

Summary of the settlement of comments of the final report "Evaluation of the communication strategy and publicity of RDI OP"

No.	Name of document	Name of chapter	Page	Notes	Correction proposal	Settlement
1	Final report	Summary		Presentation of conclusions and recommendations is unclear. I recommend presenting it as - indicate key conclusions, then the list of most significant recommendations (see example below).	Rewrite	There are formulated summary conclusions for each evaluation task –response to the evaluation circuit. Summary adjusted according to comments in FR.
2		Introduction of project background	11,12	Two paragraphs write about CoP of RDI OP, then a paragraph on ACoP is inserted, which I think does not follow on the previous paragraph and the text about CoP continues, where nothing at all is written about ACoP - information about ACoP appears to me as "extra"	Arrange for it to follow better	Edited OK
3		Applied methods and project methodology	18	A bit misleading title, "A survey of the beneficiaries of support from RDI OP" - it is the applicant and beneficiary	Add "Applicants" to the title	Edited OK
4		4.1	21	Chart - Target group of beneficiaries of support from RDI OP - it obviously also concerns applicants (?)	Add "Applicants"	Edited OK
5		4.2	22	There is also a little confusion about exactly whom is spoken of.	Specify when it concerns applicants and beneficiaries, and when about potential applicants and beneficiaries.	Edited Text edited, figures modified and added.
6		Summary,	9, 31	The summary does not reflect the main findings of	Rethink findings	The text on page 9 refers to a negative evaluation by

Summary of the settlement of comments of the final report "Evaluation of the communication strategy and publicity of RDI OP"

		Chapter 5		the report. Page 9 states that: <i>„The target groups evaluate changes in information through web portals negatively, especially www.msmt.cz, which became and recently is becoming confusing and unstructured, it is very difficult to ascertain sought information.“</i> This statement is not consistent with findings from another part of the report, specifically page 31, Section 3.1 <i>"Beneficiaries are rather satisfied with the websites of the operational programmes, the governing body and eligible applicants".</i>	Ensure consistency between the summary and other parts of the report at this example and throughout the whole report.	respondents of website changes however, the overall assessment and the use of the portal is better evaluated (see text on page 31). On page 9, second paragraph accompanied by explanatory text. OK
7		Chapter 5	Generally	Under each heading of the evaluation tasks it is necessary to have a brief summary that directly addresses the question. Otherwise, the reader will have difficulty finding answers to questions in the report.	Add the proposed summary to each task / question.	Added summary for each evaluation circuit. OK
8		Chapter 5	24, last sentence	„However, the selected activities anticipated in ACoP that are tied to the selection of external service providers (media communications, event agency, promotional items, etc.) are not implemented according to original plans. The selection of external suppliers (for selected services, carried out together with the EC OP) was not completed in the monitored period, it was thus not possible to secure the application of the planned instruments at the expected intensity“. Why not? Will this problem have any effect on the overall success of the CoP?	Clarify	Text added. Added text regarding the reasons for not completing the selection of suppliers, text added regarding the possible consequences of rules of implementing the regulation.

Summary of the settlement of comments of the final report "Evaluation of the communication strategy and publicity of RDI OP"

9			25, Section 1.2 Also, page. 31, section 3.1, third and fourth paragraph	The text is a mixture of findings, conclusions and recommendations from the respondents. While this is useful feedback, its presentation is not good. As regards the recommendations of the respondents, it is not clear 1) whether they are justified and 2) whether the evaluator agrees with the recommendations. If so, the text must clearly reflect them and the recommendations must be moved to the appropriate place (recommendations section). Otherwise the wording of the text should be rewritten so that the findings lead to clear conclusions.	Clarify the nature of the findings and recommendations as well as rewrite the text, put the recommendations into place	Section 1.2 - Text revised and edited. Section 3.1 - text with regard to section 1.2 edited and reduced. Recommendations concentrated in chap. 6
10			26, Section 1.3	See above	Rewrite paragraph	Text edited and added OK
11			27-28, section 2.1 – 2.3	The trend is clear = beneficiaries have the highest awareness. General public the lowest. Analysis is missing 1) why? 2) if this is important, and 3) if so, what to do?	state reasons and the significance of this finding, alternatively rewrite sections	Section 2.1 - Text added Section 2.3 - Text added Text edited and added with a link to the formulation of implementing the regulation, as well as data of interest in submitting additional projects (see terrain survey)
12			33-34, Section 3.5	A key part of the report is too strict and does not provide detailed information on how to adjust the indicators.	Add more specific and detailed analysis of a set of indicators	Added text and charts – output indicators and results, impact indicators. OK

Summary of the settlement of comments of the final report "Evaluation of the communication strategy and publicity of RDI OP"

13			34-35, 3,4 section 3.6 Also page 36, section 4.2 last paragraph page 38, section 4.5	This makes no sense. If a "significant part of the selection procedures was not completed" and „according to plan, the results and impacts of awareness of target groups are also correspondingly lower," how can the evaluator therefore say that the awareness of the target group is at a sufficient level? Logically this implies that either the current level is OK and then there is no need to spend more money on CoP activities, or not and they must quickly tender for other activities.	Clarify, alternatively rewrite	Texts in the relevant sections are edited and added. Added text regarding possible consequences (see the provisions in the implementing regulation).
14		Chapter 6	generally	Confusing presentation of recommendations. The management of the GB needs an understandable overview of recommendations that can easily be read and understood what is to be done for the CoP to work well / better. Missing logical line: conclusion-findings-recommendations. All the key recommendations and responses to evaluation questions should be in the final report, not in the annex. This chapter must have a chart at the beginning defending the following information: • Key issues in the evaluation (What important thing happened in CoP?) • Conclusion (why the event is important for the OP) • Relevant recommendations (what must be done)	Make a chart of conclusions and related recommendations	Text revised and added to the form of a chart. Adjustments made in the regime of changes in the FR.

