, visibility)

1. What should be according to you the role of the national coordinator?

☐ Represent your country in Euromed Youth
☐ Disseminate information about the programme
☐ Promoting the programme priorities and objectives
☐ To train actors about Euromed youth
☐ Advise project promoters on project preparation
☐ Assist project promoters to find local partners
☐ Assist project promoters to find international partners
☐ Assist project promoters to run their project
☐ On site visits to the projects
☐ Others:

2. Do you think that the objectives defined for the programme meet the real needs of your country and priorities in terms of youth policy? (target groups, specific needs not in the programme)

Overall Objective	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
1. Improve mutual knowledge, understanding and dialogue between youth in the Med and EU				
2. To stimulate young people's active citizenship, in particular young women, within their local communities.				
3. To stimulate youth NGO's contributions to their country's public life				

Specific Objective	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
1. To provide informal intercultural learning opportunities for young people especially through exchange and trans-national voluntary services				
2. To provide training opportunities in Euromed youth work for youth leaders and workers				
3.1. To exchange experiences and good practices				
3.2. To promote the acquisition of new skills and approaches to international youth work among				

youth NGO's and responsible for youth work in MED and EU				
3.3 To develop capacity building at the level of youth structures and policies				
4.1. To promote the development of non-profit making structures working in the youth field				
Specific Objective	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
5. To improve, through the youth associations, the cooperation with civil society as an element of democratic reform				
6.1. To inform youth NGO's about EU Institutions and the Euromed Partnership by strengthening the dialogue between the 27 Euromed partners				
6.2. To improve a greater understanding between their cultures and a better perception of each other				
7. To increase participation of Med NGO's in youth NGO trans-national networks				

3. Do you think that the expected results are defined in a realistic way?

Expected result	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
1. Contacts, dialogue and exchanges between EU and Med youth for a better understanding as an essential factor for peace and mutual respect				
2. Strengthening of permanent networking and contacts (NA, NC, NGO's) through training, common data base, coordination meetings, regular exchanges				
3. The Euromed Forum/Platform as platform of discussion for organisations (exchange of good practices, networking				
4. Local communities hosting activities carried out by beneficiaries (specially in the field of Voluntary Service) will benefit from an increase in mutual understanding and exchange of know how				

4. To what extent are the activities and the intervention mechanisms well adapted to your needs?

Activity/mechanism	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
1. Preparatory training and support measures (visits, seminars, training courses etc.)				

2. Networking (practitioners, beneficiaries)				
3. Multilateral youth exchanges (thematic priorities)				
4. Voluntary service exchanges (short & long term, individual & group)				
5. Experimental/innovative projects (job-creating projects)				
6. Euromed Youth Platform				

Expected result	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
7. Salto				
8. CoE convenant				

5. To what extent are other actions necessary in order to obtain those needs?

6. To what extend are the management instruments of the programme effective?

Instrument	Fully	Partially	No	Comments
1. The NC				
2. The TAO				
3. The Users guide				
4. The application form				
5. The application calendar				
6. Your contract				
7. The interim report				
8. The final report				
9. The information instruments (internet)				
10. The information material				
11. The training events				
12. The EYMP				
13. Salto				
Others				

7. What are, according to you the strengths and the weaknesses of the programme?

- Strengths:

-Weaknesses:

8. What are the main problems that you encounter?

- Problem:

- Solution proposed by you:

9. Did you encounter any specific obstacles while taking part in the Euromed youth activities?

☐ Visa   ☐ Insurance
☐ Language   ☐ Accommodation
☐ Amount of per diem   ☐ Identifying partners
☐ Identifying partners   ☐ Lack of guidance
☐ Isolation

10. How did you overcome the barriers?

11. Are you aware of the selection criteria applied by the EC?

☐ Yes
☐ No

12. Do you think that the programme is sufficiently known among the actors in your country?

Actor	Very known	Partially known	Purely known	Not at all	Comments
Ministries					
Youth organisations					
Young people					
NGO's					
Universities					
International donors					

13. How effective is the information and dissemination strategy?

☐ Very effective
☐ Effective
☐ Purely effective
☐ Not effective

14. What information and promotion mechanisms do you use?

☐ Brochure   ☐ Workshop
☐ Leaflet   ☐ Conference
☐ Newsletter paper   ☐ media publicity
☐ Newsletter electronic   ☐ participation in events
☐ Internet   ☐ Dissemination of project results
☐ Others

15. How did you hear first about the programme?

☐ Information session
☐ Information material
☐ Media advertisement
☐ Personal contacts

16. Would you take part again in the programme?

☐ Yes
☐ No

17. What is the relationship between your inputs (Human and financial resources) and the first outputs of the programme?

☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Bad

18. To what extent is there adequate ownership of the programme by you?

Question	Excellent	Good	Fair	Bad	Comments
Satisfactory understanding of the programme objectives					
Commitment to strengthening the values of the programme? (Peace, tolerance, human rights etc.)					
Participation in the projects with enthusiasm and expression of a strong will for further initiatives of cooperation					

19. How far has your project contributed to crosscutting aspects (equality between man and women, environment) and to mainstream them into youth policies?

Question	Very good	Good	Fair	Bad	Comments
Gender					
Human rights					
Cultural dialogue					
Disabled persons					
Environment					
Others					

20. Your assessment of the effect of the programme?

Question	Very good	Good	Fair	Bad	Comments
Improvement of mutual understanding and respect among young people from different countries					
Increased solidarity amongst young people?					
Development of youth structures and the voluntary sector as a means to strengthen civil society in your country?					
Increased awareness of youth policies					
Increased employability					

Question	Very good	Good	Fair	Bad	Comments
Acquisition of linguistic skills					
Acquisition of technical skills					
Increased visibility of Youth organisations					
Development of new activities at local level					
Development of international relations					
Increased awareness of the EU					
Others					

- How likely is it that the effects of the Programme would have occurred even if the Programme itself had not been launched?

D. Conclusions

- Please name 5 successes of the your project.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

E. Remarks, suggestions, comments

3.4 Web questionnaires used for Programme participants

External Evaluation of the Euromed Youth Programme Questionnaire to Programme participants

A. Identification of the organisation

Name of the organisation :……………………………………….………………

Type of organisation:[1]……………………………………………………………

Country:……………………………………………………………………………….

Name of person filling the questionnaire: ……………Age: …… Gender: …..

Role within the organisation: ……………………………………………………

Contact details:……………………………………………………………………

B. Project Information and activities

2.1. Identify all the projects you have participated, either as a promoter, partner, or participant

Project (s) identification		Promoter	Partner	Participant
Project title				
Project identification number				
Country of venue				
Date of start of activity				
Date of end of activity				
Origin of the partners involved in the projects				
Main venues for identifying and selecting partners				

2.2 Identify the Actions which your projects belong to (Tick the appropriate boxes, as well as the number of projects you have developed under each action)

1. Action 1 - Youth Exchanges	
2. Action 2 - Voluntary Service	
3. Action 5 - Support Measures	

---

1. [1] If you are a group of young people, and not an organisation, please also specify.

4. Practical experience (job shadowing)	
5. Feasibility visit	
6. Contact-making seminar	
7. Study visit	
8. Seminar	
9. Training course	
10. Youth Information	
11. Transnational partnership network	

Total number of projects implemented during the period of the evaluation, from 2001-2003		**Promoter**	**Partner**

2.3. What was the project themes of the activities developed within the project**?** (Tick maximum of 3 answers)

1. Art and Culture	
2. Heritage protection	
3. Media and Communication	
4. Heritage protection	
5. The environment	
6. Rural development	
7. Urban development	
8. Women issues	
9. Minority issues	
10. Disabled people	
11. Social exclusion	
12. Anti-racism and xenophobia	
13. Peace	
14. Health	
15. Anti drug, substance abuse	
16. Actions against delinquency	
17. Youth sports	
18. Youth leisure	
19. Youth policies	
20. European awareness	
21. Other, specify	

2.4. Has your organisation (or you) benefited from Euromed youth training?

Training activities	Strong impact	*Medium impact*	*Small impact*	Comments
1.SALTO Euromed training courses				
2. Covenant with the Council of Europe				

C. Aims and motivations

Indicate your own aims and motivations for participating in the Euromed programme.
Following is a non-exhaustive list of examples (new skills and experiences; increasing personal and organisational relations; intercultural learning, promoting the own country and identity, qualifications in youth and community work; obtaining financial support; promoting values, personal motivations…)
Please indicate your aims and motivations by order of preference:

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

D. Project implementation

- If you had any problems in the implementation of the programme, please indicate them by order of preference.
Following is a non-exhaustive list of problems (programme administrative procedures; problems with the partnership; problems with identifying and selecting participant, cultural barrier, legal barriers (Visa), financial barriers….)

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

E. Project results and dissemination

- What have been the tangible results of participating in a Euromed programme? (A result is a tangible and measurable output resulting from the development of an action. A non-exhaustive list of results could include: organisation of a thematic lecture/workshop at the local level, developing new policy in the organisation for disabled people…)

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

F. Project Impact

- What is/could be the most significant impact that your Euromed projects could create at the level of 1) the young participants and 2) the organisation, as well as in a 3) wider local and national level?

Impact on the participants, organisations and the wider level	Strong impact	Medium Impact	Low impact
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

G. Conclusions

- Please name 5 successes of the project:

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.

- Please provide us with suggestions and comments for the future improvement of the programme

Thank you very much for valuable your co-operation.

Please return the questionnaire to : mediana@skynet.be **no later than 05/08/2004**

ANNEX 4

<u>Bibliography</u>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ecosfera, "Evaluation of third-country cooperation of the Youth Programme 2000-2002 – Final Report", 2002
2. Ecotec "Mid -Term evaluation of the Euromed Youth Programme", Volume I & 2, 2001
3. Ernst and Young "Evaluation externe a mi-parcours du programme Leonardo da Vinci II". Final report, /2003
4. European Council, " Council resolution 13649/00 concerning Action Plan for Mobility"
5. European Council, "Council regulations on Democracy and Human Rights", n°975/1999 and n°976/1999, 29 April 1999.
6. European Council, "Council decision of 26 April 1999 establishing the second phase of the Community vocational training action programme 'Leonardo da Vinci'" (1999/382/EC), 1999
7. European Council, "Promoting Human Rights and Democratisation in Third Countries", COM (2001) 252 Final
8. European Commission "Barcelona Declaration" adopted at the Euro-Mediterranean Conference, , MED Committee , 27-28/11/95
9. European Commission's communication on the Reform of the Management of External
10. Assistance of 16 May 2000, Rev 8
11. European Commission, "Proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council, Creating the "Youth in Action" programme for the period 2007-20013, COM (2004) final
12. European Commission, The Euromed Youth II, project document, MIS 2001/0186, , MED Committee, 20001
13. European Commission, "The Euromed Youth Programme", Brochure, Office for the Official publications of the European Communities, ISBN 92-894-4008-2, European Communities, 2002
14. European Commission, Euromed special feature, Issue 25,   DG EuropeAid, 11 October 2001
15. European Commission, "Euromed/Youth Programme Statistics" YTH-D02-261, 3/9/2003
16. European Commission, 'The EU programmes for 2000-2006, Socrates, Leonardo da Vinci, Youth, Tempus III', the EU Directorate General for Education and Culture, 2001
17. European Commission, "Evaluating EU Activities: A practical guide for the Commission services, DG Budget, November 2003
18. European Commission, "Ex Ante evaluation a practical guide for preparation for preparing proposals for expenditure programmes", DG Budget, December 2001
19. European Commission, "The future development of the European Union education, training and Youth programmes after 2006", a public consultation document, November, 2002
20. European Commission, Memorandum of 8 May 2001; EuropeAid, Integration of Gender into the European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights 2001-2002
21. European Commission "Report from the Commission to the Council on the interim evaluation of the third phase of the Tempus Programme COM (2004) 157 final.
22. European Commission, , "National Coordinators' Handbook, updated version 9/01/2004", DG Education and Culture, 2004
23. The European Commission, "New Euromed Youth programme, to strengthen the dialogue between cultures", "Press release, IP/01/1699, Brussels, 29 November 2001
24. European Commission "Promoting Human Rights and Democratisation in Third Countries", COM (2001) 252 Final

25. European Commission, "The Regional strategy paper 2002-2006" DG RELEX, 2002

26. European Commission, "Report from the Commission: Interim evaluation of the Youth programme 200-2006 (covering the period 2000-2003), COM (2004) 158 final

27. European Commission, "Resolution of 14 May 1998 on the information and communication policy in the European Union with regard to support and action programmes", OJ C 167, 1.6.1998

28. European Commission, "Terms of Reference of the mid-term evaluation of the first Euro-Mediterranean Youth programme" (MEI/B7-4100/B/98/0418)

29. The European Commission, "Report from the Commission, Interim evaluation of the Youth Programme 2000-2006, covering the period 2000-2003, and Third countries evaluation

30. European Commission's White Paper: A New Impetus for European Youth (2001), Brussels, 21.11.2001, COM(2001) 681 final

31. European Commission and the Council of Europe. "Covenant between the European Community with the Council of Europe," signed in April 2003

32. European Commission and European Parliament, The Decision No 1031/2000/EC of the European Commission and the European Parliament of 13 April 2000 establishing the "Youth Community Action Programme", 2000

33. Euro-Mediterranean Youth Platform, "The Euro-.Mediterranean Youth Platform report", April 2003-March 2004

34. European Youth Portal : http://europa.eu.int/youth

35. European Youth Forum: Position paper on the development of the Council of Europe Youth

  programme priority of intercultural dialogue and peace, adopted by the Council of

 Members,

  25-26 April 2000,

36. Malta Government, "The Euro-Mediterranean Youth Platform operating grant agreement", 2002

37. Euro-Mediterranean Platform portal http://www.euromedp.org

38. Euromed National Co-ordinator , "Euromed Work Plan , 2002-2004". Internal document, Ministry of Youth of Algeria, 2002

39. Euromed National Co-ordinator , "Euromed Work Plan, 2002- 2004" Internal document, Ministry of Youth of Egypt, 2002

40. Euromed National Co-ordinator , "Euromed Work Plan, 2002- 2004" Internal document, Jordan Youth Council, 2002

41. Euromed National Co-ordinator , "Euromed Work Plan, 2002- 2004" Internal document, Israel Youth Council, 2002

42. Euromed National Co-ordinator , "Euromed Work Plan, 2002- 2004" Internal document, Ministry of Youth of Lebanon, 2002

43. Euromed National Co-ordinator , "Euromed Work Plan, 2002- 2004" Internal document, Ministry of Youth Tunisia, 2002

44. Euromed National Co-ordinator , "Euromed Work Plan, 2001- 2003" Internal document, Middle East Technical University 2001National Coordinator of Jordan, "Report on "Marhaba EVS training course", Jordan Youth Council, internal document, 2002

45. SALTO youth Resource Centres portal: http://www.salto-youth.net

46. SALTO Euromed Resource Centre "SALTO Euromed Resource Centre Work plan", 1 August 2001 to 31 July 2003.

47. Socrates, Leonardo and Youth Technical Assistance office "Youth Programme User's guide", valid until January 2004

48. Socrates, Leonardo and Youth Technical Assistance , Compendium of the Euromed Youth Programme, 2000-2003

49. Socrates Leonardo & Youth Technical Assistance Office: Youth programme, Selection manual, 2003

50. Socrates, Leonardo and Youth Technical Assistance Office, Reports of on-site visits to Euromed projects 2001-2003.

51. Socrates, Leonardo and Youth Technical Assistance Office, Final report assessment sheets of Euromed projects (Sample 90)

52. Socrates, Leonardo and Youth Technical Assistance Office. Projects facilitated final reports of Euromed projects submitted by the beneficiaries. (Sample of 40)

ANNEX 5

Stakeholders' meeting minutes

Brussels, 28/29 June 2004

Stakeholders' Meeting

Monday 28 June 2004

14:00   Welcome and introduction by Antonia Calvo of the Unit "Thematic support – Social and human development", DG AIDCO, European Commission

It is important to see from the side of the stakeholders:
- What has the programme provided or not provided
- Feed back from the ground
- An independent opinion

14:10   Address by Silvia Mora, "Youth" Unit of DG EAC, Prospects for the Youth programme
- The EC has noticed an important motivation of the stakeholder to participate in this meeting (see number of participants)
- It is their input to the evaluation
- It could give a comprehensive picture of the functioning of the programme
- The evaluators gave guidance for the meeting
- The results of the evaluation will be converted into recommendation for the next stage of the programme
- The Euromed Youth is a factor for development

16:30   Relevant issues related to the Euro-med programme's management raised during the evaluation field visits:
- **Discussion chaired by the evaluators.**

