

Appendix 2: Phase II - Case Study Research Instruments

Individual Case Study Guidance Notes, Reporting Structure and Interview Template

This document contains three papers:

- PAPER 1 A **Guidance Note** on undertaking individual case studies,
- PAPER 2 A standard **Reporting Structure** for writing up case studies, and
- PAPER 3 A standard **Interview Template** for undertaking and recording interviews.

Each document should be read thoroughly and with care before embarking on any fieldwork.

Case Study Approach

The project workplan states that in Phase 2 you will undertake a number of related case studies. These, together with the work undertaken in Phase 1, will form a Country Report. The selection of case studies is appended.

The case study method employed is that of a history of the partnership, illustrated by critical incidents.

The case study fieldwork will be based on documentary review and face to face interviews. Multiple informants will be used in each case and for investigating each 'critical incident'. Background interviews will also be undertaken with other stakeholders.

The Interview Template has been produced to ensure consistency of approach between different countries. You will need to expand this by adding further questions to undertake the work fully.

Paper 1 Guidance Note

1.0 Case Study Method

The following table summarises the steps of the case study methodology:

Task	Output
<p><i>You will need to interview a common set of individuals, across all your case studies, who have national responsibility (probably between 4 and 8 persons)</i></p> <p>Interview key stakeholders in national Structural Fund 'system' including as appropriate Commission desk officers; competent officials at relevant government departments; representatives of social partners; and other participants in policy debates</p> <p><i>For each individual case study -</i></p> <p>Review key documentary records including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ monitoring committee minutes ◇ ex-ante, interim, ex-post evaluations ◇ programming documents ◇ other relevant studies <p>and interview helpful sources (e.g. journalists, academics, evaluators, auditors)</p> <p>Interview key informants (members of monitoring committees and other partnership bodies and associated bodies) concerning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ overall history of the programme and partnership ◇ key relationships in the partnership ◇ critical incidents (illustrative events) selected for investigation ◇ interviewees perspectives on partnership <p>in line with the Interview Template provided. This will probably involve interviews with up to 8 people.</p> <p>Write up of individual cases covering (among other things):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ history ◇ context ◇ attributes ◇ activities ◇ outputs <p>and their relationships, illustrated (and documented) through critical incidents according to the Reporting Structure provided</p> <p>Return relevant extracts to informants for comments</p> <p><i>Taking all your case studies together -</i></p> <p>Write up of the 'national case'</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of key 'national' issues • Basic description of partnership structure • Basic description of partnership activities • Identification of critical incidents to investigate • Identification of informants to interview • Partnership history (what happened) • Comparable reports on overall history, key relationships and critical incidents • Write up of case studies • Analysis and interpretation • Verification of case studies • Final reporting

2.0 Reporting Framework

The Case Studies are to be written up in four parts based on the following **Reporting Framework**:

- Section A: Description of partnership attributes (structure) according to standard categories
- Section B: Description of programme activities (tasks) according to standard categories
- Section C: The Case Study Analysis (discursive/descriptive answers relating to overarching study questions)
- Section D: Summary Case Study Analysis (tabular summaries of the Case Study Analysis)

3.0 Explanatory Notes

3.1 *Identifying the main stakeholders, and selecting critical incidents and informants*

You will need to identify for yourself the main stakeholders, critical incidents to examine, and relevant documentation and key informants to interview.

Three critical incidents¹ should be selected for examination in each case study, one drawn from each of the three main phases of programme activities, ie:

1. Preparation and Planning
2. Implementation and Management
3. Monitoring and Evaluation

(The component activities (tasks) of these three main phases are laid out in **Table B.1** in PAPER 2: the **Reporting Structure**).

3.2 *Interviews*

The interviews have two main objectives (firstly they are expected to verify/test current understandings/concepts of partnership. Secondly, they are expected to gather/help develop new understandings/concepts of partnership). Questions will be of two types:

1. Questions which address the history of the partnership according to various specified categories of partnership behaviour, and which address the specific critical incidents identified by you for investigation.
2. Questions concerning your interviewees' own judgements/views on partnership.

As you are required to identify for yourself the main stakeholders, critical incidents to examine, and relevant documentation and key informants to interview, there is a limit to what can be provided in terms of fieldwork proformas such as interview schedules. Therefore in PAPER 3: the **Interview Template** we combine a common set of core tasks with a freedom for you to define your own questions to interviewees.