Summary of the settlement of comments of the final report "Evaluation of the communication strategy and publicity of RDI OP"

				• Who must do it • Due date (until when will this be done)		
15			39, section 6.1	This part of the report is unnecessary in this form - the evaluator must provide concrete targeted measures, not idle phrases from the guide of the management.	Rewrite section 6.1, give concrete recommendations.	Text edited. OK
16	Annex - recommendation	Whole document		The document is very large and contains a large amount of information. Unfortunately it is not clear and the overall presentation of the recommendation is chaotic. The recommendations are not prioritized by importance or urgency, it is not clear for whom the recommendations are intended (I suppose that only the GB, but why not other bodies?). Its practical application is apparently not taken into account.	At least introduce a chart according to the model in note 10, otherwise consider whether the annex cannot be more practical, concise, clearer, and more "user friendly".	Recommendations based on the results of the discussion of processing comments are in chart format included in the text of the report. The document of the annex now has only a complimentary character. Adjustments made in the structure, general parts removed, links added to relevant provisions of the regulation. Submitted 17. 5. 2011.
17	Annex recommended communication activities	Whole document		The need to exploit the potential of social network is discussed in the documents. On the other hand, the benefits of these tools for the RDI OP is not evaluated anywhere.	add text about the analysis	Social networks and appropriate target groups added directly into the text of the report. OK
18		1.3	7	The document must be drawn up by the end of November (according to OM), because it is	To launch in the start of December	Edited, launched in the start of December

Summary of the settlement of comments of the final report "Evaluation of the communication strategy and publicity of RDI OP"

				necessary to present it to the Monitoring Committee.		OK
19		1.4	10	Is the survey of PORC in education relevant to the RDI OP?	Explain or edit text	Text edited, link to Eurobarometer kept. OK
20		2.1.7	18	Media Communication - editorial cooperation – How to show this indicator? In what time frame? How to apply a media response to specific results?	Better elaborate methodology for monitoring this indicator - now it is very general and, according to me, very hard to follow in order to have an informative value (number of responses to a press release)	The indicator need not be set in its proposed form at all levels, in editorial collaboration it is possible to determine e.g. only at the output level. Explanatory text added before the chart. Reporting is then a matter of the setting of the monitoring of campaigns. It will be determined differently in the case of external security and internal security of media communication. Recommendation in the FR No. 3.1 + Evaluation question 3.5
21		2.1.7	19	Number of webs – is it appropriate to monitor only the number of visitors?	Extend also to the number of unique visitors – the website of the MEY&S unfortunately does not enable this observation however, in my opinion it would be very useful to monitor these statistics	Recommendation added directly into the text of the report - it is appropriate to monitor standard traffic statistics. Recommendation No. 3.3

Summary of the settlement of comments of the final report "Evaluation of the communication strategy and publicity of RDI OP"

22	Annex of recommended communication activities	Charter 3 and further on	21 and further on	Textbook advice - useful, but lacking in specific examples, how to revise the CoP, alternatively information on whether or not to revise and to what extent Textbook advice - no detailed linkage with the RDI OP (what is not/applicable to the RDI OP, possible risks, benefits, what is needed to secure (e.g. human resources))	I recommend giving specific examples of how to revise the current document, i.e. the extent with which to pay attention to chapters, and alternatively how to enrich the CoP (if deemed necessary).	Document revised – moved some recommendations in the report, the function of the document is now rather as complementary OK
23	Annex of terrain survey	Whole document		Prague - further clarify the survey in the region of Prague in connection with the unfamiliarity of costs	Complete the text	The seat of the region, "Prague", was mentioned in the survey deliberately, because of finding out the awareness of the legitimacy of territorial bodies when submitting projects to the RDI OP. The relevant question and graphs (graph 3, 25, Question No. 7 at the part of the questionnaire evaluation as regards potential applicants - page 44) clarifies adding the option of having "Prague" included. OK
24		1.1.1	22	Graph No.15 – unreadable description of the graph	Correct descriptions	Corrected. OK

Summary of the settlement of comments of the final report "Evaluation of the communication strategy and publicity of RDI OP"

25		1.2.1	44	The reason for not implementing projects for the support of the RDI OP was: "complexity, bureaucracy and lack of transparency of the system" characteristically together in the queries of respondents? Do potential applicants think that the system is too bureaucratic and not transparent at the same time? But that is perhaps only detail.		The characteristics of "complexity, bureaucracy, transparency of the system" were mentioned collectively according to the answer "We are concerned about too much complexity, bureaucracy and lack of transparency in the system." Respondents were able to characterize the reasons for not implementing projects in the form of comments, but the comments of the respondents did not refer to bureaucracy and the lack of transparency. OK
26	Annex - Survey of OP awareness among the general public	1.1.3	9	Collocation "the bigger half" ☺	the bigger half/ more than half	Corrected to "greater part". OK
27		1.1.4	12	Name of project: SUSAN	Correct to SUSEN	Corrected in texts and charts. OK
28	Annex - Analysis of media coverage of drawing	3.6	23,24	Why are primary schools, secondary schools, etc. shown in the charts?	Focus only on beneficiaries/bodies of the RDO OP	Media analysis was performed for the operational programmes of the MEY&S, i.e. the RDI OP and

Summary of the settlement of comments of the final report "Evaluation of the communication strategy and publicity of RDI OP"

	European funds from MEY&S					EC OP together, with a number of reports it cannot be logically separated. For this reason, all the relevant bodies for both OP appear in the relevant graphs and charts. The output can also be used in terms of a comparative analysis – EC OP vs. RDI OP. OK
--	---------------------------	--	--	--	--	---