Procedures

1. The work of TAO is OK length problems appear as soon as the EC is involved (IL)
2. The long time affects the motivation (EG)
3. Dead line is known and it is OK. The financial agreement takes too long. NC should be involved and better informed (MA)
4. NC ont assez de tâches. Paiement par NC trop compliqué (voir système bancaire du pays) (DZ)
5. NC are versatile in some countries and paying projects makes them more fragile. There is a lack of transparency regarding projects promoters about preliminary results (after selection and before acceptance/rejection letters) (MA)
6. Information au projet sur paiement par CE
7. Very little can be still done to shorten the process. An explanation should be done towards the projects promoters to increase transparency about the use of public funds.
8. Beneficiaries have to submit a bank account and omitting it delays the process (TAO)
9. Decentralisation des fonds pour NA et par ce fait il n'y a pas des problèmes de retard. Par contre AN n'est pas averti sur des projets Meda qui concernent sont pays. Dans le cas d'un retard le AN peut avancer des fonds (BE)

10. Les problèmes peuvent souder le partenariat
11. Le laps Entre la selection du projet et sa lettre d'acceptation 6 semaines d'écoulent et le NC ne peut pas annoncer
12. Il y a une différence entre 2001 et 2002 car avnt il y avait une réunion interservice
13. Les procedures sont lentes mais logiques. La phase entre séléction et décision financière trop longue. La gestion à BXL rend les affaires difficiles (TN)
14. Payment too late after submission of Final report
15. Balance problems in the past (2001 & 2002)
16. Problèmes de langue, tendence des partenaires à créer des partenariat avec des entités pouvant utiliser la même langue. Il faut réflechir à l'accès des groupes marginaux (illétrés) (MA)
17. Les association au centre de l'Algérie parlent des langues étrangères mais en dehors du centre non.
18. L'utilisation de la langue du pays est importante pour le développment d'un projet éducatif (IL)
19. There are languages problems and less advanced persons need translations

Partnership

1. Le problem de trouver des partenaires existe la plateforme peut aider. Il y a le problème de partenaires qui se retirent du projet ceci soulève la question de la crédibilité (DZ). Il faut avoir une préparation en amont pour trouver des partenaires
2. Il faudrait définir ce qui est un partenaire crédible
3. Trouver des partenaires n'est pas un problème. L est plus difficile de :
   * Les engager davantage
   * De trouver un équilibre géographique et de surmonter les différences de langues
4. Finding a last minute partner is very risky. Both hosting and sending need a very good preparation
5. Il existe un crucial problème de partenariat pour les EVS
6. Il faut créer/disposer d'outils pour mieux connître les partenaires (DZ)
7. The need for criteria to define a credible partner
8. The NC has to play a role by giving an opinion about the credibility

Barriers

1. Il n'y a pas de barières culturelles, il n'y a pas de choc, il y a la préparation. L'échange doit démonter les barières (TN)
2. La différence entre les monnais. Le change. Il faut pouvoir ouvrir un compte professionnel en devise
3. Pas de barières entre participants mais entre responsables et notamment par rapport à la participation active et la responsabilisation
4. La culture du projet, le management de projets associatif. Il faut une bonne compréhension de l culture associative
5. IL comme pays d'acceuil trouve des partenaire uniquemeny en TR en action 5
6. Problems with culture when there is a bad preparation (PT)

Tuesday 29 June 2004

National Agencies Workshop

Issue 1

1. Priorities:
   - Political:
     a. Develop cooperation with countries with historical links
     b. Develop cooperation with countries with which there is no connections
     c. For some EU Euromed is not a priority
   - Social-cultural:
     a. Euro-Med is a tool for better knowledge and intercultural learning to integrate immigrant, show what their traditions and origins are
   - Management:
     a. Promote of action5, Twinning
     b. Development of common strategy, networking
     c. Increase of activities and of budget
     d. Increase of EVS
     e. Increase of project quality and number of projects
   - Thematic Issues:
     a. Racism Xenophobia, Women's rights, diversity
     b. Toll to work with disadvantaged young persons

2. Type of activities (how to reach the priorities):
     a. Info training and partnership action
     b. Twinning cooperation

[Remark: Priorities set by country's ministry but don't get extra funding from them to achieve the goals; problem of budget]

Issue 2

Decentralisation

- Good mechanism to promote access to programme and to avoid delays
- It is faster and closer to the beneficiaries
- There is still a lack of information from other countries
- Less budget available than before
- it makes more work for the NA. Get less info.
- Easy access to training EVS
- Double screening process positive thing but should be more efficient

Weaknesses:
- for Northern European countries too important travel costs.

- NA decentralized, NC centralized: 2 different system creates an imbalance

[Remark: want info on results on projects selections. Commission publish results of their selections committee and NA publish results of their selection. NA and NC share info about projects selected where each country 's participants are involved.]

Issue 3
Support to beneficiaries

Info and guidance 15 answers
Training 12 answers,
Selection 5 answers
support answers 9

- Selection:
  - not important, low budget few projects,
  - more time to inform and give guidance to projects before application and ask for clarifying information during selection process. Accept all or else no projects at all.
  - Euromed is integrated in the overall selection

- Training: EVS training cycle, Give information on training possibilities, Regional training, preparatory training.

- Support:
  - By Visas problems,
  - Partner finding.

- Information-Guidance:
  - Info on Euro-Med programme not separate form the rest. Included in the general info.
  - Give info on training courses
  - Guidance for project application. Before deadline to improve chances of selection
  - Guidance is the most important activity done by NA

[Remark:. Lot's of proposals for low budget, low budget to fund projects, most budget go to training grants. Lot's of training proposed for low budget.

Issue 6

Interaction with Support Structures

In General:
    What kind of strategy?
    Too much information: overload: confusing

Keep it as it is

Salto:
- Cooperate about training, host courses. The training offer is too big and the NA have a limited budget (sending partners, projects), it is a pressure on the NA Publish Salto info on NA website

EMYP:
- No contact at all
- NAs have different feedback some have positive opinions, others have negative opinion. Refer to post it
- The Newsletter is useful

CoE:

Unknown, what is it
Some NA work with them as expert in training courses

TAO:

All positive feedback

[Remarks about Salto:
Questions real impact of Salto. Is Salto running MEDA? Why Salto so important?

Questions the feedback on the behaviour of participants during the training. Did not ask for it, opposed to it. It does not help. Very subjective opinion, what is the context ?
Training is about helping not judging!

Feel pressure from Salto to give info, do some work for them. Do not see any benefit for my country's participants. Have very little budget for Action 5.
Is it a Youth Worker Programme or a Programme for Young People?

Tough time to understand training programme (language), simplify it! Difficult to sell the training to youths.

Good thing that they are here but problems.]

Issue 7

Cooperation with NC

- In case of: Job Shadowing, Study Visit, Find Partner
- Normal cooperation positive
- TCP are good occasions
- Within twinning process: good experience

Negative comments:
- Not enough cooperation,

- not enough time. Difficult to find time.
- No real possibility to discuss. Not enough contact. Meetings in Brussels could be more effective. There are 2 meetings per year some times not adequate as NA & NC are separated (Lisbon)
- Lack of connections
- We are not part of the evaluation

Comments:
- NC should be included in next meeting. Problems of time to have more exchange with MEDA partner. We should provide opportunities for time to meet.
- Within twinning process: good experience. Learning how youth field organising. Should give more opportunity to benefit from twinning.
- Should use meeting to exchange and learn from each other.
- During big meetings; sit and get info but do not get to know the others. Always work with NAs, got to know the other NAs. Need to do the same with NCs.
- Not easy to organise common activities but hope future meetings to do so. TCP meeting could be such an opportunity.
- Propose that next meeting should be perfect place to work together. Interaction activities with NCs. Need separation in some meeting activities but also activities together NAs and NCs.
- Meeting should last 3-4 days. Informal time is important.
- Problem is that NCs not connected (with NAs)

Support Structures Workshop

Salto, Platform, TAO, CoE, Aidco, Commission

Issues: Existence of common strategy
        Possibility of overlap
        Involvement of different structures in selection, in management, in decision making, in information/guidance

Discussed in detail 2 areas: information and training

Information: there is missing on e clear presentation of the objectives of the programme itself. Suggest 1 text produced

No translation into French systematically provided; creates discrepancies. Need more consistency
Translation in Arabic by NC. Make sure that 1 arabic version is made usable and recognisable by all.
Important for young people to know about all Euro-Med not only Euro-Med Youth

Have one document on Internet
One Users Guide specifically of E.Y.P
Need to have strategy on visibility of programme. No coherent or perceptible strategy

Visibility of the results achieved
Training Potential for Overlap (NA, NC, Salto)

Thematic: training efficient or need more technical orientation?
Warning: too many training can be a concern.
No overlap at the time
Differentiation in purpose and specialisation

Training provided sufficient and in accordance to the needs?
Limits is how far we can go into this
The role of the training of Salto should be clarified or reviewed
Technical training: managing budget, filing report essential

Clarify target groups. In the future when designing training strategy. Opportunities for user of Action to design the objectives

Concerns about terminology title. Who is a trainer? What is a project? Ambiguity, room for development.

Follow up of training
Need to consider means to identify and to make resources person trained available to Euro-Med Youth Organisations. They are trained but we don't know where they are.

Strengthening of coordination
Reflection: need for cooperation but need for being strategic. Not add different meetings (4, 5 meetings) but also a moment where we can all meet together.

Beneficiaries' Workshop

Divided in two groups: EU countries, MEDA countries. Issues dealt by the method of "metaplan"

1. NOTES FROM PARTICIPANTS FROM MEDA BENEFICIARIES

<u>Summary report by the facilitator of the workshop (Bengt Persson)</u>

<u>1. MEDA Preparation and support activities</u>

Strength
- Young people are invited in the program. There is a demand.
- The NCS and the NA:s tries to support the organisations in tackling technical problems.

Weakness
- Not all the young people get preparation.
- Political problems in the region prevent some countries from working together.
- Visa is a huge problem. The organisations need support tackling this.
- Visa main problem facing the EMYP in MEDA countries
- Cultural issues
- The financial aspect as regards Action 1 is insufficient.
- Partners should be more involved in the preparation
- VISA problem Palestine/Israel

Proposals
- To have more influence from the European Commission on the EU-Embassies.
- Cultural issues should have the main priority in the project preparation and in the APV.
- On the visa problem: The EU should develop real mechanisms to solve this problem permanently in the political level.
- On the visa problem. It should be possible to reach all countries in the Euro-Med.
- A common guideline for the preparation of the young people could be prepared and used by the organisations (to ensure equal preparation of young people).
- Give opportunities for more participants in SALTO-training

2. MEDA Specific application

Strength
- Organsiations are so committed that they try to realise the projects against all difficulties/problems.
- NC/NA guide the organisations

Weakness
- Visa problem
- Lack of preparations of participants
- Absence of meetings for preparations
- Not enough committed to realise the objectives of the exchange*
- 3 notes difficult to interpret*
- Visa
- Not enough awareness of other cultures
- Funding and deadlines
- Contract delay in funding
- The responsibility of Management is divided on to the Sending and hosting organisations and this reveals the great problem of "partner Risk".
- Pocket money is too little (130euro) The living standard in the country is very high, the amount should be more.
- Legal restrictions for associations
- Long time between the applications and the implementation.
- Life insurance and visa applications are too costly

Proposals
- The application form is sufficient but needs an additional information to be added to part III which is: "Previous experiences" in the EM. So to prove the credibility and quality of partners if they have had previous experiences in the EM.

3. MEDA Added value

Strength
- The youth in MED are more active and organised now.
- National neworks and structures for youth organisations are created
- It is a challenge to upgrade on projects
- Local Community development

Weakness
- Not all of the organisations are capable of realising international projects.

1.2. Summary report by the beneficiary repporter from MEDA countries

Issues raised: Project development, project outcome and networking

Comments and suggestions:

- encouraging more support action 5 in MEDA countries. Could be achieved by providing more Salto Training concerning A5 preparation (Step In & To)
- Action 5 seminars easier to have a lot of them
- A5 and Salto TC are essential for the future of the next phase
- More support from the EC to the NC for national TC
- Ensuring transfer of knowledge by Salto participants to their local organisations
- Additional project related outcomes after project termination
- Encouraging the measurable follow up on the local and international activities

Networking:
- importance of networking to improve the quality of EM projects
- Through exchange of experiences better organisations
- Twinning between an experienced organisation and a young organisations (sister organisation) that observes and gains experience)

EMYP
- It needs to be developed through making of balance between EU and Meda
- It should be more efficient
- There should be more clear specifications or criteria for the registration
- Linking between the EMYP and other networks

2. NOTES FROM PARTICIPANTS FROM THE EU-MEMBER STATES
2.1. Summary report by the facilitator of the workshop (Bengt Persson)

1. Preparation and support activities

Strength
- Knowledge of National coordinators
- Action 5 – contact making seminars (because they are vital for a good prepration if the partners don't know each other)
- Extra costs for translation between participants cannot be applied for
- APV is very important
- APV and action 5
- A common list of activities as both partners has to go through before an exchange of participants

Weakness
- Political and technical differences between the MEDA and the EU-countries
- Lack of information restricts group preparation.
- We don't have a clear and centralised support for visa (our embassies don't know about the Euro-med programme)
- How to proceed when you find difficulties
- Difficult in changing political issues related to the practical arrangement

Proposals
- To use Action 5 before the "real" projects (important)
- A big step to overcome cultural differences and misunderstandings
- Activities have to be prepared long before the implementation and many times this ends up to lose the participants or their motivation
- APV needs more funds
- Create a visa book with all the steps for the associations
- To build specific strategy for youth organisations in relation to SALTO, Action 5 and the Council of Europe
- Support activities contribute positively to the actual projects by better preparing participants, organisations and most of the problems can be solved at that stage
- Support activities increase the duration between the initial idea to the actual date of the project*

2. Specific application

Strength
- The procedure of reporting money is very easy
- Knowledge of technical assistance team
- Motivate participant organisations to be prepared and organised
- Detailed and helpful "scheme"
- The possibility to receive money for extra costs
- Discussion between involved partners to verify specific problems

Weakness
- Big delays concerning the approving of the contract and the finances
- We need to find a way how to involve youth with social, economical problems in the MEDA countries

- We need more guarantee from the contract - for the organisations and the participants (some of the organisations asked to participate to pay much more than the 30% for joining projects abroad
- Time delays in realising contracts and funds restricts group preparation
- Guidelines for contracts between partners that stress "safety issues (f.ex. that the host country gurantees safe means of transport for local transportation) is not available yet.
- Decentralised way of decision making helped to a reliable and punctual pay-out of the grant from the national agency to the beneficiary
- Complexity of contract
- The time we wait to know the response about approval of the projects and to receive the money
- Application time
- It is quite difficult to learn th know-how of these issues and that discourage many people to deal with. Thus it ends up in elitistic framework

Proposals
- Good preparation keep the deadlines and the Euromed cooperating
- Integrate guideline for safety issues in t-kit or guideline
- To establish the good cooperation with EU embassies for agreement re visa and documents for volunteers and youth

3. Added Value

Strength
- Intercultural learning
- Learn the know-how
- A great change for the continuation of the cooperation between the partners
- Breaking down barriers with Islamic countries at a time of heightened anxiety
- Intrerculturality, better understanding between the MEDA and EU-countries
- To make cultures which are in conflicts to talk and to come together promoting peace
- The Euromed programme is nearly unique in enabling direct contacts between young people from my country (ger) with MEDA countries without belonging to the upper class.
- Intercultural learning opportunities knowing about different cultures and exchange that difference
- Strategy for the future – Euromed programme
- Reaching all society

Weakness
- Lack of quality control and coherent structures for evaluation and progression
- A great load of work that tires organisers and discourages them to take over another activity in the future.
- Difficult to measure "added value"
- If you have better prepared youth workers you can have good expectations instead of just leisure and holiday for the participants
- Lack of strategy for the future Euromed programme
- Follow-ups

Proposals
- To establish the fast procedure for application
- Lack of strategy to multiply the programme

1.2. Summary report by the beneficiary repporter from EU

Project development and training opportunities.
- Salto important for quality programme and project
- Difficult to make a link between Salto and CoE training courses. Less info about CoE training courses.
- Need to promote and support use of Action 5.
- promote and use training of Youth Leaders before they participate in youth projects
- Weak point: no structure and real follow up.
- Importance to ensure continuation of project. Each action has to be connected to something else in the local or international level
- Need to develop projects linked to other European projects
- eed Action 3 as good opportunity for local impact

Networking:
- set up 1 standard in platform and quality standards
- Platform important but should increase visibility, don't know how to use it. Can be used as database but also for more than that.
- Develop participation of organisations in Euro-Med Platform to give them the chance to become active members

Project development and training activities
- Salto and CoE training courses are very important for the quality of the programme and they work complementarily to the programme
- Promote and support the use of Action 5 to insure less problems and to put safety management in place and build strong partnerships
- Promote the training of youth leaders even before they participate in the Euromed.