¹ In exceptional circumstances, because of the nature, scale or maturity of the case, it may only be possible to identify two useful critical incidents.

3.3 *Evaluation Questions*

Please carefully distinguish between the evaluation questions, which should be addressed in the case study report and are presented in PAPER 2: the **Reporting Structure** as a frame for description and analysis, and actual *interview questions* which should be defined by you following the prompts which are suggested in PAPER 3: the **Interview Template**.

3.4 *Records*

With your case study reports you are required to provide:

- a list of all documents consulted, with copies of (or extracts from) documents not widely available attached
- fieldnotes on all interviews (according to the **Interview Template** provided: in English or language of interview, and in electronic form (preferably MS-Word))

You should carefully reference data in case studies to interviews and documents, by means of footnotes or notes in the margin. Please make clear the system/approach you are using.

3.5 *Critical Incidents*

Examining critical incidents is central to our case study approach. By 'critical incident' we mean an event which 'uncovers', 'illustrates' or 'lays bare' some key relationship or dynamic of a partnership. A critical incident (also known as an illustrative event) may be considered to be a micro-case study within the case study which sheds light on the relationship between the *context* (eg regional or sectoral setting, national policies, ...) of a partnership (*much of which you have already detailed in your Phase 1 report*), its *attributes* (eg number of obligatory partners, legal powers, ...), its *activities* (project selection, monitoring, ...) and its *outcomes* (eg rate of fund absorption, effect on inter-organisational co-ordination, ...).

A critical incident will normally consist of one of the formal activities of the partnership (say, project selection or re-programming) which had some transformative effect (something happened, something changed), where it might be possible to see (relate) something about the nature of the partnership to the outcomes (effects) of the partnership.

Critical incident analysis allows us to substantiate our partnership 'histories'. It is important that information on critical incidents is carefully cross checked using data from a number of different sources (documents and multiple informants).

Examining a critical incident will allow us to comment in our case studies on the nature and dynamics of partnership under different conditions and to assess the relationship (if any) between partnership arrangements and programme performance.

Paper 2. Reporting Structure

This reporting structure applies to each case study you have been asked to undertake. Please follow the same numbering system and reproduce the tables in your case study report.

Section A: Description of Partnership attributes (structure)

Please set out the basic facts about the partnership. This should be based in the first instance on documentary review and your interviews with the key stakeholders (although you will probably need to revise and augment your findings with data gathered from other informants as your research progresses).

Please define the full extent of the partnership paying attention to the different levels including the monitoring committee, thematic working groups and any other bodies. Please also define elements of the wider (informal) partnership including NGOs, and other representatives of civil society.

A.1 The legal framework

Please explain the legal and regulatory context of the partnership.

A.2 The administrative structure

You should identify:

- the number of partners,
- who the vertical (obligatory) partners are,
- the number and types of horizontal partners (identifying: regional or local authorities, political representatives, etc),

This should include all management and operational arrangements which may not necessarily be required by statute such as management committees, secretariats, consultative fora etc.

You should set out the structure of the partnership indicating:

- the delegation of powers,
- the status and role of different groups,
- the particular role of political representatives and the social partners,
- the procedures for making key programme decisions (eg re-programming)
- whether competitive bidding exists for project selection

You should also set out here how any informal arrangements for partnership differ from the formal partnership structures.

Section B: Description of Programme activities (tasks)

Using **Table B.1**, this section should describe who does what for the activities identified. Please also clarify for each which partners are involved and in what way, and what are the strengths and weaknesses of this type of involvement (an example follows for 'programme preparation'). If it is the monitoring committee, or other formal group, whose membership was listed in Section A please simply state 'MC'/[group title] - do not re-list the membership.

