

General programme "Fundamental Rights and Justice": specific programme "Fight against violence" - Daphne III Programme 2007-2013

2005/0037A(COD) - 06/02/2017 - Follow-up document

The Commission presents an *ex post* evaluation report on the Daphne programme (2007-2013).

The main aspects evaluated are:

relevance;

coherence and compatibility;

effectiveness;

sustainability and transferability;

efficiency;

the scope for simplification and EU added value.

An independent external evaluator assisted by the Commission's staff carried out the evaluation.

To recall, the programme had the following general objectives:

to help protect children, young people and women against all forms of violence and to help them attain a high level of health protection, wellbeing and social cohesion;

to help develop Community policies (in public health, human rights and gender equality) and action to protect children's rights and combat trafficking in human beings and sexual exploitation.

The total budget earmarked for Daphne III (2007-2013) was almost **EUR 123.88 million**.

Main conclusions:

1) Relevance of the programme: in general, the initiatives carried out under the Daphne III programme were relevant to the programme and its objectives and priorities. Priority setting was not a standardised process.

The programme funded many initiatives that informed and supported policy and legislative development. Overall, initiatives appear to have been designed to respond to beneficiaries' identified needs and developed on the basis of needs assessments.

2) Coherence and complementarity: there was substantial scope for complementarity and thus also the risk of overlap between Daphne III and the Criminal Justice (JPEN) and Fundamental Rights and

Citizenship (FRC) DG Justice programmes, as well as - to a lesser extent - the Safer Internet Plus programme (DG DIGIT). Even though there is some overlap, the stage of the process involving calls for proposals helped differentiate them to some extent.

3) Effectiveness: most measures helped improve protection for victims of violence or groups at risk, either directly or indirectly. A significant number also appear to have contributed to policymaking and law making at national level – and to some extent at EU level. Most projects achieved their own objectives and there is already good evidence of positive results, as well as evidence of unexpected positive results.

4) Sustainability: it was found that the Commission had been less successful in projects' outputs dissemination. This was mainly due to lack of human resources and emphasis on financial reporting and production of project outputs. Although arrangements have been made in some cases to continue using the outputs and making them available (e.g. a website), grant beneficiaries say additional funding is needed to be able to continue project activities. On the other hand, a significant part of activities developed under the programme would have not been developed had the programme not existed.

5) Efficiency: demand for Daphne III funding was high, mainly because of the nature of the programme and the type of eligible grant beneficiaries. The funding made available was sufficient for grants to achieve their objectives. However, the needs of procurement as a funding tool were overestimated.

As regards scope of simplification, the level of detail required in the application form has increased from the 2010 call. This has benefited both the Commission and the applicants.

6) EU added value: most grant beneficiaries found that the transnational partnerships required under the programme enabled them to learn from other countries. For many others, the chance to disseminate the outputs and results of their project at EU level was also a real advantage.

EU 'branding' also gave added momentum to some projects and greater leverage with policymakers and other key stakeholders.

For networks, such as *EuroNet-FGM* and *Missing Children Europe*, it is likely that only an EU programme would have enabled them to achieve their goals.

However, the geographic coverage of the project was rather limited, with the main lead organisations being based in the UK, Italy, Germany and Belgium.

Key recommendations: amongst the main recommendations made by the Commission following the evaluation of the programme are the following:

better define the priorities, to ensure that these help the programme to achieve specific objectives relevant to the programmes' general objectives ;

support the achievement of longer-term objectives, and influence policymakers and target audiences;

make realistic assessments of **project risks** and better risk mitigation strategies, by asking for brief progress reports that identify any potential risks as they arise during the implementation of the project;

increase focus on **assessment of impacts at all levels** and not merely on outputs, as regards monitoring and evaluation;

explore ways of enhancing the uptake of project outputs, results and best practices by other organisations, including in other Member States, with **more resources for dissemination**;

sharpen the **programme's intervention logic**.