NC workshop

Priorités thématiques
- Activités pas identifiées comme priorité au début. Priorité faire connaître le programme dans le pays. (MA)

Support accordé au NC
- Au passé il y avait un manque d'opportunité de support mais maintenant c'est résolu pour les nouveaux NCs. Support fournis de source informel

Besoins réels

- Mise à jour régulières de leur infos
- Assistance permanente dans présélection, présentation des projets
- Critères à respecter dans sélection ?
- Plus de données sur les projets MEDA
- Méthodologie de rédaction sur rapport final (200 pages ou 20 pages), modèles à suivre.

Coopération idéale entre délégations et NC

- Délégations Eu supporte des NC dans l'accomplissement de leur tâches
- Assure coopération permanente NC-DE
- Visite de terrain
- Aide au problèmes de visas, problèmes de participants.
- Suivi permanent
- Application processus de Visa
- Manque de stratégie vis-à-vis représentation.
- Associer au processus de sélection ?
- Officiellement besoin de stratégie claire

Plan national formation dissémination

- Rôle de démultiplicateur devient accentué
- Faiblesse : dissémination du NC, difficulté d'atteindre l'ensemble des régions géographique
- Problèmes du suivis des NGO . NC pas tout le temps impliqué
- Points forts : (pas accordé + d'intérêt, considéré comme acquis) Informe NGO sur le programme, favorisé grâce au work plan. Aide mise en place stratégie Nationale pour la Jeunesse.
- Démultiplicateur. Stage dans certains pays, d'autres non.
- Facilité + rencontre dans régions + contacts avec porteur de projets, remplace NC
- Implanter programme dans régions éloignées.

- Problème du démultiplicateur : quelle rémunération, travail bénévole

Besoin pour l'ensemble NC
- Rencontre entre NC des pays MEDA. Besoin networking entre NC
- But: opportunité d'identifier besoins de formation.
- Augmentation coopération pays Sud-Sud. + approprié si pays MEDA abritent cette rencontre

National co-ordinators' workshop

General constatation: Diversity of approaches and ideas due to the particularities of the participating countries.

The level of coverage of the thematic priorities

- There was a common agreement among all NC that the thematic priorities were considered secondary in the initial phase of consolidation of the programme in their countries. The focus was given to providing technical information and gaining geographical balance
- In the current consolidation phase of the programme the NC see that they WILL stress higher the thematic priorities to promoters (As a related matter, see comment of workshop structures were the training to NC on thematic issues is introduced)
- An analysis by NC of the main thematic priorities can be drown after analysis of questionnaires.

Training

Evaluation:
- There is a general perception that there was a clear lack of training in the initial phase of the programme by many national co-ordinators. This initial lack was later covered by different actors and approaches, according to each NC need.
- There is a general perception that at the current stage the NC have sufficient training to perform their duties, and that they have had many opportunities available.
- There is a common agreement of the added value and efficiency of training at the TAO, job shadowing, and informal support of SALTO, to improve their job performance.
- A detailed analysis of the value of training provided by the different actors for each of the tasks that the National co-ordinator should perform will come out after the analysis of the tables is provided.

Recommendations:
- NC feel that at the current stage further guidance and orientation could replace training in many instances. Guidance documents and the possibility of having resource persons for consultation is the scheme agreed by a big number of co-ordinators. (It is commonly agreed that the NC work too much in isolation)
- Future needs the focus is in the following areas
  Training:
  1) Presentation of quality projects (pre-selection assessment),
  2) Efficient project management
  3) How thematic priorities should be elaborated
  4) Self-evaluation
  Orientation:
  5) Drafting of final reports (provide a model to follow)
  Information:
  6) Information sessions on the Barcelona process and local MEDA opportunities

- There is a request for better co-ordination of TCP, in terms of calendar and training issues.

National information and dissemination plan

Strengths:
- Raising knowledge about the programme at national level
- Motivation in attracting new comers.
- More confidence and self-assurance in submission of projects
- Gives support to the work of the civil society
- Gives support to the national strategy(?)
- Identification and existence of resource persons (trainers, junior trainers) to support process
- Additional local networking

Weaknessess:
- Support of political structures is still weak
- Political visibililty of the progamme is weak
- National coverage in big countries is difficult
- Difficulty to follow up and support applicants (indication of the need of the multipliers structure)
- Language barriers to attract certain organisations

The multiplier and its status

- There is not a clear statute for the multiplier, after their training.
- The Commission has to provide a clear statute to multipliers, to be also recognised by national authorities. This is at the basis of the recognition to perform their work.
- There is not a general consensus among NC about the nature of the contribution of the work (payed, non payed service). It varies according to country. This issue has raised a lot of discussion, particularly because aside from the multipliers, there are also resource persons.
- It has been agred that the issue of multipliers should be in the agenda of a future meeting with the Commission.

Regional meetings among National co-ordinators
Need analysis
- There is a real need perceived among all the NCs to increased their networking
- The interest is perceived at the following levels: To discuss problems of common interest and solutions; to jointly identify their training needs and communiate them to the TCP; to prepare joint agendas to annual meetings, to further develop South-South co-operation, one of the objectives of the programme.
Recommendations

- Informal initiatives to launch this scheme have not been successful, there is an agreement that the Commission should introduce this meetings as mandatory. This is perceived at the current moment as the best way to assure its launhing.
- Meetings should take place previous to the annual meetings, preferably in meda countries

Co-operation of NC and Delegations

General perceptions/Weaknessess
- The NC perceive that in general there is a lack of strategy at the level of the COM, still pending to be defined, as what is, should be the role of the Delegations in relationship to Euromed.
- For many countries , there is a perception that the Delegations have a low interest in Euromed

Recommendation
- Urgent need to identify a clear stategy and roles and expectations from each actor.

The roles, vis a vis each other are perceived by NC the following way:

European delegation towards NCs

- Sustained communication of issues relevant to NC (political, calls for tenders, courses)
- Support to visa problems
- Field visits
- "General" support to NC

NCs towards European delegation

- Regular timely update of information on programme
- Implication on Visa problems
- Clearer definition of approach to delegations.

Support structures Workshop[2]

The objective of this workshop was to analyse if the programme had or not and articulated a coomon strategy; if there was overlapping of functions among the programme actors, if the essencial training provision was fulfilled, and to gain further clarity of the primary role of the partners NC and Nas.

---

2. [2] Difference between Covenant and SALTO. Covenant is closer to the spirit of the progamme. Salto closer to the programme.

The matters dealt in the workshop included : selection ; management and monitoring; decision making bodies, information, guidance and training. The workshop concentrated in information and training.

INFORMATION

Weaknesses

- Official translations in French and arabic are missing. These are also missing in the web site of the Commission (informal presentations exist, but not official!)

Recommendations

- The programme needs a single unitary presentation to be used by ALL programme actors (one programme "meta-text" is needed)
- The essencial political documents related to the Barcelona process should be available on the web site
- Need to provide more information to young people on how to influence the Barcelona process (e.g: civic forum)
- The user´s guide should be adapted as to make the relevant parts concerning Euromed in one single document (e.g: user´s guide in Euromed), including the specific objectives and framework of the Euromed youth programme
- Official translations in French and Arabic are recommended
- A strategy is needed to promote the visibility of the programme and the results achieved.

TRAINING

Weakness

- The too vague nature of the Commission mandate for training, particularly for SALTO, linked to the improvement of promoter´s performances?
- There is a lot o f enthusiasm about the dynamics of the programme, less about technical achievements?
- Low participation of participants, beyond those selected by the NC and Nas
- Current programme terminology and grading standards

Recommendations

- The Commission should clarify the mandate of the training for SALTO
- National agency and national co-ordinator staff training needed at the thematic level to cover all the process (application, monitoring)
- The training strategy should avoid all overlapping, even in thematic issues
- There is a strong need by the sector for training in enginyering of projects. This is an important area for further follow-up
- There is a clear need to diversify the target groups beyond the Nas and NC
- To improve the opportunities of programme beneficiaries to organise their own trainings

- There is a need to clarify terminology: "trainer" , or a "resource person", "project" (to be differenciated from activity!!!), as well as the grading systems (and their reporting).
- To have a record (a common data base?) on the trainers

Added Value of Euro-Med Youth Programme

Added value to normal work, to the region

1. Local community development : Euromed contribute to improvement of skills as those who did not participate can benefit from those who has participate (EG)
2. Israel NC: places of EU as a player especially for youth in activities not obvious. This programme changes that
3. Associations: connaissance de nouvelles methods, de pratiques internationale, nouvelles techniques, amelioration de partenariats, mobilité
4. The programme contributes to increase cooperation among local associations and especially when they did not meet before (TR)
5. It raises the awareness of local authorities regarding youth issues (TR)
6. More involvement of NGO,s
7. New Youth policy strategy in Jordan
8. It encourages intercultural cooperation (EYP)
9. Be directly involved and not go through ministries.
10. Euro-Med nowadays very important for more political dynamics between N/S and E/W. augmentation of conflict between religion , racism. Racism is increasing. Euro-Med is a good tool to fight this. (IT)
11. Challenging stereotypes against Islam developed by the media and arabophobia right now.
12. Excellent outil pour favoriser la connaissance des cultures. Vision de l'immigration. Découvrir les pays du Sud par Européens ? Ambassadeurs de la capacité des jeunes volontaires.
    Valeurs de solidarité d'échanges de coopération.
    Euro-Med unique programme qui traite de ces sujets. Valeur Ajouté dans le fait qu'il n'y a pas d'autre programme !
    Demande réflexion après trois ans d'échange . Quel est l'impact sur les jeunes MEDA ?
    Impact souvent très négatif ? envie d'immigrer

13. Le seul programme qui offre aux jeunes du Sud de venir en Europe, valorisant pour eux.

Sur immigration : coté négatif au retour, apport est positif

14. Pourquoi participants d'Europe se servent du programme? Ca sert à quoi pour l'Europe? (valeur ajoutée pour Européens
    Européens : ont peur se servir de beaucoup sur ce programme. Les MEDA peuvent nous donner un autre sens, autre air, change notre façon de penser. (GR)

15. Euro-Med : lutter contre Xénophobie. Encourager la <u>compréhension mutuelle</u> N/S

TAO insiste préparation des jeunes est une bonne chose ?

16. Mr Mbarak Tunisie : approche pour MEDA. Problème égalité des chances. Problèmes financiers pour transport. 30% participation personnelle : injuste Tunisien surpris de la ponctualité, respect à l'égard des traditions, cultures : réciprocité des chances. Equilibre géographique pas encourageant en ce moment. Egalité de traitement ne veut pas dire égalité des chances. (TN)
17. Added Value : Young people explain why stereotypes are true. Do not work during lunch because of heat not because they are lazy.
18. Huge amount of cultural learning happening.

[Judith or Esther: Theme active citizenship not mention as added value]

ANNEX 6

[Evaluative cards](#)

Evaluation Methods and tools

The methodology designed by the evaluators consisted in the design of evaluation questions under the form of standard evaluative forms. These were at the basis of the inception report.

This approach enable the evaluators to:
- Understand the question through intermediate key sub-questions
- Define the evaluation criteria
- To set up the type of analysis and indicators
- To identify the sources of information
- To identify the type of results

A sample of the standard forms and the evaluation questions developed are presented hereafter

Standard Evaluative form

The evaluative questions will be organised under the form of a Standard Evaluative form presented below:

Question number

The theme to which the question refers :
- A: Relevance
- B: effectiveness
- C: efficiency
- D: Utility and sustainability
- E: Impact

Declension of the key question in intermediate key sub question

Formulation of an evaluative question in compliance with the ToR

Q

Question concerning … :

▶

Key Question:
I-

Evaluation and judgment criteria:
IA.
IB.
IC.

Evaluation and judgment criteria, referential.

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Sources of information:	Expected result:
IA.	IA.	IA.	IA.
IB.	IB.	IB.	IB.
IC.	IC.	IC.	IC.

Expected result related to each evaluation criteria/judgment

Details per each evaluation criterion and/or judgment and the envisaged type of analysis

Details per judgment criterion of the indicators and descriptors permitting to support the analysis

Sources of information about the indicators and the descriptors:

Q A1

QUESTION CONCERNING PERTINENCE AND RELEVANCE

> ➤ To what extent are the programme's principles, objectives and actions still pertinent with the priorities and needs of the Euro Mediterranean partnership?

Key question:
1. To what extent do the objectives respond to the needs of the relevant target group in the Mediterranean Partners?

Evaluation criteria:
IA. Political, institutional, social and economic context
IB. Expectations and motivations of the beneficiaries and the actors
IC. Main problems to be solved and their causes

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
I. Analysis of the context **IA.** Definition of the scope and the political, institutional, social and economic environment **IB.** Identification of Expectations and motivations of the beneficiaries and the actors **IC.1** Identification of the Main problems to be solved and their probable causes **IC.2** Hierarchy of the main problems to be solved and their probable causes	**I. Indicators and descriptions related to the context** **IA** ➤ Social-economic indicators (demography and youth, education, employment, vulnerability ➤ Evolution of the indicators (1998, 2000, 2002) **IB** ➤ Type of the target groups ➤ Type of the needs ➤ Needs per target group **IC.1** ➤ Type of problems ➤ Type of causes ➤ Type of target	**IA** ➤ Review of documents: statistics Euro-Med Stat, Unesco, Arab Youth Barometer **IB** ➤ Interviews with EC ➤ Interviews with National Coordinators ➤ Questionnaires: national agencies, SALTO Euro-Med and Euro-Med Youth Platform[3], Council of Europe ➤ Interviews with experts and trainers	**IA** ➤ Analysis of the context and its evolution **IB** ➤ Typology of the targets ➤ Typology of the needs per target group

---

3. [3] Short form of the Euro-Mediterranean Youth Platform used in the tables for space reason

Q A1

QUESTION CONCERNING PERTINENCE AND RELEVANCE

> ➢ To what extent are the programme's principles, objectives and actions still pertinent with the priorities and needs of the Euro Mediterranean partnership?

Key question:
   2. Are the objectives of the programme equally relevant to the different MEDA partner regions? Are there any specific needs of some partners?

Evaluation criteria:
IIA. Political, institutional, social and economic context
IIB. Expectations and motivations of the beneficiaries and the actors
IIC. Main problems to be solved and their causes

Type of analysis: II. Analysis of the context	Indicators and descriptors: Indicators and descriptions related to the context	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIA.1 Definition of the scope and the political, institutional, social and economic environment	**IIA.1** ➢ Social-economic indicators (demography and youth, education, employment, vulnerability ➢ Evolution of the indicators (1998, 2000, 2002)	**IIA** ➢ Review of documents: statistics Euro-Med Stat, Unesco, Arab Youth Barometer	**IIA** ➢ Analysis of the context and its evolution
IIA.2 Analysis of the changing situation in the Euro-med Partnership: accession of Cyprus & Malta, specific situation of Turkey	**IIA.2** ➢ Political indicators ➢ Observations about the transition period	**IIA.2** ➢ Interviews with EC ➢ Interviews with National Coordinators ➢ Questionnaires: national agencies, SALTO Euro-Med and Euro-Med Youth Platform, Council of Europe ➢ Interviews with experts and trainers	**IIA2** ➢ Definition of a new role for the accessing countries and Turkey in the programme
IIB. Identification of Expectations and motivations of the beneficiaries and the actors	**IB** ➢ Type of the target groups ➢ Type of the needs ➢ Needs per target group		
IIC.1 Identification of the specific problems to be solved and their probable causes in each country	**IIC.1** ➢ Type of problems ➢ Type of causes ➢ Type of target		**IC1** ➢ Typology of the targets ➢ Typology of the needs per target group
IIC.2 Identification of other action inside the Youth programme that could answer those problems	**IIC.2** ➢ Type of action		**IIC2** ➢ Typology of the problems ➢ Typology of the causes

Q A1

QUESTION CONCERNING PERTINENCE AND RELEVANCE

> ➤ To what extent are the programme's principles, objectives and actions still pertinent with the priorities and needs of the Euro Mediterranean partnership?

Key question:
   3. Are all the actions equally relevant to the different MEDA partner countries?

Evaluation criteria:
IIIA. Political, institutional, social and economic context
IIIB. Expectations and motivations of the beneficiaries and the actors
IIIC. Main problems to be solved and their causes.

