Examples of evaluation questions

Interreg Germany-Netherlands

No	Priority	IP[1]	Specific Objective (SO)
1	Raising the cross-border innovation capacity in the programme area	1B	Increase of product and process innovations in the sectors relevant for the border regions
		4F	Increase of product and process innovations in CO_2 reduction and sustainable energy
2	Socio-cultural and territorial cohesion	IP 11 (plus Art. 7 ETC-Regulation a)iv)	Reduction of the border effect as barrier for citizens and institutions

General question to the value added

- Which impacts specific for Interreg and/or success factors of projects can be identified? Do these factors contribute to the programme objectives? If so – to which extent?

Questions across all IPs

- What are the project impacts in a short mid and long-term perspective?
- Does the intervention logic of the programme function?
- Do projects attain their objectives?
- Do the projects contribute to the objectives at programme / priority and SO level?
- Do the projects contribute to the attainment of targets for result indicators

- If so – how is this being achieved; what are key success factors? In case projects fail to contribute – what are the main reasons?

- What impact can be expected from Interreg in a longer-term perspective?
- What could be changed in order to maximize the intended impact of the projects in the priority? (current period or/and with a view to post 2020?)
- What is the impact of project frameworks (open projects)? Does the actual impact correspond to the intended one? Are there any notable differences compared to the impact of standard projects?
- Sustainability: do the projects achieve sustainable respectively durable outcomes? Do the projects contribute to strengthened economic structures in the programme area?

Specific questions at priority level

Priority 1 IPs 1B, 4F
- How has the cross-border innovation capacity / the level of product and process innovations / developed / the share of SMEs introducing product and process innovations developed since the start of the programme? What can be attributed to the programme? What other factors are decisive?
- Add-on to sustainability: what is the share of innovation partnerships / projects which are continued beyond the project end?

Priority 2 IP 11
- How has socio-cultural and territorial cohesion / the barrier effect of the border for citizens and institutions / the perception of the German Dutch as a barrier developed since the programme start? What can be attributed to the programme? What other factors are decisive?

---

[1] IP stands for Investment Priority in accordance with Regulation (EU) 1301/2013 on ERDF

Northern Periphery and Arctic Programme (NPA) 2014-2020

No	Priority	IP[2]	Specific Objective (SO)
1	Using innovation to maintain and develop robust and competitive communities	1B	Increased innovation and transfer of new technology to SMEs in remote sparsely populated areas
			Increased innovation within public service provision in remote, sparsely populated areas
2	Promoting entrepreneurship to realise the potential of the programme area's competitive advantage	3A	Improved support systems tailored for start-ups and existing SMEs in remote and sparsely populated areas
		3D	Greater market reach beyond local markets for SMEs in remote and sparsely populated areas
3	Fostering energy-secure communities through promotion of renewable energy and energy efficiency	4C	Increased use of energy efficiency and renewable energy solutions in housing and public infrastructures in remote, sparsely populated areas
4	Protecting, promoting and developing cultural and natural heritage	6C	

Overarching questions
- Do the NPA-Programme and the supported interventions reflect real and broadly acknowledged needs within the Programme area?
- Has the NPA-Programme succeeded to develop the strong focus on tangible outputs and results further compared to previous programmes?

Horizontal questions (for each priority)
- To what extent have underrepresented groups as young people, indigenous peoples or women been directly involved in the activities organised by the supported projects?

Specific questions at priority level

Priority 1: Using innovation to maintain and develop robust and competitive communities
SO: Increased innovation and transfer of new technology to SMEs in remote sparsely populated areas

Tentative question:
- To what extent has the Programme contributed to the observed development in transnational collaboration between SMEs and R&D?

Supplementing questions:
- What kind of businesses (sector, size, maturity) and facilitating organisations have been involved, directly and indirectly, through NPA funded actions?
- What kind of new innovation support systems and structures have been established as an impact of the Programme?
- Has the cooperation between R&D and SMEs been enhanced as a direct impact?

SO: Increased innovation within public service provision in remote, sparsely populated areas

Tentative question:
- To what extent has the Programme contributed to enhancement of the availability and use of technology-driven public service provision in remote and sparsely populated areas?

