



European Union  
Investing in your Future  
European Social Fund

*Community of Madrid ROP ESF  
2014-2020*

*Communication Strategy  
Evaluation*

*Executive Summary*



## COMMUNITY OF MADRID ROP ESF 2014-2020 COMMUNICATION STRATEGY- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The **context of the present evaluation** is determined by the programming period 2014 – 2020 application rules that establish the need to highlight the role played by the European Union, **ensure the transparency of aid from the Funds and transmit the achievements of the Cohesion Policy** and inform potential beneficiaries about funding opportunities. They also set the obligation to assess the results of the information and communication measures developed, regarding degree of visibility and awareness of the programs, as well as the role played by the EU.

This compulsory midterm evaluation of the Community of Madrid ROP ESF 2014-2020 Communication Strategy has been carried out following comprehensively the evaluation methodology provided in the **Methodological Guide for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Communication Strategies of the ERDF Operational Programs and the European Social Fund 2014-2020**, provided by the National Management Authorities. The temporal scope of the Evaluation encompasses the information and communication actions carried out between January 1, 2014 and June 30, 2019.

As far as the **methodology used** during the evaluation process is concerned, it has been a combination of both quantitative and qualitative techniques. The latter have based on interviews with the ESF Managing Authority, Intermediate Coordinating Body and Intermediate Managing Organisms of the OP, as well as in the holding of Focus Groups and an interview with the citizens of the Community of Madrid on the basis of a proportional stratified sample<sup>1</sup>. Quantitative techniques have focused on the analysis of the communication indicators, both performance and result indicators. Also, an intense work of documentary analysis has been carried out.

Regarding the analysis of the **validity and consistency** of the Communication Strategy, it can be seen that there is a programming logic that extends from the general objectives to the specific objectives, through the different levels of application of the same (program and project level), so these are guaranteed.

It can be verified that in the ROP Communication Strategy there is **a proportionality** in terms of the planned budget for information and communication measures, from the qualitative point of view and in view of the degree of execution of the actions through which these measures are specified. There have been significant advances throughout the programming period so far, as actions have been carried out by the vast majority of Intermediate Managing Bodies and the Intermediate Coordinating Body itself.

Regarding the **Communication Indicators**, they are divided into **Performance Indicators**, which measure the degree of execution of the actions that feed each of them and **Result Indicators**, which measure the degree of achievement thereof, regarding the goals set for the end of the programming period and reflected in the Communication Strategy. Below are two compilation tables of the degrees of execution of the indicators.

---

<sup>1</sup> CATI (Computed Assisted Telephone Interview)

## Performance Indicators

Performance Indicators	Programmed	Total	
		Executed	%
1. Number of activities and public events	1.550	809	52,19%
2. Number of disseminating actions	523	914	174,76%
3. Number of external publications carried out	500	583	116,60%
4. Number of web pages	100	282	282,00%
5. Number advertising media	1.350	605	44,81%
6. Number of internal documents distributed	2.600	130	5,00%
7. Number of information and publicity networks	10	3	30,00%

Source: Data offered by the different Intermediate Management Bodies on the actions implemented in the framework of the Communication Strategy (data as of June 30, 2019).

The **performance indicators'** degree of execution is, in the case of indicators 1 "Number of activities and public events" and number 5 "Number of advertising media", somewhat lower than what would be in line with the timing of the programming period this evaluation is carried out. Indicators number 2 "Number of dissemination actions", number 3 "Number of external publications carried out" and 4 "Number of web pages", are in values that greatly exceed the target value established in the Communication Strategy, in what could imply an excess of execution. Indicator number 4 "Number of internal documents distributed" is the one that is in furthest values to the goal, because it feeds on information that usually tends not to be registered.

## Result Indicators

Result Indicators	Programmed	Total	
		Executed	%
1. Number of attendees	40.000	92.344	230,86%
3.1. "% of distributed / edited publications	350	90,12%	
3.2. Number of distribution points	381	5.947	1.560,89%
4. Number of visits to web pages	1.980.000	2.571.090	129,85%
6. % of covered organisms	100%	99,6%	
7.1. Number of meetings	160	23	14,38%
7.2. Number of attendees	700	51	7,29%

Source: Data offered by the different Intermediate Management Bodies on the actions implemented in the framework of the Communication Strategy (data as of June 30, 2019).