Example B.1: Description of Programme activities (tasks)

Task	Partners Involved	Types of Involvement	Strengths and Weaknesses of this type of involvement
I. Preparation & Planning
a) programme preparation	P1 Commission P2 Central Govt. -Dept.of Finance -Dept.of Industry P3 Regional Authorities	approval define priorities provide information / advice; consulted	(strength) wide consultation with those who will be responsible for implementation (weakness) insufficient involvement of potential beneficiaries

Table B.1: Description of Programme activities (tasks)

Task	Partners Involved	Types of Involvement	Strengths and Weaknesses of this type of involvement
I. Preparation & Planning			
a) programme preparation			
b) negotiating programme content between the Commission and national government			
c) identifying which spatial areas should receive targeted assistance			
d) deciding on project selection criteria			
e) programme evaluation (ex-ante)			
f) any other key activities			
II. Implementation & Management			
g) selection of which projects to fund			
h) payment to projects			
i) management of the programme			
j) use of technical assistance			
k) undertaking actual projects (as beneficiaries)			
l) any other key activities			
III. Monitoring and Evaluation			
m) monitoring of projects			
n) programme monitoring			
o) deciding on programme adjustments including re-programming			
p) programme evaluation (ex-post)			
q) use of technical assistance			
r) any other key activities			

Section C: Case Study Analysis

This Section should describe the history of the partnership using a Critical Incident and other sources to illustrate/explain how the partnership has responded at each of the following three programme stages and how this has shaped its outputs.

- *preparation and planning*
- *implementation and management*
- *monitoring and evaluation*

*This should be a synthetic description based on the full range of documents, informants and background literature you have surveyed. It should **not** simply be a summary of the views of your informants. You should provide references to your sources where ever possible. You should clearly relate the context, attributes, activities and outputs of the partnership to each other.*

C.1 Description of history and critical incidents

C.1.1 Describe the operation and development of the partnership. You may find it helpful to refer back to set of programme stages and activities listed in **Table B.1**.

You should include here an outline of the three 'critical incidents' you have chosen to investigate.

Your history of the partnership should highlight (*by way of references to critical incidents or otherwise*):

- I. any history of previous development initiatives in a particular area
- II. any history of previous co-operation between partners
- III. the requirements of the regulations of the different funds (ESF, ERDF, EAGGF-Guidance Fund, and FIFG)
- IV. the arrangements put in place by the member state to meet its responsibilities under the Structure Fund regulations
- V. whether partnership consists of wider arrangements/relationships than just the monitoring committee
- VI. levels of resources and expertise available to the partners
- VII. whether partners were regarded as legitimate members of the partnership by other partners
- VIII. whether partners were regarded as legitimate members of the partnership by those outside the partnership
- IX. the number of partners involved
- X. common understandings between partners of their role in the partnership
- XI. the degree of integration of the Structural Funds' Programmes with other national, regional, or local programmes
- XII. levels of collaboration between partners
- XIII. levels of collaboration between the partnership and other agencies
- XIV. where partnership is rendered in-operable/superseded by other arrangements.

C.1.2 Describe the evolution of the partnership culture. You may wish to express this in terms of:

- experience(s) gained (of what, by whom)
- changes in attitudes and behaviour over the programming cycle (of what, by whom)
- evolution of strategies (at programme, sub-programme, and ex-programme levels)
- unexpected consequences of any partnership activities
- organisational learning (by the partnership as a whole, and by individual partner organisations)
- innovative behaviours and lessons learned in partnership (of what, by whom)

C.1.3 Describe the contribution of partnership, positive or negative, to:

- the planning, implementation and quality of programmes
- greater transparency in programme operation
- more effective management of resources
- increasing the overhead costs of the programme
- complexity and delay in programme decision-making
- the development of institutional capacity (nationally, locally)
- local partnership development
- the structures and behaviours of the member state in non-Structural Fund domains.
- the structures and behaviours of the Structural Funds
- achievement of programme aims

C.1.4 Describe the contribution of partnership to actual material outcomes, such as:

Intermediate outcomes of partnership, which might include:

- *efficient implementation*, for example
 - conformance with regulations
 - adequate fund absorption
 - good timetabling
- *effective decision making*, for example:
 - better project selection
 - addressing key development bottlenecks
 - projects which address expressed user needs

Final outcomes of partnership might include:

- *enhancing development capacity*, for example
 - more relevant sectoral and regional plans
 - institutional innovation and inter-institutional co-operation
- *policy success*, for example
 - job creation
 - economic revival
 - social cohesion
 - local development

C.2 Assessment of the Partnership

On the basis of all your sources make an assessment of:

C.2.1 The specific impact of the different factors **I** to **XIV** (outlined in **C.1.1**) above in the history of the partnership

C.2.2 The role of the partnership in:

- increasing or decreasing the transparency/visibility of the Structural Funds on the ground
- leading the participants in the partnership to identify more closely with the Structural Funds

C.2.3 The relationship between the structure (attributes) of the partnership described in A.1 and its effectiveness (*however you wish to define this*) in terms of:

- decision-making
- fitness for purpose (given the context and nature of operations)
- operational flexibility
- value added to operations
- legitimacy
- inclusiveness
- expression of the principle of subsidiarity

Please particularly comment on the benefits of, and limitations to, expanding the range and number of organisations involved in the partnership.