Type of analysis: III. Analysis of the context	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIIA Definition of the scope and the political, institutional, social and economic environment	**IIIA** ➤ Social-economic indicators (demography and youth, education, employment, vulnerability ➤ Evolution of the indicators (1998, 2000, 2002)	**IIIA** ➤ Review of documents: statistics Euro-Med Stat, Unesco, Arab Youth Barometer	**IIIA** ➤ Analysis of the context and its evolution
IIIB1 Identification of Expectations and motivations of the beneficiaries and the actors	**IIIB1** ➤ Type of the target groups ➤ Type of the needs ➤ Needs per target group	**IIIB1** ➤ Interviews with EC ➤ Interviews with National Coordinators ➤ Questionnaires: national agencies, SALTO Euro-Med and Euro-Med Youth Platform, Council of Europe ➤ Interviews with experts and trainers	**IIIB1** ➤ Typology of the targets ➤ Typology of the needs per target group
IIIB2 Identification of the specific problems to be solved and their probable causes in each country	**IIIB2** ➤ Type of problems ➤ Type of causes ➤ Type of target	**IIIB2** ➤ See above	**IIIB2** ➤ Typology of the problems ➤ Typology of the causes
IIIC Identification of actions inside the Euro-Med Youth programme that are not relevant to the reality of some partners	**IIIC** ➤ Type of action per partner	**IIIC** ➤ See above	**IIIC** ➤ Typology of the non coherent actions per country

Q A2

QUESTION CONCERNING PERTINENCE AND RELEVANCE

> ➢ To what extent is the programme and its intervention mechanisms still well adapted to the objectives and the priorities of the Euro-med programme?

Key question:
1. To what extent are the different types of actions (Actions 1, 2, and 5) designed adequately in view of the objectives they should obtain and the target groups they should serve? 4 . To what extent are other actions necessary in order to obtain those aims?

Evaluation criteria:
IA. Adequacy between actions and objectives
IB. Adaptation of the actions to the evolving objectives

Type of analysis: I Cross analysis	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IA Analysis of the adequacy between the actions and the current needs and objectives	**IA** ➢ Correlation between the actions, the objectives and the needs	**IA** ➢ Review of documents: statistics Euro-Med Stat, Unesco, Arab Youth Barometer ➢ The Commission decision on the approval of the second phase of the Euro-Med Programme ➢ The Commission decision (2001/2347) on the approval of the second phase of the Euro-med Programme.	**IA** ➢ Cross analysis frame presenting the link between actions needs and objectives
IB1 Analysis of the adaptability of the actions to the evolving needs	**IB1** ➢ Correlation between the evolving needs and the actions ➢ Possible adequacy between the evolving needs and other actions to be added	**IB1** ➢ See above	**IB1** ➢ Analysis of the coherence to adapt the objectives and the actions with regard to evolving and new needs
IB2 Analysis of new needs	**IB2** ➢ Correlation between new needs and old actions ➢ Correlation between new needs and new actions	**IB2** ➢ See above	**IB2** ➢ See above

Q A2

QUESTION CONCERNING PERTINENCE AND RELEVANCE

> ➢ To what extent is the programme and its intervention mechanisms still well adapted to the objectives and the priorities of the Euro-med programme?

Key question:
2. To what extent is the training and guidance and other support mechanisms put by National Coordinators, National Agencies, SALTO Euro-Med, Euro-Med Youth Platform and the covenant between the Commission and the Council of Europe in the field of Euro-Med

---

4 The detailed methodological approach on how to analyse the adequacy between the current specific and operational objectives of the Youth Actions is developed in the section of indicators and descriptors, under the chapter of output indicators.

training, adequate in view of the objectives they should obtain?

Evaluation criteria:

IIA. Distribution of roles and functions as described in the official texts. Evolution of the organigram after Euro-Med I

IIB. Effective roles of the structures, platform and actors

IIC. Relations between structures and level of complementarity

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
II. Context and institutional analysis IIA Analysis of the official role and functions of each actor in the programme	II Context Indicators IIA ➢ Description of the role and responsibilities of each actor and structure and distribution of tasks, as stated in official documents and as being taken in charge in reality (Euro-Med I and II) ➢ Level of implementation capacity of the National Co-ordinators and National Agencies. ➢ Level of involvement and inputs of national governments and support from regional and local organisations	IIA ➢ The Commission decision on the approval of the second phase of the Euro-Med Programme ➢ The Commission decision (2001/2347) on the approval of the second phase of the Euro-med Programme ➢ The national coordinator's handbook ➢ "The Euro-Mediterranean Youth programme model work plan" ➢ "Note on the EYP ➢ Salto-Euromed Resource Work plan Interviews with: NC, NA, EC, Youth TAO, SALTO, National Youth Platform, European Youth Forum, CoE	IIA ➢ Functional organigram, for Euro-Med I and for Euro-Med II ➢ Analysis of the evolution of actor's roles, functions and level of implication ➢ Analysis of the Level of implementation capacity of the National co-ordinators IB1 ➢ See above
IIB1 Analysis of the support mechanisms (Training, guidance, partners search, information, dissemination)	IIB1 ➢ Typology & Description of the mechanisms allocated to each structure	IIB1 ➢ See above	
IIB2 Strengths and weaknesses of the mechanisms	IIB2 ➢ Reference to "success" stories ➢ Reference to dysfunctions	IIB2 ➢ See above	IIB2 ➢ See above ➢ Sampling for success stories and dysfunction
IIC Analysis of the relations between the structures and analysis of the level of complementarity	IIC ➢ Existence of formalisation of relations ➢ Types, frequency and level of efficiency of the relations undertaken among the implementation structures ➢ Level of complementarity ➢ Risks of duplication or conflict.	IIC ➢ See Above	IIC ➢ Presentation of types of existing links and relations among structures and actors. ➢ Comparison with expected official relation and links.

Q A2

QUESTION CONCERNING PERTINENCE AND RELEVANCE

> ➢ To what extent is the programme and its intervention mechanisms still well adapted to the objectives and the priorities of the Euro-med programme?

Key question:
3. What is the role of the involvement of the Mediterranean Partners in relation to the rest of the Programme, and its different strands?

Evaluation criteria:
IIIA. Adequacy all strands of the Youth Programme

Type of analysis: III context analysis	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIIA1 Short analysis and comparison of the role of all the strands of the Youth Programme	**IIIA1** ➢ Description of objectives and dynamics of each strand as stated in official documents ➢ Synergies and complementarity between the strands	**IIIA1** ➢ The Commission decision on the approval of the second phase of the Euro-Med Programme ➢ The Commission decision (2001/2347) on the approval of the second phase of the Euro-med Programme ➢ The Mid Term evaluation of Third countries Cooperation and Euro-med I ➢ Interviews with EC Desks officers	**IIIA1** ➢ Functional organigram of the European Youth programme ➢ Analysis of the level of involvement of the Mediterranean partners compared to other Third Countries ➢ List of specificities of the Mediterranean cooperation (mechanisms, structures) compared with other third countries strands
I			
IIA2 Short analysis and comparison between the different Third Countries Cooperation	**IIIA2** ➢ See IIIA2	**IIA2** ➢ See above	

Q A3

QUESTION CONCERNING PERTINENCE AND RELEVANCE

> ➤ To what extent is the programme relevant and coherent with the objectives of the third chapter of the Barcelona Process as well as to the objectives of the Youth Programme*?*

Key question:

1. What is the degree of complementarity of the programme with other Euro Mediterranean regional programmes and mainly in the third chapter

Evaluation criteria:

IA. Coherence between the different chapters of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IA1 Short analysis of the third Chapter (political objectives, programmes, achievements, future development)	**IA1** ➤ Description of the third chapter ➤ Level of participation and motivation of the Euro-Med partners ➤ Type of programmes	**IA1** ➤ Barcelona Declaration ➤ Meda Regulations ➤ Interim Report on an EU Strategic Partnership with the Mediterranean and the Middle East (2003) ➤ The Barcelona process ➤ The Europe-Mediterranean ➤ Partnership 2001 review ➤ The Barcelona Process 5 years on – 1995-2000	**IA1** ➤ Overview of programmes and objectives of Chapter II ➤ Figures about the participation and about the projects
IA2 Short analysis of Chapter I (political cooperation) and Chapter II (economic cooperation)	**IA2** ➤ Description of the chapter I, II ➤ Level of participation and motivation of the Euro-Med partners ➤ Type of programmes per chapter	**IA2** ➤ See above	**IA2** ➤ Overview of programmes and objectives of Chapter I & II ➤ Figures about the participation and about the projects
IA3 Identification of potential synergies between the programme and other Euro-Med regional programme	**IA3** ➤ Euro-Med programmes addressing indirectly youth issues ➤ Projects in Euro-Med Youth addressing issues of other Third Chapter programmes ➤ Projects in Euro-Med Youth addressing issues of Chapter I &II ➤ Youth issues in other EC programmes with international Cooperation: Environment, transport, Justice, Research, and Tempus etc.	**IA3** ➤ Tempus-Meda: Euro-Mediterranean co-operation in higher education	**IA3** ➤ List of programmes addressing Youth issues

Q A3

QUESTION CONCERNING PERTINENCE AND RELEVANCE

> ➤ To what extent is the programme relevant and coherent with the objectives of the third chapter of the Barcelona Process as well as to the objectives of the Youth Programme? (Question to go to a larger scale, within MEDA, AIDO and RELEX)

Key question:
2. To what extent there are synergies with other projects supported by the EU on the bilateral level

Evaluation criteria:
IIA. Coherence between the bilateral and the regional approach of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership

Type of analysis: II Context and policy analysis	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIA1 Short analysis of the Euro-Mediterranean bilateral track (policy, priorities, procedures, management reform)	**IIA1** ➤ Degree of budget absorption ➤ Degree of respect of the Country strategy Paper ➤ Role of the EC and Delegations ➤ Role of Mediterranean Partners ➤ Good progress of the deconcentration of EuropeAid	**IIA1** ➤ Barcelona Declaration ➤ Meda Regulations ➤ Interim Report on an EU Strategic Partnership with the Mediterranean and the Middle East (2003) ➤ The Barcelona process ➤ The Europe-Mediterranean ➤ Partnership 2001 review ➤ The Barcelona Process 5 years on – 1995-2000 ➤ Country Strategy papers ➤ EIB Reports	**IIA1** ➤ Short description of the bilateral track ➤ List of Partners practicing Youth policy with the EU support
IIA2 Short analysis of the approach to youth policy in the bilateral relations	**IIA2** ➤ The importance of youth policy in the strategy papers ➤ Its relation to other sectoral issues ➤ The technical capacity of the managers (EC, Delegations, Partners)		**IIA2** ➤ Analysis on the importance of Youth as a sectoral issue and crosscutting issue
IIA3 Research (sampling) of case studies illustrating support to youth policy in the bilateral relations	**IIA3** ➤ Increase of youth projects in the bilateral track ➤ The importance of Youth as a crosscutting issue in other policies: immigration, higher education, human rights	**IIA2** ➤ See above **IIA3** ➤ See above ➤ Examples of projects dealing directly and indirectly with Youth	**IIA3** ➤ Representative list of bilateral projects dealing directly with Youth
IIA4 Research on synergy and complementarity with regard to Youth policy between the bilateral and the multilateral tracks.	**IIA4** ➤ See above	**IIA4** ➤ See above	**IIA4** ➤ See above ➤ Short analysis on synergy potentialities

Q A4

QUESTION CONCERNING PERTINENCE AND RELEVANCE

➢ **To what extent is the budget appropriate for the pursued objectives?**			
Key question: 1. Does the budget allocated take into consideration the importance of the youth population in the Mediterranean? **Evaluation criteria:** **IA.** Coherence between the budget and the needs **IB.** Coherence between the overall budget and the objectives **IC.** Criteria for budget allocation (RIP)			
Type of analysis: I Context and policy analysis	**Indicators and descriptors:**	**Source of Information:**	**Expected result:**
IA Identification of Expectations and needs of the beneficiaries and the actors concerning support to Youth	**IA** ➢ Type of the target groups ➢ Type of the needs ➢ Needs per target group ➢ Financial needs	**IA** ➢ Interviews with EC ➢ Interviews with National Coordinators ➢ Questionnaires: national agencies, SALTO Euro-Med and Euro-Med Youth Platform, Council of Europe ➢ Interviews with experts and trainers	**IA** ➢ Typology of the targets ➢ Typology of the needs per target group ➢ Chart with estimated needed budget
IB Definition of the scope and the political, institutional, social and economic environment	**IB** ➢ Social-economic indicators (demography and youth, education, employment, vulnerability, budget allocated to youth policy) ➢ Evolution of the indicators (1998, 2000, 2002)	**IB** ➢ Review of documents: statistics Euro-Med Stat, Unesco, Arab Youth Barometer, RIP	**IB** ➢ Analysis of the context and its evolution
IC Analysis of the engagement procedure for the Regional Indicative Programme and for the European Youth programme	**IC** ➢ The importance of the youth sector in the RIP ➢ The place of International Cooperation and especially with the Mediterranean in the Youth Programme		**IC** ➢ Organigram and description of the procedures (Euro-Med & Youth)

Q B1

Questions related to effectiveness

> ➢ Is the Programme achieving its objectives? (This part covers the relationship between the outputs/results of the programme and the programme expected purpose/specific objectives.)

Key question:

1. To what extent have the specific objectives of the Actions (1,2,5) and the general objectives of the programme have been fulfilled by the projects?

Evaluation criteria:

IA. Type and level of implementation per action
IB. Conclusions on the attainment of the operational objectives

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IA.1 Analysis of the expected level and type of implementations per action and per year: 2001, 2002, 2003 (Quantitative analysis of the operational objectives)	**IA1** ➢ Number of foreseen projects per action for: 2001, 2002, 2003 ➢ Number of the overall foreseen projects per action	**IA1** ➢ Official documents	**IA1** ➢ Presentation of the expected results
IA2 Analysis of the implemented projects (level and type of implementation) per action and per year	**IA2** ➢ Number of implemented projects per action for: 2001, 2002, 2003 ➢ Number of the overall implemented projects per action ➢ Number of unsuccessful projects and the budget disbursed	**IA2** ➢ See above ➢ Follow up and management structures: EC, TAO, NA. NC, EMYP ➢ Interviews with EC, TAO, NA. NC, EMYP ➢ Reports: National, EC, evaluation, projects	**IA2** ➢ Charts describing the evolution of implementation across the years ➢ Comparison diagrams ➢ Analysis of the success and failure level ➢ Conclusion on the level of achievement per action
IB. Analysis of the extent of attainment of the operational objectives	**IB.** ➢ See above	**IB** ➢ See above	**IB** ➢ Comparative charts for expected & achieved results per action ➢ Analysis on the degree of progress and attainment of the operational objectives

Q B2

Questions related to effectiveness

> ➢ What have been the roles and responsibilities of the European and regional structures, new platforms and other actors involved in the implementation of the Programme? [5]

Key question:

1. What is the role and responsibility of each programme structure? Structure (The European Commission, the Technical Assistance Office, the Euro-Mediterranean Committee, the National Coordinators, the National Agencies, the EC delegations, SALTO Euro-Med, Euro-Med Youth Platform and the covenant between the Commission and the Council of Europe in the field of Euro-Med training)? What are the functions they are expected to perform and the relations and synergies among them?

Evaluation criteria:

IA. Role distribution for the different structures in the official texts and evolution of this role since Euro-Med I
IB. Evidence for the effective role, responsibility and management method for each partner
IC. Evidence for complementarity and synergy between the structures

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IA Analysis of the official role, responsibility and management method for each structure as stated in official documents/ contracts	**IA** ➢ Clear formulation of the role and responsibilities of each actor and structure and distribution of tasks, as stated in official documents ➢ Distribution of operational objectives among the structures ➢ Evolution of the structures and the actors and redistribution of task since Euro-Med I	**IA** ➢ The Commission decision (2001/2347) on the approval of the second phase of the Euro-med Programme. ➢ Covenant between the EC and the Council of Europe ➢ The users guide ➢ The national coordinators handbook ➢ "The Euro-Mediterranean Youth programme model work plan" ➢ "Note on the EYP" ➢ Salto-Euromed Resource Work plan	**IA** ➢ Official organigram of the programme structures

IB Analysis of the effective role of each partner, its mission and the evolution of the role	**IB** ➢ Effective functions and tasks of each actor and structure ➢ Evolution of the role ➢ Redistribution of role during Euro-Med I and	**IB** ➢ Interim reports on the implementation of the programme ➢ Interviews: EC, TAO, NA, NC, EMYP, Salto, Experts	**IB** ➢ Analysis of the evolution of actors roles, functions and level of implication

---

[5] The second phase of the programme focuses on establishing and strengthening support structures, namely: The SALTO-resource Centre, the Euro-Mediterranean Youth platform and the covenant wit the Council of Europe. For this reason, this evaluation study will give particular attention to these structures.

4. [6] One of the priorities of the second phase is increasing co-ordination and synergies among the regional and European structures, with actions such as the twinning national MEDA structures with EU national agencies, promoting a network of national co-ordinators…). Special attention will be given to monitoring the implementation of such initiatives

	after		➢ Level of implementation
IC Analysis of responsibilities allocated to each structure and possible synergy with other structures[6]	IC ➢ Existence of formal of relations (types, frequency and level of efficiency) ➢ Level of complementarity ➢ Indicators for duplication or conflict.	IC See above	IC Presentation of types of existing links

QB2

Questions related to effectiveness

➢ **What have been the roles and responsibilities of the European and regional structures, new platforms and other actors involved in the implementation of the Programme?**	

Key question:
    2.   What are the strengths and the weaknesses of these structures?