As for the **Result Indicators**, they show an uneven degree of progress towards the goal. In three of the seven indicators analysed, the expected values for the end of the period have been exceeded: Number of distribution points, Number of attendees and Number of visits to web pages. In the first case, the extreme execution value presented by the indicator is due to a calculation methodology that does not correspond to the one established. The indicators that measure the "% of covered organisms" and the "% of distributed / edited publications" are very close to reaching their goal with 96.9% and 90.12% of execution respectively. The values reached by indicators 7.1 and 7.2, Number of attendees and Number of meetings, both referring to the Communication Networks, they show even further values from the expected goal.

In the Evaluation it has been recommended to **revise upwards** the expected values of those Indicators that are already very close to reaching the value established in the Strategy by the end of the programming period, in order to adapt them more realistically to their execution levels. Likewise, in the case of indicators that are further from the planned goals, recommendations have been formulated **to increase the rate of implementation** of the measures that feed them to achieve the target value established in the Strategy for the end of the programming period.

The **percentage of expenditure on information and communication** in the different actions that are within the Communication Strategy is high, **exceeding 85% of the planned total**.

Another mandatory aspect that has been assessed in the Evaluation has been that the **Annual Implementation Reports** presented since the approval of the ROP include the mandatory information from the regulatory point of view regarding information and communication on the activities carried out in this area in each annuity within the framework of this ESF ROP 2014-2020 for the Community of Madrid.

It should be noted that **the compliance with the information and communication objectives** under the ESF ROP 2014-2020 **is high** if the obligations established at the regulatory level are taken into account, as well as the degree of implementation of the measures provided for in the Communication Strategy. However, there are possibilities for improvement in terms of monitoring the methodology for calculating the communication indicators or reporting on Good Practices, including justification of the criteria agreed in the GERIP<sup>2</sup> that constitute them as such. All this has been the subject of some recommendations by the evaluation team, to contribute to the improvement of these aspects.

The **Principle of Equal Opportunities** has been taken into account when planning the Strategy and in the information and publicity measures it foresees. Likewise, this Principle has been widely observed in the information and communication actions carried out, through which the measures have been specified, carried out during the evaluation period from January 1, 2014 to June 30, 2019.

Within the framework of the Evaluation, the following set of **impact indicators** have been analysed:

1. Degree of knowledge of the obligations on the part of the Intermediate Managing Bodies.
2. Satisfaction rate with the information provided to the Intermediate Managing Bodies for the compliance of the information and communication obligations.
3. Rate of utility of the actions carried out to inform about the obligations of information and communication.
4. Degree of knowledge of the different Funds by the citizens.
5. Degree of knowledge of the role played by the European Union.

---

<sup>2</sup> Spanish Group of Responsibles for Information and Publicity

The **results in terms of impact are highly positive** since the utility rate and satisfaction with the information provided is high. Likewise, the degree of knowledge of the obligations is also significant, although it has decreased with respect to the end of the previous programming period. The **degree of knowledge on the part of the citizens** about the fact that the Community of Madrid receives money from the EU to contribute to economic and social progress is very high (74.9% of the people surveyed said they had this knowledge) having already reached the target value for the end of the programming period. The knowledge of the term "European Social Fund" in particular is not so widely acknowledged by citizens.

The **Good Practices** elaborated in the framework of the Regional Operational Program constitute outstanding actions selected as such by the Intermediate Managing Bodies themselves and also provide relevant information in order to justify their status as relevant projects, although they do not include the justification of the criteria established by the GERIP. Therefore, a recommendation has been made in this regard by the evaluation team to homogenize those Good Practices presented for their inclusion on the Management Authority's website in order to increase their dissemination, as well as to publish them on the websites of the Intermediate Managing Bodies with this same purpose.