C.2.4 The good partnership practice in this case. Please organise your comments in terms of the three main stages programme operation, namely:

- preparation and planning
- implementation and management
- monitoring and evaluation

C.2.5 The contribution of partnership, to:

- organisational learning and the transfer of that learning between partners
- positive impacts of partnership on monitoring and implementation
- any shift (actual or envisaged) from day-to-day management partnership arrangements towards a more strategic partnership

C.2.6 The relationship between the nature of partnership and actual material outcome.

Here you should attempt to causally link (or at least hypothesise links between) the context, attributes, activities and outputs of the partnership and actual outcomes of partnership (however you may choose to define them).

Intermediate outcomes of partnership might include:

- *efficient implementation*, for example
 - conformance with regulations
 - adequate fund absorption
 - good timetabling
- *effective decision making*, for example:
 - better project selection
 - addressing key development bottlenecks
 - projects which address expressed user needs

Final outcomes of partnership might include:

- *enhancing development capacity*, for example
 - more relevant sectoral and regional plans
 - institutional innovation and inter-institutional co-operation
- *policy success*, for example
 - job creation
 - economic revival
 - social cohesion
 - local development

Section D: Summary Analysis

*In previous sections you reported the case study in a discursive/descriptive format following broad descriptive and analytical categories. In **Section D** please re-present your analysis using the following synthetic categories which will allow us to more easily summarise across cases.*

D.1 Impact of Partnership arrangements

Table D.1 Impact of Partnership arrangements

Assess the impact (positive or negative) of partnership on each of the following programming stages (*by circling '+' and/or '-' and '1', '2' or '3' as appropriate*), explaining your assessment with reference to your presentation in **B.1** above :

Task	positive + negative -	strong impact (1)	weak impact (2)	no impact (3)	explanation and cross-reference
I. Preparation & Planning					
a) programme preparation	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	
b) negotiating programme content between the Commission and national government	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	
c) identifying which spatial areas should receive targeted assistance	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	
d) deciding on project selection criteria	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	
e) programme evaluation (ex-ante)	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	
f) any other key activities	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	
II. Implementation & Management					
g) selection of which projects to fund	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	
h) payment to projects	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	
i) management of the programme	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	

Table D.1: Impact of Partnership arrangements *continued*

Task	positive + negative -	strong impact (1)	weak impact (2)	no impact (3)	explanation and cross-reference
j) use of technical assistance	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	
k) understanding actual projects (as beneficiaries)	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	
l) any other key activities	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	
III. Monitoring and Evaluation					
m) monitoring of projects	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	
n) programme monitoring	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	
o) deciding on programme adjustments including re-programming	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	
p) programme evaluation (ex-post)	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	
q) use of technical assistance	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	
r) any other key activities	+	1	2	3	
	-	1	2	3	

D.2 Factors, effects and outcomes of partnership

In Table D.2 please summarise the contribution of the factors listed below to the effectiveness of the partnership and consequent programme outcomes. You may wish to refer to the list of possible programme outcomes provided in C.2.6. (An example follows).

Example D.2 Factors, effects and outcomes of partnership

Factor	Effect	Outcome
the history of previous development initiatives in this area	established management mechanism for innovative initiatives	speedy project selection and start up ensuring adequate fund absorption

Table D.2: Factors, effects and outcomes of partnership

Factor	Effect	Outcome
the history of previous development initiatives in this area		
the history of previous co-operation between partners		
the level of resources and expertise available to partners		
partners were/were not regarded as legitimate members of the partnership by other partners		
partners were/were not regarded as legitimate members of the partnership by those outside the partnership		
the involvement of many partners (say, more than 15)		
the involvement of a limited number of partners (say, less than 5)		
a common understanding between partners of their role in the partnership		
the integration of the Structural Funds' programmes with other national, regional, or local programmes		
the level of collaboration between partners		
the level of collaboration between the partnership and other agencies		
changes in attitudes and behaviour over the programming cycle		
evolution of strategies (at different programme levels)		
unexpected consequences of any partnership activities		
organisational learning (by the partnership as a whole, and by individual partner organisations)		
innovative behaviours and lessons learned in partnership		

Table D.2.A: Additional factors, effects and outcomes

Please also nominate any further factors you believe to have an important bearing on partnership outputs in this case.