Evaluation criteria:
IIA. Strengths and weaknesses of structures of Euro-Med Youth
IIB. Strengths and weaknesses in the relations between the structures

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIA.1 Analysis of weaknesses and strengths of the structures as viewed by the structures themselves **IIA.2** Analysis of weaknesses and strengths of the structures as viewed by the beneficiaries **IIB** Analysis of weaknesses and strengths of the relations between the structures as viewed by the structures themselves	**IIA.1** ➢ Knowledge about its own structure, its role, the role of the other structures ➢ Dysfunctionning identified by the structures ➢ Improvements identified by the structures **IIA.2** ➢ Structural weaknesses and strengths identified by the beneficiaries ➢ Quality of structural support the projects **IIB** ➢ See above	**IIA.1** ➢ Interviews with managers of the structures (EC, NA, NC, TAO) ➢ Questionnaires to national authorities in partner countries **IIA2** ➢ Interviews with selected project promoters and ministries concerned ➢ Questionnaires to a greater number of project promoters **IIB** ➢ See above	**IIA.1** ➢ Presentation and analysis of the perception of role by each structure **IIA2** ➢ See above ➢ Summary of Strengths and weaknesses **IIB** ➢ Presentation of the perception about the relationships between the different structures ➢ Critical analysis of strengths and weaknesses ➢ Judgement about the cooperation between the structures

Q B2

Questions related to effectiveness

➢	What have been the roles and responsibilities of the European and regional structures, new platforms and other actors involved in the implementation of the Programme?

Key question:

3. What are the current opportunities and potential threats to the consolidation of the   Euro-Mediterranean Youth Platform?

Evaluation criteria:

IIIA. Current opportunities and potential threats concerning the Euro-Mediterranean Youth Platform?

Type of analysis: III SWOT analysis	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIIA.1 Analysis of opportunities and threats of the structure as viewed by the structure itself	IIIA.1 ➢ See IIA.1 & 2 ➢ External circumstances favouring the development of the EMYP ➢ Unfavourable external circumstances influencing the EMYP ➢ Strategy foreseen to favour opportunities and to combat threats ➢ Comparison to the former structure	IIIA.3 ➢ Interviews with managers and officers of the structure ➢ "Note on the EYP"	IIIA.1 ➢ Presentation and analysis of the view of the structure about Opportunities and Threats (Bottom-Up) ➢ Summery of Opportunities and Threats ➢ Summary report identifying a range of priority areas
IIIA.2 Analysis of opportunities and threats of the structure as viewed by the other structures	IIIA.2 ➢ See above	IIIA.2 ➢ Interviews and questionnaires to other structures	IIIA.2 ➢ See above
IIIA.3 Analysis of opportunities and threats of the structure as viewed by the beneficiaries	IIIA.3 ➢ See above	IIIA.3 ➢ Interviews with selected project coordinators	IIIA.3 ➢ See above

Q B3

Questions related to effectiveness

> ➤ Which procedures do the management structures apply to select, manage, and disseminate projects?

Key question:

1. How efficient is the advice and assistance, and support given by National Coordinators and SALTO and the newly created   EMYP to potential promoters, prior to the submission phase?

Evaluation criteria:
IA. Strategies and methods to support
IB. Coherence of the support mechanisms on a national level
IC. Coherence of the support mechanisms on a national level

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IA Effective mechanisms at the EU, National levels and other actors concerning assistance and support of programme activities	**IA** ➤ Effective assistance, support mechanisms and training put by the structures at EU and National level. ➤ Evolution of the above mentioned mechanisms after mid-evaluation report recommendations	**IA** ➤ Mid-term evaluation Euro-Med ➤ Interviews: Youth, EC, TAO, NA, SALTO, EMYP ➤ Questionnaires: NC ➤ Annual report SALTO ➤ Training materials and documents produced by SALTO ➤ Documents and materials produced by EYP ➤ Questionnaires to programme, SALTO and EMYP beneficiaries ➤ Case studies	**IA** ➤ Strengths and weakness identified in assistance and support policies ➤ Conclusions on budget adequacy
IB Effective mechanisms at the National level adapted to the local reality	**IB** ➤ See above ➤ Local specific needs taken into consideration	**IB** ➤ See above	**IB** ➤ See above
IC Effective mechanisms at the Regional level adapted to the Mediterranean reality	**IC** ➤ See above ➤ Specific complementary support mechanisms put by SALTO and the newly created EMYP platform, improve applications, its content and its partnership ➤ Weaknesses and dysfuntionalities identified ➤ Appropriate human resources and budget for Salto and EMYP	**IC** ➤ See above	**IC** ➤ See above

Q B3

Questions related to effectiveness

> Which procedures do the management structures apply to select, manage, and disseminate projects?

Key question:

2. Which tools, procedures and strategies are applied to monitor the progress of the programme and of projects?

Evaluation criteria:

IIA. Availability of a strategy to monitor project and adequacy of resources
IIB. Existence of effective methods to monitor projects on a regional level
IIC. Existence of effective methods to monitor projects on a national level

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIA. Analysis of the procedures and distribution of roles concerning monitoring and follow up for Programme activities	**IIA.** ➢ Existence of formal procedures ➢ Evolution of formal procedures during the two phases of the Programme ➢ Suitability and human resources available ➢ The follow-up documents ➢ Level of satisfaction of the control institutions (Euro-Med Committee) ➢ Weaknesses and dysfuntionalities identified	**IIA** ➢ "The Euro-Mediterranean Youth programme model work plan" ➢ "Note on the EYP" ➢ Salto-Euromed Resource Work plan ➢ Interim reports on the implementation of the programme ➢ Interviews: EC, TAO, NA, NC, Salto	**IIA** ➢ Presentation, assessment and conclusions on the mechanisms put in place ➢ Report on Strengths and weakness ➢ Comparative information of National Coordinators monitoring capacity ➢ Comments on adequacy of resources available?
IIB. Effective mechanisms at the EU and Mediterranean levels and other actors concerning monitoring and follow up for Programme activities	**IIB.** ➢ Effective programme monitoring and control by the EC with support of Youth TAO. ➢ See above	**IIB** ➢ See above ➢ Youth TAO reports ➢ The National co-ordinators reports on work plans ➢ Sample overview of Projects' Final Reports	**IIB** ➢ See above
IIC. Effective mechanisms at the National level and other actors concerning monitoring and follow up for Programme activities	**IIC.** ➢ See above	**IIC** ➢ See above ➢ The national coordinators handbook	**IIC** ➢ See above

Q B3

Questions related to effectiveness

➢ **Which procedures do the management structures apply to select, manage, and disseminate projects?**	

Key question:

    3.   What information and promotion mechanisms the different structures concerned at European, regional and platform levels to assure proper information circulation to all potential beneficiaries have developed? How efficient is the flow of information chain?

Evaluation criteria:

IIIA.   Strategy for promotion and information of programme at the EU level, budget and practices

IIIB.   Strategy for promotion and information of programme at National level, budget and practices

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIIA Analysis of the EU and other actor strategy for Strategy for promotion and information of programme, budget and practices	**IIIA** ➢ New strategies put in place during the second phase of the Euro-Med project by the EC ➢ Strategies of the new platforms involved ➢ Frequency and quality of actions to promote the programme	**IIIA** ➢ Interviews with the EC and BAT, EMYP, SALTO ➢ Data base of EYP ➢ Interviews with a sample of Mediterranean network youth organisations	**IIIA** ➢ Analysis of the promotion strategies ➢ Examples of good practice ➢ Conclusions of the pertinence and effectiveness
IIIB Analysis of the national strategy for promotion and information of programme at National level, budget and practices	**IIIB** ➢ Existence of practices of information and promotion	**IIIB** ➢ See above ➢ Interviews with NC	**IIIB** ➢ See above ➢ Comparative analysis between the countries

Q B3

Questions related to effectiveness

➢ Which procedures do the management structures apply to select, manage, and disseminate projects?	

Key question:

4. What are the strategies and practices put in place by the different concerned structures to foster dissemination and valorisation of projects

Evaluation criteria:
IVA. Strategy for dissemination and valorisation of projects at the EU level, budget and practices
IVB. Strategy for dissemination and valorisation of projects at National level, budget and practices

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IVA Analysis of the EU and other actor strategy for promotion and dissemination and valorisation of projects at the EU level, budget and practices	IVA ➢ New strategies put in place during the second phase of the Euro-Med project by the EC ➢ Strategies of the new platforms involved ➢ Frequency and quality of actions to promote the programme ➢ Multiplication of projects, reproduction of products	IVA ➢ Interviews with the EC and BAT, EMYP, SALTO ➢ Data base of EYP ➢ Interviews with a sample of Mediterranean network youth organisations	IVA ➢ Analysis of the dissemination strategy ➢ Examples of good practice ➢ Conclusions of the pertinence and effectiveness
IVB Analysis of the national strategy for dissemination and valorisation of projects at the EU level, budget and practices	IVB ➢ Existence of practices of dissemination and valorisation	IVB ➢ See above ➢ Interviews with NC	IVB ➢ See above ➢ Comparative analysis between the countries

Q B4

Questions related to effectiveness

> ➢ To what extent is the administrative management of the programme efficient and coherent? (Calendar, application procedures, contract and payment modalities)

Key question:

1. Are there any new administrative rules?

Evaluation criteria:

IA. Existence of strict administrative rules
IB. Division of administrative roles

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IA Analysis of the administrative procedures: Calendar, submission of proposals, selection, contracting, daily management, budgetary procedures **IB** Analysis of the roles distribution on a EU, Regional and national level	**IA** ➢ New administrative rules of the Commission ➢ New financial regulation of the Commission ➢ Existence of simple and strict administrative rules ➢ Control methods of individual projects ➢ Comprehensiveness of the participants' guide, calls, contracts, report forms ➢ Adequacy between Meda and EAC procedures **IB** ➢ Evolution of the task distribution ➢ Appropriate support mechanisms for each task ➢ Identification of decision takers in case of administrative problems ➢ Way of finding solutions in practice ➢ Number of problems ➢ Type of administrative problems	**IA** ➢ Administrative guides and forms ➢ Other administrative documents **IB** ➢ See above ➢ Interview with EC, TAO, NA, NC ➢ Questionnaire to project promoters	**IA** ➢ Presentation of administrative documents **IB** ➢ See above ➢ Description and typology of the administrative tasks of each structure ➢ Identification of complementarity or conflicts

Q B4

Questions related to effectiveness

➢ To what extent is the administrative management of the programme efficient and coherent? (Calendar, application procedures, contract and payment modalities)	

Key question:
2. Do the administrative rules harmonise with the rules of the structure around the Mediterranean?

Evaluation criteria:
IIA. Compliance between the rules of the EC and the practices and capacities of the Mediterranean partners

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIA1 Analysis of the main administrative procedures in the Med Partner countries and comparison with the requirements of the Commission	IIA1 ➢ Existence of clear administrative rules in the Med countries ➢ Differences between private, associative and public sectors ➢ Administrative reforms ➢ Capacity building ➢ Transfer of know how ➢ Intercultural approach	IIA1 ➢ Administrative guides and forms ➢ Other administrative documents ➢ Current administrative rules in the Med area ➢ Status of civil society ➢ Other international cooperation	IIA1 ➢ Short description of current and main administrative rules in the Meda area ➢ Analysis of the administrative capacity of the civil society ➢ List of difficulties and barriers ➢ Conclusions and recommendation to overcome barriers
IIA2 Identification of the main difficulties and barriers	IIA2 ➢ See IIA1 ➢ Persisting political, cultural, economic and social barriers ➢ Adaptation capacity of the programme ➢ Adaptation capacity of the beneficiaries and actors	IA2 ➢ See above	IIA2 ➢ See above

Q B4
Questions related to effectiveness

➤	To what extent is the administrative management of the programme efficient and coherent? (Calendar, application procedures, contract and payment modalities)

Key question:
What are the strengths and the weaknesses of the present administrative system?

Evaluation criteria:
IIIA. Adequacy of human and financial resources allocated to the administrative management
IIIB. Pertinence of the administrative management (Strengths & weaknesses)

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIIA Compared analysis of the adequacy of financial and human resources allocated to each structure for administrative management	**IIIA** ➤ Human resources: number of persons for each task in each country or structure ➤ Financial resources: budget allocated (NA, NC, TAO) ➤ Respect of deadlines: Payment, reports, selection ➤ Flux of information	**IIIA** ➤ Official administrative documents ➤ Interviews with EC, NC, NA, TAO	**IIA** ➤ Charts about human and financial resources in each country ➤ Critical analysis of the adequacy of financial and human resources mobilised with regard to problems and dysfunctions
IIIB Critical analysis of the functionality of the tools	**IIB** ➤ Changes and evolution of administrative tasks as a consequence of Euro-Med I evaluation ➤ View of the project promoters and beneficiaries ➤ Barriers	**IIIB** ➤ See above ➤ Euro-Med evaluation ➤ Questionnaires: TAO, NC. Representative group of project promoters	**IIIB** ➤ Synthetic presentation of the views of the project promoters ➤ Critical analysis about the evolution from Euro-Med I to II ➤ Conclusions about the pertinence of the administrative management with regard to the satisfaction of the promoters

Q B4
Questions related to effectiveness

To what extent is the administrative management of the programme efficient and coherent? (Calendar, application procedures, contract and payment modalities)
Key question:
4. What is the intervention logic of the evaluation and selection process? How adequate and efficient has the selection process been? To what extent are the procedures and criteria for project selection appropriate and have been applied uniformly as set out in the Guidelines? How appropriate have been the frequency and times of project selection deadlines?
Evaluation criteria: **IVA.** Intervention logic in the official documents   **IVB.** Effective criteria and procedures for evaluation and selection   **IVC.** Adequacy between guide lines and procedure

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IVA Analysis of the intervention logic concerning evaluation and selection	**IVA** ➢ A clear intervention logic with distribution of role and working procedures ➢ Information on the programme in the calls ➢ Application procedures ➢ Eligibility criteria ➢ Selection procedures ➢ Transparency of the procedures	**IVA** ➢ Official legal documents ➢ Users guide ➢ Expert handbook ➢ Calls ➢ Interview with EC, TAO, NC, NA, academic experts/evaluators, project promoters	**IVA** ➢ Typology of the decision makers ➢ Typology of the structures concerned by the selection ➢ Conclusion of the pertinence of the procedures
IVB Analysis of the procedures and the criteria	**IVB** ➢ See above	**IVB** ➢ See above	**IVB** ➢ See above
IVC Analysis of the adequacy between the guidelines and the procedures	**IVC** ➢ Identification of misunderstanding ➢ Queries concerning selection decisions ➢ Training and briefing of evaluator ➢ Flux of information between the structures involved ➢ Management of rejection of project proposals	**IVC** ➢ See above	**IVC** ➢ See above

Q B5
Questions related to effectiveness

> ➢ How have the financial resources been distributed among the activities, the projects?

Key question:
1. To what extent is the financial administration sound and coherent with the objectives?

Evaluation criteria:
IA. Effectiveness of the budgetary procedure
IB. Allocation per country, action, year
IC. Conformity of the expenses with the initial budget

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IA Budgetary process	**IA** ➢ Clear budgetary calendar ➢ Information about the procedure ➢ General criteria and priorities to design the budget ➢ Updating mechanism	**IA** ➢ Financial and administrative rules ➢ Regional Indicative Programme for Meda ➢ Other programming documents ➢ Audits	**IA** ➢ Presentation of the budget procedure ➢ Presentation of the programming mechanisms
IB Analysis and evolution of the allocation criteria and distribution among objectives, actions and projects	**IB** ➢ Methods to fix the budget break down ➢ Methods to quantify the objectives ➢ Integration of the real needs of the Med partners ➢ Clear explanation of the distribution rules ➢ A programming framework to reflect on allocation and distribution	**IB** ➢ See above	**IB** ➢ Presentation of the instrument in charge of allocation and distribution ➢ Presentation pf the attribution criteria
IC Analysis of the coherence between the budget programming and the effective expenses	**IC** ➢ Effective expenses versus budget programming ➢ Degree of commitment per position ➢ Comparison of the commitments per action ➢ Going beyond or under the budget	**IC** ➢ See above ➢ Interview with EC, NC, TAO	**IC** ➢ See above ➢ Explanation for under commitment or going beyond budget

Q B5
Questions related to effectiveness

> How have the financial resources been distributed among the activities, the projects?

Key question:
2. To what extent did the financial support granted to the beneficiaries of the Programme merely substitute for support likely to have been provided from other sources anyway?