Factor	Effect	Outcome

D.3 Contribution of partnership to beneficial outcomes

Table D.3: Contribution of partnership to beneficial outcomes

Please find below a number of statements that are commonly made to describe the positive contribution of partnership. Please weigh (circle) what you judge to be the *positive* contribution of the partnership in this case using the following scale:

	no contribution (1)	little contribution (2)	significant contribution (3)	large contribution (4)	unsure/ data not available (5)
'transparency/visibility of the Structural Funds on the ground'	1	2	3	4	5
'identification of the partners more closely with Structural Funds'	1	2	3	4	5
'changes to non-Structural Fund arrangements'	1	2	3	4	5
'improved co-ordination across organisational boundaries'	1	2	3	4	5
'replacing top down and distant decision-making with locally owned solutions'	1	2	3	4	5
'compensating for institutional inertia with innovation and flexibility'	1	2	3	4	5
'empowering programme beneficiaries <i>vis a vis</i> programme deliverers'	1	2	3	4	5
'avoiding the duplication of efforts'	1	2	3	4	5
'leveraging of mainstream budgets of the partners'	1	2	3	4	5
'increased ability to absorb funds'	1	2	3	4	5
'better planning, implementation and quality of programmes'	1	2	3	4	5
'more effective management of resources'	1	2	3	4	5

Table D.3: Contribution of partnership to beneficial outcomes *continued*

	no contribution (1)	little contribution (2)	significant contribution (3)	large contribution (4)	unsure/ data not available (5)
'the development of institutional capacity'	1	2	3	4	5
'local partnership development'	1	2	3	4	5
'appropriate and timely decision-making'	1	2	3	4	5
'increased programme fitness for purpose (given the context and nature of operations)'	1	2	3	4	5
'increased programme acceptability'	1	2	3	4	5
'inclusion of a wider set of organisations in programme decision-making'	1	2	3	4	5
'increased expression of the principle of subsidiarity'	1	2	3	4	5
'transfer of good practice to other settings in the preparation and programming phase of the policy cycle'	1	2	3	4	5
'organisational learning and its transfer to other organisations'	1	2	3	4	5
'increased participant identification with the Structural Funds'	1	2	3	4	5
'improved preparation and planning'	1	2	3	4	5
'improved implementation and management'	1	2	3	4	5
'improved monitoring and evaluation'	1	2	3	4	5
'better project selection'	1	2	3	4	5

D.4 Mapping of Partnership characteristics

Please map this case of partnership against the possible characteristics identified in **Table D.4** :

1. Please indicate which statement in each row best describes partnership in this case.
2. Please also indicate, taking into account the precise objectives and role of the partnership (objectives, institutional context, etc) what would be the 'ideal' characteristics of this partnership, in your opinion. (In some cases there may be no differences between the results of '1', but normally we would expect you to identify some 'room for improvement'.)
3. Please comment on how such improvements could be made.

(Note. This should reflect your own judgement of the case and not merely summarise the views of your informants)

An example follows:

Example D.4: Mapping of Partnership characteristics

Characteristic	Statements				
A Maturity	1. 'Very 'mature''	2. 'The partnership was built on pre-existing relations which were in place for some time' [X] Ideal	3. 'Partnership represents minor modification to pre-existing arrangements'	4. 'Few (or no) relations between partners existed before introduction of the partnership principle ' [X]Actual	5. 'Entirely 'new''
Comment/ Explanation	Lack of previous working relations led to poor communication and delays at programme start-up. As relations built up over the life-time of the partnership communication and efficiency of decision making improved				