Evaluation criteria:

IIA. The institutional support to youth policy in the Meda Countries
IIB. The international support to youth policy in the Meda Countries
IIC. Comparison and complementarities

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIA Financial analysis of the political, institutional situation with regard to youth policy on the national level	**IIA** ➢ Budget allocated to youth ➢ Number of national projects ➢ Visibility of the policy and the projects ➢ Percentage in the overall budget of the country	**IIA** ➢ Official documents of the concerned partners ➢ Interviews with ministries in charge, with the local EU delegation	**IIA** ➢ Budget tables concerning youth national policy per year ➢ Number of projects per year
IIB Financial analysis of the international support with regard to youth policy per Meda country	**IIB** ➢ Presence of international institutions specialised in youth ➢ Number of international projects ➢ International cooperation of the Member States ➢ Visibility of the actions	**IIB** ➢ Official documents of donors ➢ Interview with international donors, some promoters of international projects	**IIB** ➢ Budget tables on international projects ➢ Explanation of the Importance of youth policy for international donors
IIC Budgetary synergies between national and international support to youth	**IIC** ➢ Complementarity of the actions ➢ Conflicts between different actions (double financing) scattering		**IIC** ➢ Case studies on cooperation between national and international donors ➢ Typology of donors

Q B5
Questions related to effectiveness

➢ How have the financial resources been distributed among the activities, the projects?

Key question:

   3. How likely is it that the effects of the Programme would have occurred even if the Programme itself had not been launched?

Evaluation criteria:

IIIA. Coherence of the operational objectives with the real needs of beneficiaries

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIIA Analysis of the local political context with regard to similar programmes	**IIIA** ➢ Role of local, national and international donors ➢ Type of needs ➢ Type of beneficiaries ➢ Evolution of local needs since Euro-Med I	**IIIA** ➢ National political documents ➢ International documents ➢ Interviews with Delegations of EC, NC, national ministries, international donors	**IIIA** ➢ Paper on national policies and strategy with regard to youth ➢ Paper of international strategy for youth per country ➢ Check of complementarity with Euro-Med II

Q C1
Questions related to efficiency

> ➢ What is the relationship between the inputs (Human and financial resources) and the first outputs of the programme?

Key question:
1. What is the relationship between the inputs (Human and financial resources) and the first outputs of the programme?

Evaluation criteria:
IA. Estimation of the costs
IB. Efficiency regarding implementation
IC. Efficiency regarding results

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IA Estimation of the programme costs	**IA** ➢ Functioning costs: 2001, 2002, 2003 of CE, TAO, NC (staff, overheads etc.) ➢ Allocation of operational costs per action	**IA** ➢ Financial data (EC, TAO, NC) ➢ Present Status of the budget (overheads, grants)	**IA** ➢ Synthetic tables of operational costs (2001, 2002, 2003) ➢ Break down of the cost according to realisation ➢ Table of the grants paid 2001-2003
IB Relation between implementation and costs (per action, per country)	**IB** ➢ Country comparison ➢ Implementation indicators ➢ See above	**IB** ➢ See above	**IB** ➢ See above ➢ Presentation of the relation cost/implementation ➢ Conclusion on efficiency
IC Relation between results and costs (per action, per country)	**IC** ➢ See above	**IC** ➢ See above	**IC** ➢ See above

Q D1

Questions related to Sustainability

> ➤ To what extent is there adequate ownership of the programme by the target groups / beneficiaries?

Key question:

1. To what extend have the beneficiaries showed a satisfactory understanding of its objectives?

Evaluation criteria:

IA. Coherence between the knowledge of beneficiaries and effective objectives of the programme

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IA Analysis of the ownership of the programme by the targets	IA ➤ Clear presentation of the political and operational objectives ➤ Availability of the presentations ➤ Mechanisms to promote and inform ➤ Comparison between actions ➤ Comparison between countries	IIA ➤ Official publications ➤ Promotional actions ➤ Information strategies ➤ Interviews with: EC, NC, NA, EMYP ➤ Questionnaire to a wide range of project promoters	IIA ➤ Analysis of the ownership of the programme by action and by country

Q D1

Questions related to Sustainability

➢ To what extent is there adequate ownership of the programme by the target groups / beneficiaries?	

Key question:

2. To what extent were the targets committed to strengthening the values of the programme? (Peace, tolerance, human rights etc.)

Evaluation criteria:
IIA. Coherence between the projects and the values of the programme
IIB. Mainstreaming of the values into the beneficiaries organisations

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIA Analysis of the relationship between the implemented projects and the values (per year, per action, per value)	**IIA** ➢ Type of projects (Year, action, country, value) ➢ Type of participating organisations ➢ Dissemination of the values by the beneficiaries ➢ Relation between the needs and the values	**IIA** ➢ Projects compendia and data basis	**IIA** List of projects per value (country, year, type of organisation) Hierarchy of values according to the projects implemented Conclusion of the sustainability of values
IIB Analysis of the integration of the values by the organisations	**IIB** ➢ See above ➢ Follow up projects promoted by the same organisation on the same values	**IIB** ➢ Good practices ➢ Case studies ➢ Interviews with project promoters	**IIB** ➢ Analysis of the ownership of the programme by action and by country ➢ Compilation of case studies and good practices

Q D1
Questions related to Sustainability

➢ To what extent is there adequate ownership of the programme by the target groups / beneficiaries?
Key question:
3. To what extend they have participated in the projects with enthusiasm and expressed a strong will for further initiatives of cooperation? To what extend have the organisations established partnerships which will be able to work on independently from the Programme?
Evaluation criteria: **IIIA.** Satisfactory of participants **IIIB.** Coherence with the real needs of the beneficiaries

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIIA Analysis of the quality of participation, partnership	**IIIA** ➢ Type of participation ➢ Type and quality of partnership ➢ Type of projects ➢ Satisfactory factors and indicators	**IIIA** ➢ Projects compendia and data basis ➢ Projects reports	**IIIA** ➢ Survey on satisfactory of beneficiaries per country and actions ➢ Good practices of partnership ➢ Identification of motivations
IIIB Analysis of potentiality regarding further actions	**IIIB** ➢ See above ➢ Needs of the participating organisation ➢ Potential donors per country ➢ Follow up projects	**IIIB** ➢ See above ➢ Interviews with potential donors	**IIIB** ➢ See above

Q D2
Questions related to Sustainability

> To what extent have the relevant authorities had a supportive policy during implementation of the programme?

Key question:
1. To what extent was the programme successful in mainstreaming of youth policies into government policies in the countries concerned?

Evaluation criteria:
IA. Mainstreaming of programme objectives into national policies
IB. Support of Ministries to the programme (Human resources, finance)

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IA Analysis of the coherence, complementarity or non adequacy of the programme with the Med countries youth national policies	**IA** ➤ Existence of a clear national policy concerning youth (per country) ➤ Information channels to policy makers about the programme and its results ➤ Needs assessment done by ministries ➤ Capacity building of actors concerned	**IA** ➤ Interviews with: delegations, NC, national ministries, experts ➤ Information and dissemination of the programme	**IA** ➤ Presentation of the national policy and priorities per country ➤ First conclusions on capacity building
IB Analysis of the support given to the programme by national ministries	**IB** ➤ See above ➤ Existence of support mechanisms to policy makers (NGO, Research, University) ➤ Support Budget to the programme ➤ Administrative and political support	**IB** ➤ See above	**IB** ➤ See above ➤ List of support mechanism and measures

Q D3
Questions related to Sustainability

➢ To what extent will all beneficiaries have adequate access to benefits and products during and after the programme?

Key question:
1. To what extent has the programme supported the capacity building of organizations, institutions etc. in the Meda area?

Evaluation criteria:
IA. Sustainable capacity building of beneficiaries

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IA Analysis of the process and first results of capacity building	IA ➢ Similar understanding of the programme by EU and Med partners ➢ Improvement of managerial skills ➢ Improvement of political capacities ➢ Improvement of project related skills ➢ Type of skills per country ➢ Appropriate training ➢ Establishment of long term missions by the beneficiaries ➢ Adaptability of the programme to local situations ➢ Local conditions for sustainable development	IA ➢ Interviews with: EC, NC, TAO, SALTO ➢ Training materials ➢ Training projects ➢ Country strategies	IA ➢ List of training materials and mechanisms ➢ List of training projects ➢ Tentative list of skills built (per country) ➢ Analysis of the sustainability of the local situation (per country)

Q D3
Questions related to Sustainability

➢	To what extent will all beneficiaries have adequate access to benefits and products during and after the programme?

Key question:

   2. To what extent was the training crucial to attain the necessary capacity building for transforming the beneficiaries' activity into a sustainable development process?

Evaluation criteria:
IIA. Sustainability of the training mechanisms and offer

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIA Analysis of the training mechanism and offer and its sustainability	IIA ➢ Existing training mechanisms ➢ Existing training offer ➢ Training projects ➢ Transformations observed ➢ Formulation of long term missions by the beneficiaries ➢ Increased responsibility of Meda Partner ➢ Existence of promotion material ➢ Existence of resource centres ➢ Type of training issues	IIA ➢ Interviews with: EC, NC, TAO, SALTO ➢ Training materials ➢ Training projects ➢ Country strategies	IIA ➢ List of training materials and mechanisms ➢ List of training projects ➢ Tentative list of skills built (per country) ➢ Analysis of the sustainability of the local situation (per country) ➢ Conclusions on training priorities

Q D4
Questions related to Sustainability

➢ How far has the programme contributed to crosscutting aspects (equality between man and women, human rights, fight against intolerance, xenophobia and racism, environment)?

Key question:

1. To what extent has the programme succeeded in mainstreaming crosscutting issues into projects and youth policies?

Evaluation criteria:

IIA. Mainstream of crosscutting issues into youth programmes and projects

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IA Analysis of integration of transversal issues into the programme	IA ➢ Needs to integrate transversal issues ➢ Examples of integration ➢ Type of transversal issues per country ➢ Type of associations strongly related to a transversal issue ➢ Gender mainstream ➢ Gender balance (Structures, projects) ➢ Coherence between EU and Meda priorities (RIP)	IA ➢ Interview with EC, NC, Delegation, project promoters ➢ Projects compendia and data base ➢ Gender analysis/evaluations of EuropeAid	IA ➢ List of priority crosscutting issues ➢ Tentative list of projects including genuinely crosscutting issues ➢ Recommendation on inclusion of crosscutting issues in the future

Questions related to Impact

➢ To what extent has the programme succeeded in busting a growing interest among the 27 Euro-Mediterranean Partners in the Euro-Mediterranean cooperation in the youth field	

Key question:
1. Did the number of projects and participants grow in a sensible way in comparison to the first stage?

Evaluation criteria:
IA. Growing quality and number of projects and participants

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IA Analysis of the developments during Euro-Med Youth II	IA ➢ Growing number of projects ➢ Growing number of participants ➢ Growing quality of projects ➢ Dissemination of results ➢ Projects developing networks ➢ Projects stimulating creation of other projects ➢ Increased awareness on Euro-Med ➢ Creation of new structures: voluntary services, training etc.	IA ➢ Projects data base ➢ Salto data base ➢ Interviews with Delegations, NA, NC, Ministries	IA ➢ Analysis for reason of growth or diminution of projects per action and per country ➢ Presentation of new structures per country ➢ Tentative list of projects stimulated by similar Euro-Med projects ➢ Strengths and weaknesses of the Euro-Med Partnership regarding Youth

QE1

Questions related to Impact

➢	To what extent has the programme succeeded in busting a growing interest among the 27 Euro-Mediterranean Partners in the Euro-Mediterranean cooperation in the youth field?

Key question:

2. To what extent have barriers and handicaps been dismantled: Visa, difficult mobility, insurance etc?

Evaluation criteria:

IIA. Strategy to dismantle barriers

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIA Analysis of past and existing barriers	IIA ➢ Clear strategy to overcome barriers ➢ Type of barriers and comparison to Euro-Med I ➢ Cooperation with other institutions to dismantle barriers ➢ Support and solidarity networks ➢ Intervention of the programme structures ➢ Visibility of the programme objectives ➢ Effective arrangements ➢ Further barriers impeding the development of the programme	IIA ➢ Council resolution (13649/00) concerning an action plan for mobility ➢ Proposal on a directive on entrance and residence conditions of third country nationals for the purposes of studying, training and voluntary services. ➢ Official documents issued by the EC and national authorities ➢ National co-ordinators and EC reports ➢ Interviews to National authorities ➢ Interviews with EVS	IIA ➢ Presentation of the strategies and progress ➢ Conclusions, particularly concerning impact in EVS

Q E1
Questions related to Sustainability

> ➢ To what extent has the programme succeeded in busting a growing interest among the 27 Euro-Mediterranean Partners in the Euro-Mediterranean cooperation in the youth field

Key question:

    3. To what extent has the programme succeeded to promote a greater South-South cooperation?

Evaluation criteria:

IIA. Effective South-South cooperation

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIIA Analysis of past situation and future developments	IIIA ➢ Number of projects promoting SSC ➢ Type of projects promoting SSC ➢ Type of countries promoting SSC ➢ Type of issues ➢ Type of action ➢ Strategy to promote SSC ➢ Barriers (political, cultural, language, economic) ➢ Needs of beneficiaries	IIIA ➢ Projects Data base ➢ Interview: EC, Delegations, NC, EMYP	IIIA ➢ Tables comparing SSC with regard to project type, action, issue ➢ List of barriers ➢ Conclusion for the future

Questions related to Sustainability

➢ In what way did the programme succeeded to create a real regional cooperation?

Key question:
1. Was the establishment of network of National coordinators successful and to what extent were other forms of regional partnerships created?

Evaluation criteria:
IA. Evolution of the regional dynamic

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IA Analysis of the needs for regional support structures and mechanisms	IA ➢ Needs identified ➢ A clear strategy for regional mechanisms ➢ Availability of resources (human, financial) ➢ Common needs for the countries ➢ Evolution of the regional needs ➢ Past experiences ➢ Other international dynamics (Unesco, CoE)	IA ➢ Interviews with: EC, NC, EMYP, Salto ➢ Salto-Euromed Resource Work plan	IA ➢ Typology of needs for regional cooperation ➢ Strengths and weaknesses of EMYP ➢ Conclusion on possible forms of regional dynamics

Q E2
Questions related to Impact

In what way did the programme succeeded to create a real regional cooperation?			
Key question: 2. How big is the number of projects with a genuine regional character? **Evaluation criteria:** **IIA.** Growing number of genuine regional projects			
Type of analysis:	**Indicators and descriptors:**	**Source of Information:**	**Expected result:**
IIA Analysis of strengths and weaknesses of the regional dynamic	IIA ➢ Genuine regional projects in the different actions ➢ Growing number of projects having more than required partnership ➢ Strengths of the regional dynamic ➢ Weaknesses of the regional dynamic	IIA ➢ Projects data base ➢ Best practices ➢ Interviews with: EC, EMYP, project promoters	IIA ➢ Compilation of best practices ➢ Typology of the projects

Q E3

Questions related to Impact

➢ To what extend has the programme generated an interaction with other EU programmes concerning youth and civil society?

Key question:
1. To what degree is the programme known by actors of other programmes (Euromed Audiovisual, Heritage etc.)?

Evaluation criteria:
IA. Visibility pf the programme

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IA Analysis of possible synergies with other programmes	IA ➢ Administrative channels of communication ➢ Common objectives to all programmes ➢ Common issues ➢ Existence of an information strategy	IA ➢ Interviews with: desk officers of other programmes, TAO of other programmes ➢ Sampling questioners to other programmes beneficiaries	IA Typology of issues and priorities common to all programmes Conclusions on synergies with other programmes

Q E4
Questions related to Impact

➢ To what extent has the programme had an effect of the beneficiaries?	

Key question:
1. Has the Programme enhanced mutual understanding and respect among young people from different countries? Has it increased the solidarity amongst young people?

Evaluation criteria:
IA. Best practices for mutual understanding
IB. Best practices for solidarity

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IA Analysis of the concept of mutual understanding and its promotion	IA ➢ Clear explanation about the concept in programme documentation ➢ A strategy to promote ➢ A similar understanding by EU and Med partners of the concept ➢ Growth of number of projects dealing with the issue	IA ➢ Official EC documents ➢ Projects data base ➢ Interviews with: EC, NC, project promoters	IA ➢ Typology of projects ➢ Clarification about the concept ➢ Conclusions for future developments
IB Analysis of the concept of solidarity and its promotion	IB ➢ See above	IB ➢ See above	IB ➢ See above

Q E4

Questions related to Impact

➢ To what extent has the programme had an effect of the beneficiaries?

Key question:

    2. To what extent has the action encouraged the development of youth structures and the voluntary sector as a means to strengthen civil society in the Meda countries?

Evaluation criteria:

IIA. Existence and sustainability of youth structures

IIB. Development of the voluntary sector

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIA Analysis of the evolution of youth structures as linked to the programme	**IIA** ➢ Existence of youth structures ➢ Type of structures ➢ Sector of activities ➢ Capacity building	**IIA** ➢ Interview with NC, Ministries, experts ➢ Last mid term evaluation	**IIA** ➢ Typology of structures per country and per sector ➢ Conclusion on youth structures development and sustainability
IIB Analysis of the youth voluntary sector as linked to the programme	**IIB** ➢ Type of service per country ➢ Type of sector ➢ Type of organisation ➢ Evolution in last years ➢ Capacity building ➢ Active participation in the action	**IIB** ➢ See above ➢ Projects data base	**IIB** ➢ Typology of structure per country ➢ List of representative projects ➢ Best practices ➢ Conclusions on youth voluntary service

Q E4
Questions related to Impact

> ➢ To what extent has the programme had an effect of the beneficiaries?