Table D.4: Mapping of Partnership characteristics

Characteristic	Statements				
A <i>Maturity</i>	1. 'Very 'mature''	2. 'The partnership was built on pre-existing relations which were in place for some time'	3. 'Partnership represents minor modification to pre-existing arrangements'	4. 'Few (or no) relations between partners existed before introduction of the partnership principle'	5. 'Entirely 'new''
Comment/ Explanation					
B <i>Technical Assistance/ Secretariat Support</i>	1. 'High quality technical assistance / secretariat support'	2. 'Significant technical assistance / secretariat support'	3. 'Adequate technical assistance / secretariat support'	4. 'A little technical assistance / secretariat support'	5. 'Minimal / inadequate technical assistance / secretariat support'
Comment/ Explanation					
C <i>Clarity of Roles</i>	1. 'High degree of clarity and formality in operation of partnership'	2. 'Roles and responsibilities well-defined'	3. 'High degree of flexibility has been required - some confusion'	4. 'Lack of clarity amongst most partners'	5. 'Ad hoc and in practice informal'
Comment/ Explanation					
D <i>Range of Partners Involved</i>	1. 'All possible partners involved'	2. 'All 'obvious' partners formally within partnership'	3. 'Reasonable selection of partners included'	4. 'Partnership confined to minimum for credibility'	5. 'Only the statutory minimum partners involved'
Comment/ Explanation					

Table D.4: Mapping of Partnership behaviour characteristics *continued*

Characteristic	Statements				
E <i>Influence of Partners</i>	1. 'Genuine joint ownership and shared responsibility'	2. 'Weaker partners perceive strong benefit of involvement and that they are stakeholders'	3. 'Some partners feel 'involved'	4. 'Some limited influence over decision-making criteria'	5. 'Partnership is nominal'
Comment/ Explanation					
F <i>Power of Partners</i>	1. 'A serious decision-taking organisation'	2. 'Genuine debate and influence over strategic and tactical decisions'	3. 'Choices tend to be marginal and concern 'exception'	4. 'Minimal impact'	5. 'A 'rubber stamp''
Comment/ Explanation					
G <i>Impact of Partnership</i>	1. 'Impact beyond its immediate tasks'	2. Improved communication, local knowledge and future capacity'	3. 'Some impact on quality of analysis, planning and choices of priorities'	4. 'Little impact beyond immediate function'	5. 'No impact beyond immediate functions'
Comment/ Explanation					

Paper 3. Interview Template

The interview template is composed of four parts:

- 1. A standard paragraph/statement describing the study*
- 2. Standard information about the interview*
- 3. Questions to be asked*
- 4. Mapping exercises for informants.*

Note: *You may need to translate the three mapping exercises into the native language of your informants.*

1. Standard paragraph/statement describing the study

Please introduce the study to your interviewees in the following terms:

'The Thematic assessment of the partnership principle is the first major thematic evaluation of one of the guiding principles of the Structural Funds. The study aims to demonstrate the positive impacts of partnership on the different stages of the policy cycle as well as highlighting any areas which need to be improved. It will establish a typology of different partnership operations across the fifteen member states with a view to explaining the diversity of partnership forms and roles operating throughout the policy cycle in the EU today.'

Please make it clear to your informants that their comments will be treated in confidence. No information which identifies specific individuals will be forwarded to the European Commission or National authorities.

2. Standard information about the interview

Interviewee name:	Organisation:	Partnership role:
Place of interview:	Date of interview:	Duration of interview:
Language interview conducted in:	Electronic copy: Yes / No	

3. Interview prompts

*In PAPER 2: the **Reporting Structure** the content of your report has been specified in some detail. In your interviews you will need to ensure that your informants provide you with all relevant information.*

The following are intended as a guide only. You will need to expand on these in order to generate the necessary information to complete the case study.

3.1 Background check

- Confirm the legal framework of the partnership
- Confirm the administrative structure of the partnership
- Confirm any informal arrangements which may exist

3.2 Interview description of programme activities

Using **Table 3.2** overleaf, you should ask your interviewees (to the extent that they are in a position to comment) to describe the programme activities in terms of:

- the partners involved,
- their types of involvement, and
- the strengths and weaknesses of this type of involvement.

Table 3.2: Interviewee description of programme activities

Task	Partners Involved	Types of Involvement	Strengths and Weaknesses of this type of involvement
I. Preparation & Planning			
a) programme preparation			
b) negotiating programme content between the Commission and national government			
c) identifying which spatial areas should receive targeted assistance			
d) deciding on project selection criteria			
e) programme evaluation (ex-ante)			
f) any other key activities			
II. Implementation & Management			
g) selection of which projects to fund			
h) payment to projects			
i) management of the programme			
j) use of technical assistance			
k) undertaking actual projects (as beneficiaries)			
l) any other key activities			
III. Monitoring and Evaluation			
m) monitoring of projects			
n) programme monitoring			
o) deciding on programme adjustments including re-programming			
p) programme evaluation (ex-post)			
q) use of technical assistance			
r) any other key activities			

3.3 Highlight any factors affecting partnership behaviour - you should use the factors **I - XIV** listed in **C.I** of PAPER 2: the **Reporting Structure** as a prompt here.

3.4 Outline the identified Critical incident for each of the three programme stages:

- preparation and planning
- implementation and management
- monitoring and evaluation

and ask the interviewee for their assessment of this incident and explore the implications for the partnership process emerging in terms of:

- the role of the partnership
- the effectiveness of the partnership
- the impact of the partnership
- the evolution of partnership

You should refer back to the individual sub-sections of **Section C** for detailed prompts here. You should also explore these issues more generally with the interviewee, not relying solely on the Critical Incident.

3.5 Explore the potential outcomes of the partnership process.

3.6 Draw out any good practice lessons.

3.7 Using **Table 3.7** you should ask your interviewee to nominate up to five aspects of partnership which they consider to be the most important, explaining why and illustrating with reference to the case study.'

Table 3.7: Mapping of key aspects of partnership

Key Aspect	Why a key aspect	Actual importance in this case
1.		<i>Little</i>) 1 2 3 4 5 (Very
2.		<i>Little</i>) 1 2 3 4 5 (Very
3.		<i>Little</i>) 1 2 3 4 5 (Very
4.		<i>Little</i>) 1 2 3 4 5 (Very
5.		<i>Little</i>) 1 2 3 4 5 (Very

3.8 Mapping of partnership characteristics

Using **Table 3.8** you should ask your interviewees to map the partnership against the possible characteristics listed, indicating which statement is closest to reality.

Table 3.8: Mapping of Partnership behaviour

Characteristic	Statements				
A <i>Maturity</i>	1. 'Very 'mature''	2. 'The partnership was built on pre-existing relations which were in place for some time'	3. 'Partnership represents minor modification to pre-existing arrangements'	4. 'Few (or no) relations between partners existed before introduction of the partnership principle'	5. 'Entirely 'new''
B <i>Technical Assistance/ Secretariat Support</i>	1. 'High quality technical assistance / secretariat support'	2. 'Significant technical assistance / secretariat support'	3. 'Adequate technical assistance / secretariat support'	4. 'A little technical assistance / secretariat support'	5. 'Minimal / inadequate technical assistance / secretariat support'
C <i>Clarity of Notes</i>	1. 'High degree of clarity and formality in operation of partnership'	2. 'Roles and responsibilities well-defined'	3. 'High degree of flexibility has been required - some confusion'	4. 'Lack of clarity amongst most partners'	5. 'Ad hoc and in practice informal'
D <i>Range of Partners Involved</i>	1. 'All possible partners involved'	2. 'All 'obvious' partners formally within partnership'	3. 'Reasonable selection of partners included'	4. 'Partnership confined to minimum for credibility'	5. 'Only the statutory minimum partners involved'
E <i>Influence of Partners</i>	1. 'Genuine joint ownership and shared responsibility'	2. 'Weaker partners perceive strong benefit of involvement and that they are stakeholders'	3. 'Some partners feel 'involved''	4. 'Some limited influence over decision-making criteria'	5. 'Partnership is nominal'
F <i>Power of Partners</i>	1. 'A serious decision-taking organisation'	2. 'Genuine debate and influence over strategic and tactical decisions'	3. 'Choices tend to be marginal and concern 'exception''	4. 'Minimal impact'	5. 'A 'rubber stamp''
G <i>Impact of Partnership</i>	1. 'Impact beyond its immediate tasks'	2. 'Improved communication, local knowledge and future capacity'	3. 'Some impact on quality of analysis, planning and choices of priorities'	4. 'Little impact beyond immediate function'	5. 'No impact beyond immediate functions'