Key question:

3. Has the participation to the action encouraged the young people involved to increase or improve the acquired knowledge of the society of the exchange countries?

Evaluation criteria:

IIIA. Growing interest of concerned persons in the exchange cultures

Type of analysis:	Indicators and descriptors:	Source of Information:	Expected result:
IIIA Analysis of the exchange projects and type of influence of beneficiaries	IIIA ➢ Active exchange projects between EU and Med ➢ Type of projects ➢ Issue of exchange (language, life skills, Vocational skills) ➢ Studies and/or activities carried out after the exchange in relation with it ➢ Continuation of the relationship with the hosting country	IIIA ➢ Projects data base ➢ Interviews with NC, project promoters, participants ➢ Best practices	IIIA Typology of exchange projects (per country, per issue) Mechanisms of follow up after termination of the project Presentation of best practices

2.7 INDICATORS AND DESCRIPTORS

A. Results indicators

The framework for the evaluation of the level of performance of the Actions of the programme is based on output indicators. The approach designed by the evaluation team to analyse the performance for Youth Exchanges (Action I), Voluntary Service (Action II) and Support Measures (Action V) is described below.

T1. Outputs indicators for the operational objectives of Action I and Action II

Operational objectives Youth Exchanges and the Voluntary Service	Outputs indicators 7	Source
Youth Exchanges (Action I) Voluntary Service (Action II)	➢ Number of projects approved/submitted ➢ Number of projects taking place in MEDA countries ➢ Distribution of beneficiaries by region and by country. ➢ Distribution of beneficiaries by sex ➢ Number of projects involving people with less opportunities ➢ Distribution of participation by type of beneficiary (Young people/youth worker) ➢ Number of projects by criteria used to select the participants ➢ Number of projects by strategies for contacting the beneficiaries ➢ Number of beneficiary organizations/number of times they have benefited from programme ➢ Number of projects by sources of information used by the organisations ➢ Number of projects that would have been funded without the Community aid.	➢ Statistics provided by the TAO ➢ Interviews and questionnaires to National co-ordinators ➢ Questionnaires and sample interviews to project co-ordinators ➢ Questionnaires to project beneficiaries

---

7 This outputs indicators apply for both Action I and Action II

T2. Results indicators for the specific objectives of Action I and Action II

Specific objectives	Results indicators (Action I and II)8	Source
Youth Exchanges (Action I) Voluntary Service (Action II)	➢ Utility of the Actions from the experience of non-formal learning ➢ Utility of the Actions for: developing understanding of cultural diversity and fundamental rights, enhancing dialogue, tolerance and cultural, including south-south developing increased solidarity ➢ Utility of the programme in terms of facilitating training of youth workers and its impact ➢ Evolution of youth working methods triggered by the participation in youth exchange projects (perception) ➢ Role of the action in building solid partnerships among countries from both sides of the Mediterranean, as well as within MEDA ➢ Role of the action in promoting exchange of information and experience between participating youth organisations ➢ Evidence of raising awareness at the local level of the values of non-formal education and intercultural learning ➢ Role of the action in the development of the voluntary sector (perception) ➢ Evidence provided by voluntary experiences in fostering beneficiaries employment ➢ Evidence of support to the development of local communities in specific sectors	➢Interviews and questionnaires to National co-ordinators ➢Questionnaires and sample interviews to project co-ordinators ➢Questionnaires to project beneficiaries ➢Conclusions from interim evaluation report ➢Documents on cases of good practice ➢Youth TAO related statistics ➢Case studies

T3. Outputs indicators for the operational objectives of Action V

Operational objectives	Outputs indicators	Source

---

8 This results indicators will be used selectively for Action I and Action II

Action V: Support Measures	- Number of projects approved/submitted - Number of projects taking place in MEDA countries - Distribution of partner beneficiaries by region and by country. - Distribution of participation by type of beneficiary - Distribution of beneficiaries by sex - Number of projects involving people with less opportunities - Number of beneficiary organizations/number of times they have benefited from programme - Number of projects by sources of information used by the organisations - Number of projects that would have been funded without the Community aid.	- Youth TAO related statistics - Interviews and questionnaires to National co-ordinators - Questionnaires and sample interviews to project co-ordinators - Questionnaires to project beneficiaries - Conclusions from interim evaluation report

T4. Results indicators for the specific objectives of Action V

Specific objectives	Results indicators	Source
Action V: Support Measures	- Utility of the programme in terms of providing capacity building and new skills and networking to young workers - Evidence in its immediate impact in youth organisations - Utility of the programme in terms of increasing and sustaining partnerships and networks - Utility of the programme in terms of informing partners about Youth programme priorities - Utility of the programme to improve access of young people in other programme actions	- Youth TAO related statistics - Interviews and questionnaires to National co-ordinators - Questionnaires and sample interviews to project co-ordinators - Questionnaires to project beneficiaries - Conclusions from interim evaluation report

B. Impact indicators

The framework for the evaluation also previews indictors to measure the impact of the programme.

T5. Impact indicators for the Euromed Programme

Expected Impact9	Indicators and descriptions	Sources of information
The growing interest of the Euro-Mediterranean cooperation in the youth field among the 27 Euro-Mediterranean Partners	➢ The increasing number of applications and projects ➢ The increasing number of participants ➢ The support given to the national coordinators ➢ Awareness and knowledge of all the Euromed Youth facilities, opportunities and projects ➢ Change in the visa, mobility dispositions etc. to enable a greater movement and exchange	➢ Interviews with national coordinators, ministries, BAT, EC ➢ Projects data bases (Saykiss, Salto)
The establishment of network of National coordinators and of partnerships created		
The real interest of national authorities in the Mediterranean Partners in improving national youth structures and policies	➢ Synergies established between the Euro-Med dynamics and results and national mechanisms and policies ➢ Support given to National Coordinators ➢ Increase of national budget allocated to youth policy ➢ Integration of NGO, s and Academy into policy decision taking	➢ Survey on local youth projects ➢ Interviews with National Ministries, Coordinators, Delegations of the EC, NGO, s and Experts
The capacity building strengthen through national networks	➢ Increase of good quality proposals and projects ➢ Change in the working methods, in the financial and operational management of the concerned entities ➢ Increased involvement of non governmental bodies in advocacy and policy making ➢ Increase of the South-South cooperation ➢ Degree of democratisation of the civil society of the Mediterranean partners	➢ Projects data bases (Saykiss, Salto) ➢ Interviews with National Ministries, Coordinators, EC Officials, NGO's ➢ Questionnaires
Contribution of the programme, on the long term, to decreasing cultural gaps	➢ Increased number of projects related to the issue ➢ The nature of the North-North and	➢ Projects data bases (Saykiss, Salto) ➢ Questionnaires to project promoters

---

9 As described in the Financial Proposal for Euro-Med II, MIS: 2001/0186

	South –South cooperation ➢ Cooperation between conflicting regions and groups ➢ Increase of projects dealing with special groups: female young persons, disabled, minorities	
Interaction and harmonization of the programme with other EU programmes concerning youth and civil society	➢ Degree of knowledge of the Euromed Youth objectives and results among actors of other programmes (Euromed Audiovisual, Heritage etc.) ➢ Interest of other EU programmes in Euro-Med Youth ➢ Tools of dissemination and validation	➢ Interviews EC Officials dealing with the other programmes, EC Delegations, NGO's ➢ EMYP

ANNEX 7

<u>Terms of Reference</u>

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Evaluation of the Euro-Mediterranean Youth Programme

BACKGROUND

Context

This evaluation is meant to cover the end of the first phase of the Euro-Med Youth Programme and the second phase of the programme. It will help to guide and motivate the ongoing negotiations for the third phase of the programme.

The funds of the first programme were completely committed before the end of 2002. The second phase of the programme was immediately approved respecting the continuity. The funds for this second phase will have to be committed by the end of 2004.

The Barcelona Declaration stressed that "*youth exchanges should be the means to prepare future generations for a closer co-operation between the Euro-Mediterranean partners.*" As part of civil society, young people and youth organisations play a significant role in the restructuring and stability of the neighbouring countries. However, a lack of tradition of voluntary work, limited experience in youth policy and youth work as well as restricted youth mobility are the main obstacles faced by youth NGOs and young people within these neighbouring Regions.

This action started in 1999 and is currently at its second phase. On 15 September 1998, the Med Committee gave its favourable opinion on the proposal for the establishment of a Euro-Mediterranean Youth Action Programme developed in close co-operation with the Youth Unit of DGEAC. This regional Programme was provided with a budget of € 9.7 Mio, initially for two years (1999-2000), of which € 6 Mio financed by MEDA. The second phase of the programme covers three years, from 2002 to 2004. The overall budget for this phase is 14 Millions € (10 Mio coming from MEDA and 4 from EC YOUTH Programme). There was a budget increase of 40 % compared to the first phase of the programme.

Euro-Med Youth is based on the third chapter of the Barcelona Process (Partnership in social, cultural and human affairs). Its aims are to facilitate encounters and partnerships among young people from the e Euro-Mediterranean partnership (25 countries, 35 as from April 2004 a result of EU enlargement). It is also coherent within the context of the Wider Europe policy proposed by the Commission.

The second phase of Euro-Med Youth was focussed on strengthening the support structures - such as training of the National Coordinators within the Mediterranean countries; twinning of national structures with EU YOUTH National Agencies; establishment of a SALTO-Resource Centre and of the Euro-Mediterranean Youth Platform to consolidate the network of NGOs. As a result, it achieved the enhancement of the quality as well as increasing the number of youth projects with a focus on Mediterranean priorities in the field of youth.

Links:

Youth Programme:

http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/index_en.html

Euro-Mediterranean Youth Programme:
http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/priorities/euromed_en.html
DG External Relations:
http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/med_mideast/intro/index.htm
http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/euromed/index.htm

Barcelona Declaration:
http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/euromed/bd.htm

DG Europe Aid:
http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/europeaid/index_en.htm

Report by the high level advisory group established at the initiative of the president of the European Commission
http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/euromed/publication/euromed_report68_en.pdf

Subject of the evaluation

This evaluation is meant to cover the end of the first phase of the Euro-Med Youth Programme and part of the second phase of this programme (2001, 2002 and 2003).

The Programme to be evaluated

1.3.1 Aims

General objective of the Programme
- The development of dialogue, knowledge and mutual comprehension between young people from both shores of the Mediterranean ;
- The promotion of citizenship and young people's integration into social and professional life ;
- The contribution to the democratisation and active participation of the civil society.

1.3.2 Specific objectives

The general goals of the programme are achieved by means of some specific objectives:

- Stimulating active participation of young people in non formal education and multilateral projects based on intercultural dialogue ;
- Promoting the capacity building of youth organisations;
- Promoting exchange of experiences and good practices, as well as acquiring new skills (capacity building) and the diffusion of new methodologies for youth work;
- Offering training activities that help youth workers to develop new ways to manage projects at the international level ;
- Encouraging the development of independent youth NGOs through active participation in social, economical and political life ;
- Favouring the participation of Youth NGOs of partner countries in transnational networks in order to enhance the Euro-Mediterranean dialogue ;

- Reinforcing cooperation between people responsible for local administrations in the youth policies.

1.3.3 Implementation measures

The operational management of the Euro-Mediterranean Youth Action Programme is provided by DG Education and Culture together with the Socrates-Leonardo-Youth Technical Assistance Office (TAO), which provides technical support for project selection rounds. DG EAC chairs selection panels (in which DG External Relations and DG EuropeAid are represented), defines the level of financing of projects and submits the list of selected projects to inter-services consultation prior to the Commission's final decision.

The implementation of the programme provides a good balance between the centralised approach (mainly based on the selection of projects, management of contracts for Mediterranean NGOs, etc.) and the decentralised management through National Coordinators (mainly based on diffusion of information about the programme, support provided to the organisations and promotion of the programme).

The implementation covers four components:

- **Projects**: the Programme offers financial resources and technical assistance to develop three types of activities:

  – transnational youth exchanges,

  – voluntary service projects

  – and support measures, such as training courses, study visits, seminars, etc.

- **National Coordinators**: for the purposes of the implementation of the programme, each Mediterranean partner has been asked to identify and designate an independent National Coordinator with good knowledge of local non-profit associative life, as well as of the needs and realities of youth work. These Coordinators ensure the promotion and development of the programme, in close co-operation with the European Commission and its Delegations in Mediterranean partner countries.

  Nine National Coordinators out of 10 Mediterranean partners have been designated (the coordination in Syria is assumed temporarily by the EC Delegation. Because of their imminent accession to the EU, Malta and Cyprus are not longer considered Mediterranean partners, but will have to be included in the scope of this evaluation.

  National Coordinators are supposed to liaise also with the European co-ordination structures, in particular the network of Youth Action Programme National Agencies, which already exist in each Member State.

  In this way, the Mediterranean Coordinators can benefit from the support, the experience and the common approach that have been developed between the Commission and the structures of the Member States. The development of the programme involves a major effort of exploring and mobilising local associations by means of intensive information and of advisory and training actions directed to youth leaders.

- **Euro-Mediterranean Youth Platform (EMYP)**: to achieve these aims, the Programme has also supported the establishment and activities of the Euro-Mediterranean Platform of youth organisations, founded with the technical support of the European Union Youth Forum. The objectives of the platform are representing youth movements and acting as an interface with authorities responsible for youth matters, giving young people the floor in decisions that concern them, in particular the setting up and development of democratic youth policies.

The first attempt to create such a body was the "Mediterranean Youth Forum", which was created in May 1998 to strengthen youth cooperation in the Euro-Mediterranean region and to manage the regional network between the twelve co-signatory partners of the Barcelona Declaration.

As the MYF entered a period of stagnation, a new structure, the Euro-Mediterranean Youth Platform was launched in September 2003 with a secretariat in Malta. The Euro-Mediterranean Youth Platform is meant to be a place of exchange and cooperation amongst youth organisations in order to create networks, find new partners, get information, exchange good practices, discuss problems and elaborate debate. For the sake of this evaluation, a discussion forum has been created by the Platform as a tool for the consultation of youth organisations on the future of the programme.

Euro-Mediterranean Youth Platform (EMYP): http://www.euromed.org

- ▪ **Other support structures for the implementation of the programme: the Resource Centre SALTO Euro-Med and the covenant with the Council of Europe**.

The first two phases of the Euro-Med Youth programme have been mainly focused on covering one of the priorities highlighted in the previous evaluation: training. The need to develop training courses and seminars for organisations from the Mediterranean in order to develop their capacity building.

In this context, the Commission has developed a strategy for training called SALTO-YOUTH (Support for advanced learning and training opportunities within the Youth Programme). These centres are hosted by a certain number of National Agencies of the Youth Programme. Recently, SALTO YOUTH developed into a network of **8 resource centres**. Each of them concentrates on a specific priority issue, either concerning **regional cooperation** within the Youth Programme (Euro-Med, Eastern Europe and Caucasus, South East Europe), or concerning a **specific content topic or action** (Cultural diversity, Social inclusion, etc.) or h**orizontal** (training cooperation and information).

The Resource Centre SALTO Euro-Med provides project and youth promoters with training courses and seminars, supports National Coordinators and National Agencies, gives information about the programme, etc.

SALTO EURO-MED YOUTH Webpage:
http://www.salto-youth.net/index.php?page=%2Feuromed%2F%3FSID
http://www.salto-youth.net/index.php?page=%2Fhome%2F

Documents: Newsletters produced by the Resource Centre SALTO Euro-Med

Along these lines, the Commission has also developed **a Partnership with the Council of Europe on Euro-Med Youth.** This covenant is focused on training courses on relevant topics to increase the quality of projects and the capacity building of organisations.

Leaflet: The partnership on Euro-Mediterranean Youth cooperation in the field of Training Link: www.photography.hu/euromed

1.3.4 Beneficiaries of the programme

These are young people aged 15 to 25. Young people under 25 represent 50 to 60% of the total population of most Mediterranean partners, i.e. more than 200 million young people aged

between 15 and 25 in the Euro-Med region. The programme is targeted to all young people, in particular to those who have had few, if any, chances to benefit from national or international mobility activities, in particular young women, regardless of their socio-economic profile or their educational, cultural, religious, physical or geographic backgrounds. The programme is also targeted to those responsible for youth associations, clubs and centres/houses, to youth trainers and leaders, and those in charge of youth work at local or national level.

1.3.5 Actions launched to date

From 2000-2003, more than 500 projects have been approved and more than 13.000 young people from both sides of the Mediterranean have participated in the Programme, with a balanced participation of young people coming from the EU Member States and the Mediterranean Partners.

Document: Up-dated statistics 2000-2003 produced by the Technical Assistance Office.

Previous evaluations, studies and reviews

The first phase of the Euro-Med Youth programme was subject to an evaluation carried out by external experts. Goals to be achieved in the second phase of the Programme were inspired by this evaluation.

Executive summary of the mid-term evaluation report:
http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/priorities/evaluation.pdf

CONTRACT OBJECTIVES & EXPECTED RESULTS

The present review will include two phases: a first phase for the evaluation and analysis of the Euro-Med Youth programme and a second phase for the preparation of orientations for future action in this field, including for the extension of the programme.

Overall objectives

The overall objectives to which this contract will contribute are as follows:

- Summative evaluation on the current implementation of the programme

- Conclusions and related recommendations on the programme based on a complete analysis of the current programme implementation and design;.

- Suggestions for the continuation of the programme after 2004

Specific objective

The specific objective of the first phase is to procure an external, independent evaluation covering the first and the second phase of the Euro Mediterranean Youth Action, including conclusions and recommendations for programme improvement.
The specific objective of the second phase is to provide scenarios for the design and implementation of the programme in the future.

Results to be achieved by the contractor

The results to be achieved by the contractor are as follows:

– an external, independent evaluation covering the first and the second phase of the Euro Mediterranean Youth Action programme, according to the provisions of section 3 below;

– Conclusions and recommendations on the programme based on a complete analysis of the current programme implementation and design.

– Suggestions of different scenarios for the extension of the programme , if appropriate

– A presentation of the final report to the Euro Mediterranean Youth Action Committee which will take place in Brussels (probably in September 2004).

THE EVALUATION

Scope

The objectives of the evaluation project are to assess **the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability** of the programme, as well as the impact, according to the specific objectives of the programmes (see point 1.2.3)

• relevance of the Programme's objectives, priorities and implementing instruments;

• the effectiveness and impact of the Programme;

• its efficiency and cost-effectiveness;

• its utility and sustainability;

• the intervention logic of the Programme.

Main evaluation questions

The main evaluation questions have been grouped under 5 headings:

i)   Relevance

ii) Effectiveness

iii) Efficiency

iv) Utility and sustainability

v) Impact.

The detailed questions have been arranged hierarchically. *It is expected that the contractor selected will use their knowledge and experience to refine these questions and propose further questions to the Steering Group (see section 3.4, below).*

i)   Relevance

- To what extent are the Programme's objectives, principles and actions still pertinent with respect to the needs and priorities of the Euro Mediterranean partnership?

- To what extent the completed or on-going projects are appropriate to contributing to the objectives of the third chapter of the Barcelona Process[10] "*Partnership in social, cultural and human affairs*"?

"... *Euromed Youth in the field of youth exchange aiming at facilitating the integration of young people into social and professional life and stimulating the democratisation of the civil society of the Mediterranean partners in that it improves mutual comprehension and cohesion between young people across the Mediterranean basin."*

ii)   Effectiveness

- Is the Programme achieving its objectives? This part covers the relationship between the outputs/results of the programme and the programme expected purpose/specific objectives.

  It is anticipated that some research by the contractor, both documentary and on the basis of interviews with relevant players, will be required under the auspices of the Steering Group (see section 3.4, below) in order to clarify the correct interpretation of official goals. Some typical official statements and related evaluation questions are:

- To what extent is the Programme on track to:
  - *Improving mutual comprehension between the young people of the EU and of the Mediterranean partners, as well as dialogue, respect and tolerance between the various cultures;*
  - *Encouraging youth initiatives;*
  - *Encouraging the development of non-profit making structures working in the youth field and the training of youth leaders in this field, because of the vital role that NGOs play in maintaining and strengthening civil society;*
  - *Promoting exchanges of experience and good practice between youth NGOs of Member States and Mediterranean partners and between those responsible for youth work at the national, regional or local level, in order to establish the bases of co-operation at the level of youth structures and policies.*

- To what extent have the criteria for project selection set out in the Guidelines been applied uniformly?

- To what extent have the stakeholders' implementation projects fulfilled their intended role?

- To what extent have the National Authorities and the MEDA partners fulfilled their intended role?

- To what extent did the financial support granted to the beneficiaries of the Programme merely substitute for support likely to have been provided from other sources anyway?

- How likely is it that the effects of the Programme would have occurred even if the Programme itself had not been launched?

---

5.   [10] The Barcelona Process, five years on , European Communities, 2000

iii) Efficiency

The evaluation project will assess the extent to what the inputs of the programme (budget and human resources) have been economically converted into outputs and results
To what extent has the Euro-Mediterranean Youth Action Programme proved to be clear, consistent and unambiguous in its stipulations and requirements?

* How appropriate has the frequency and timeliness of project selection deadlines?

* How efficient has the selection process been?

* How efficiently have projects been monitored and evaluated?

* Is the budget of the Programme commensurate with its objectives?

* How efficiently did the Programme's delivery mechanisms target the intended beneficiaries?

* What has been the role, if any, of the National Coordinators, the National Agencies, SALTO Euro-Med and Euro-Med Youth Platform? Could this be enhanced, and if so, how?

* How does the efficiency of the Programme compare with any similar interventions executed under Community auspices, or undertaken by national or regional governments?

∘ Which are the main practical obstacles for smooth implementation of the Euro-Med Youth programme?

iv) Utility and sustainability

The evaluation project will assess the sustainability/replicability of the programme's activities and outputs/results where relevant. The review will assess the quality of the technical support to propose and implement the national projects.

- To what extent is the Programme developing capacity building?

- To what extent are the National Co-ordinators and the EMYP Secretariat direct beneficiaries of a transfer of European know-how?

- How is the capacity building taken in to ensure the sustainability of the social dialogue as the main objective of the Barcelona Process?

- To what extent are the support structures helping to achieve sustainability?

v) Impact

The Review Mission should attempt to determine which impact (positive/negative) is likely to be achieved in keeping with the current methodology / approach / trend. The team will assess the visibility of the projects in each country, the impact on young people, youth structures and voluntary sector.

- How is the Mediterranean Youth Programme awareness being developed?

- How is the information circulating?

- Are the information supports adequate? –

How effective is the collaboration between the National Co-ordinators and the EC Delegations in each country?

- How is the national co-ordination developing?

- How do the competent National Authorities perceive the programme?

Methodology to be followed in data collection and analysis

This section gives broad guidelines on the data collection and analysis methods to be followed by the contractor. It is expected that the contractor will use their knowledge and experience to refine the suggested approach in discussion with the Steering Group (see section 3.4 below). The evaluation should be approached in six stages:

a) Reconstruction of the intervention logic

b) Basic data and information-gathering

c) Field interviews

d) Case-studies

e) Stakeholders meeting in Brussels

f) Analysis and assessment.

All data used or referred to in the final evaluation report must be linked to comprehensive metadata (i.e., information enabling users to interpret the data correctly, such as definitions of variables used, sampling decisions, how the data was processed, etc). The sources of all information cited or otherwise referred to must also be given.

a) Reconstruction of the intervention logic

The reconstruction of the intervention logic of the Programme should be used to identify the data and information needed to carry out an analysis and assessment.

b) Basic data and information-gathering

1. During the inception phase, data and information should be gathered from published sources (Programme documentation, Programme website, evaluation reports, speeches, etc). As far as published sources are concerned, EAC/D1 will provide the necessary documentation during the initial briefing in Brussels. Furthermore, information should be gathered directly from the parties involved in the programme. After the briefing by Europe Aid/B/4 and before the field mission, the consultant will be asked to meet the EC and other parties involved in the preparation, the selection and the implementation of the Youth Programme and the Mediterranean Youth Programme in Brussels. Explorative interviews will have to be arranged with:

   - people responsible for the implementation of the programme in DG EAC/D/1, DG RELEX/F/2 and DG AIDCO/B4;

   - people responsible for the implementation of the programme in the Socrates-Leonardo-Youth Technical Assistance Office;

   - representatives from the Resource Centre SALTO Euro-Med (Paris) and the European Youth Forum (Brussels);

A list of people to be interviewed will be agreed during the initial briefing in Brussels. The steering Committee will provide the consultant with facilities in order to arrange these explorative interviews.

c) Field interviews

The evaluation should draw on information and views supplied directly by key Programme stakeholders in the partner countries. The mission will assess the programme in 12 countries: Algeria, Cyprus, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Malta, Morocco, West Bank and Gaza Strip, Syria, Tunisia and Turkey. Missions should combine countries in the same area.

The team will meet the key persons in charge of proposing and implementing the projects i.e.:
– Local authorities,
– EC Delegations;
– National agencies of the Youth Programme;
– The person responsible for the Resource Centre SALTO Euro-Med;
– The person responsible for the Euro-Med Youth Platform;
– National Co-ordinators and civil society involved in the Programme;

The key tool for gathering such views should be tailored semi-structured interviews guide lines. In the inception report, the consultant should provide a possible sample of key programme stakeholders to be interviewed in the partner countries as well as a first draft of the semi-structured interviews guide lines. Focus group could also be considered.

d) Case-studies

Case-studies should be undertaken of an illustrative sample of projects proposed by the EC.

e) Stakeholders meeting in Brussels

In May/June 2004 a meeting will be organised in Brussels by the EC. The following stakeholders are expected to participate:
– National Coordinators;
– National Agencies;
– Beneficiaries of the programme;
– SALTO EURO-MED;
– Technical Assistance Office (TAO).

The consultant is expected to attend this meeting. The aim of the meeting will be providing the consultant with the opportunity to contact almost all the actors of the programme and focus some of the evaluation questions. The consultant is expected to propose some suggestions in order to the organisation of the meeting, in particular:
– Agenda
– Discussion points
– Execution.

f) Analysis and assessment

Considerable emphasis should be placed on this stage of the evaluation.
The detailed evaluation of the Programme should be guided by the data and information gathered from published sources, internal information from the joint administrators of the Programme and key stakeholders, information and opinion gathered by interviews, case studies.

The contractor must support findings and recommendations by an explanation of 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. Where overall judgements in terms of standard evaluation criteria are made (see section 3.2 above), the criteria used should be explained.

Management

3.4.1 Responsible body

The contract will be managed by Unit B4 of the Directorate General Europe Aid of the European Commission. Unit D1 of the Directorate General for Education and Culture and Unit F2 of Directorate General External Relations will be associated to the evaluation.

3.4.2 Management structure

A stakeholder Steering Group will be involved in the management of the evaluation. The responsibilities of the Steering Group will include ensuring that the monitoring and supervision of the contractor does not compromise the contractor's independence in evaluating the action;

This group will comprise:
– the administrators responsible for the programme in DG AIDCO/B4 and DG EAC D1;
– the contact person in DG RELEX/F2;
– a representative from the evaluation sector in DG EAC and/or DG AIDCO
– the EAC evaluation coordinator for the Youth domain.

LOGISTICS AND TIMING

Location

The operational base for the evaluation will be the contractor's home office. It is anticipated that the contractor will need to carry out some interviews in the partner countries.

Starting date

The indicative starting date is 22/03/2004. The contract will actually start after both parties have signed the contract.

Period of execution

The period of execution of the contract is maximum one year.

Work-plan and timetable

The following outline work plan and timetable is envisaged:

Deadline (from starting date)	Task

Inception phase 10 calendar days	Briefing in Brussels. Contractor prepares **inception report** and presents to Steering Group in Brussels.
Data and information collection phase End month 4	Field research completed (included meeting in Brussels).
Analysis phase Mid-month 5	Contractor presents **draft final report** and **draft executive summary** to Steering Group in Brussels.
Beginning month 6	**Final report** and **final executive summary** sent to Steering Group for sign-off.

The reporting requirements are specified in detail in section 6 below.

REQUIREMENTS

Personnel

This assignment should be carried out by two experts. Arabic knowledge would be an asset. Preferably they will have experience in Youth programmes and knowledge of the MED region.

Expert 1, Team leader (Category II): Specialist in evaluation

◦ university post-graduate level in sociology or a relevant related field,
◦ at least ten (10) years of professional experience,
◦ 5 years in working with qualitative aspects of youth programmes, with associations involvement,
◦ at least 10 years of experience in projects evaluation,
◦ knowledge and/or experience of logical framework analysis / programme cycle management/ EC procedures would be an advantage,
◦ good interpersonal skills and capacity to work with programmes and civil society and to liaise with parties concerned by the programme, including beneficiaries,
◦ familiarity with the Mediterranean context, particularly in the concerned sector.

Expert 2 (Category III)

◦ university post-graduate level in sociology or a close field,
◦ 5 years of experience in the field,
◦ good knowledge of Mediterranean socio-cultural context,
◦ experience of Youth exchanges or community life in their country but also in the region,
◦ knowledge of the regional cultural context.

Languages

Experts 1 and 2 will be fluent in English **and** French.

The Contracting Authority estimates that between 120 person-days of work will be required to execute the tasks satisfactorily. The tenderer could propose an allocation of resources that they believe will best achieve the desired results, taking into account the evaluation scope and indicative methodology. An indicative allocation of resources is described here-below:

Schedule and number of days for the assignment per expert

	Tasks	Expert n°	Duration	Total

1	**Briefing in Brussels and preparation in Brussels including inception report (+ including days for travelling)**	**1 & 2**	**7**	**14**
2	**Inception Report**	**1 & 2**	**3**	**6**
3	**Mission in the field (including days for travelling) + including meetings in Brussels**	**1 & 2**	**60**	**120**
4	**Debriefing in Brussels (including days for travelling)**	**1 & 2**	**3**	**6**
5	**Draft and final report**	**1 & 2**	**12**	**24**
	Total			**170**

REPORTS

Reporting requirements

Copies of each report must be submitted to the responsible body in printed form, and each report must also be sent to DG AIDCO B4, DG EAC D1 and RELEX F2 by e-mail. Electronic files must be in Word for Windows format.

The language and style required for each report is specified in sections 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4 below.

The period within which the responsible body will comment on all reports is specified in sections 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4 below. Within 10 working days of receiving the responsible body's observations, the contractor must submit the report in definitive form, taking full account of these observations, either by following them precisely, or by explaining clearly why they cannot be followed. Should the responsible body still not consider the report acceptable, the contractor will be invited to amend the report until the Commission is satisfied.

Inception report

The inception report must be submitted in English within ten calendar days of the date of signature of the contract by the last of the two parties. The responsible body will comment on the inception report within seven calendar days of its receipt.

It 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, and in particular how the methodology will answer each evaluation question and provide a judgement.

Draft final report

The draft final report, including a draft executive summary, must be submitted in English within four months of the date of signature of the contract by the last of the two parties. The responsible body will comment on the draft final report within fifteen calendar days of its receipt. The consultant is expected to send 5 copies of the draft final report to the responsible body.

This document must provide the conclusions of the evaluator in respect of the evaluation questions in the terms of reference and must be clearly based on evidence generated through the evaluation. Judgements provided must be clear and explicit. The draft final report should also contain some exploratory recommendations developed on the basis of the conclusions reached by the evaluator.

It is essential that the report be clear, unambiguous and comprehensible for the non-specialist. Any potential reader must be able to understand:

– the purpose of the evaluation;

– exactly what was evaluated;

– how the evaluation was designed and conducted;

– what evidence was found;

– what conclusions have been drawn on the basis of this evidence;

– what recommendations are being made / lessons learnt on the basis of these conclusions.

The structure of the report should reflect its different uses and follow a broad classification into three parts:

• **Executive summary**. This must provide, in a maximum of five pages, a synthesis of the main conclusions of the evaluation, the key items of evidence that underpin them, and the resulting recommendations.

• **Main report**. This must be aimed at those directly involved in the evaluation and the management of the Programmes. 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 activity to be evaluated, the context of the evaluation, and the methodology used (with an analysis of the latter's strengths and weaknesses).

• **Technical annexes**. These should collate the technical details of the evaluation, and must include the terms of reference, interview guides, any additional tables or graphics, and references and sources.

More details about the structure of the main part of the draft final report will be provided to the selected contractor.

The draft final report will be subjected to a preliminary quality assessment that will verify the extent to which it respects the relevant criteria contained in the contracting authority's Evaluation Standards[11].

Final report

The final report and executive summary must be submitted within four-and-a-half months of the date of signature of the contract by the last of the two parties. The responsible body will comment on the final report within fifteen calendar days of its receipt.

---

6. [11] See standards D.1 to D.6 inclusive on p.13 of the European Commission's *Communication on Evaluation Standards and Good Practice*, C(2002) 5267, 23.12.2002
    http://europa.eu.int/comm/budget/evaluation/pdf/C_2002_5267_final_en.pdf

The consultant is expected to send a total of **60 paper copies** of the draft final report to the responsible body (45 copies in English and 15 copies in French) **and the electronic versions** of the documents.

The report must be provided in English and French as well as the executive summary. It 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 evaluator in respect of their conclusions.

Tentative date of submission final report

Beginning September 2004.