Supplementing questions:
- What kind of public services have been impacted?
- What kind of new technologies have been introduced?
- What other kind of innovative solutions and models (than technology driven) have been introduced?
- Can any changes in the mind set and awareness among public service providers in relation to new solutions and models be identified as an impact of programme interventions?

Priority 2 – Promoting entrepreneurship to realise the potential of the programme area's competitive advantage
SO Improved support systems tailored for start-ups and existing SMEs in remote and sparsely populated areas

Tentative question:
- To what extent has the NPA contributed to improvement of the conditions for start-ups in remote, sparsely populated areas?

Supplementing questions:
- To what extent has the availability of support services been enhanced because of activities funded by the Programme?
- What kind of businesses (sector, size, maturity) has been impacted by the Programme's interventions?

SO Greater market reach beyond local markets for SMEs in remote and sparsely populated areas

Tentative question:
- to what extent has the Programme increased the capacity of SME in remote and sparsely populated areas to act beyond local markets?

Supplementing questions:
- Have SMEs to a higher extent been engaged in transboundary business-to-business activities because of Programme funded activities?
- What kind of new transboundary business networks, clusters and other business to business relations have been established?
- What kind of SMEs (sector, size, maturity) has been involved?
- Have new (permanent) business support services been established to facilitate access to new markets?

Priority 3: Fostering energy-secure communities through promotion of renewable energy and energy efficiency
SO Increased use of energy efficiency and renewable energy solutions in housing and public infrastructures in remote, sparsely populated areas

Tentative question:
- To what extent the Programme has contributed to increased energy performance of residential buildings and public infrastructures in remote and sparsely populated areas?

Supplementing questions:
- What kind of new energy solutions for public infrastructures and housing have been developed as result of Programme interventions?
- Has programme interventions resulted in higher independence from imported fossil fuels?

---

[2] IP stands for Investment Priority in accordance with Regulation (EU) 1301/2013 on ERDF

- What kind of stakeholders has been influenced by Programme interventions?

Priority 4: protecting, promoting and developing cultural and natural heritage

SO Increased capacity of remote and sparsely populated communities for sustainable environmental management

<u>Tentative question:</u>
- To what extent has the Programme contributed to an enhanced capacity of responsible authorities in remote, sparsely populated areas for environmental management in relation to climate change and impacts of new investments in the exploitation of natural resources?

<u>Supplementing questions:</u>
- Have Programme interventions contributed to a better horizontal and vertical integration within public authorities in relation to climate change adaptation or management of new investments in the exploitation of natural resources?
- Has the Programme contributed to a higher degree of international cooperation of local and regional authorities on climate change adaptation?
- Has a higher extent of community involvement in relation planning and decision making in sustainable environmental management been a result?
- Have the availability and reach of capacity building initiatives been enhanced for local and regional authorities?

Interreg Poland-Slovakia

No	Priority	IP	Specific Objective (SO)
1	Protection and development of the cross-border area's natural environmental and cultural heritage	6C	Increasing the level of sustainable use of natural and cultural heritage for visitors and residents
2	Sustainable cross-border transport	7B	increasing cross border mobility by improving cross-border connections
			Increasing the cross border area accessibility through development of multi-modal transport
3	Development of cross-border education and lifelong learning	10 (ETC)	Improving the quality of cross border education and professional skills

General questions

- Have the specific objectives of priority axes been achieved and to what extent?
- What are the results of the implementation of projects relating to Polish and Slovak cooperation? In which areas (territorial and thematic) the greatest progress has been made?
- What kind of changes have been observed in the area of support and how has the life of local communities changed as a result of the implemented projects?
- Has the Programme (including the SPF) contributed to eliminating barriers under the selected thematic areas, and to what extent?
- How and to what extent are the following horizontal policies taken into account during Programme implementation (i.e. equality between men and women; equal opportunities and non-discrimination, in particular, accessibility for persons with disabilities; sustainable development)

Questions to the Small Project Fund (SPF)

- To what extent has the SPF contributed to the achievement of Programme objectives?
- What is the impact of the SPF on the life of the border region communities and on the development of Polish and Slovak cross-border cooperation?

Questions to operational aspects

- To what extent is the policy of reducing the administrative burden for applicants and beneficiaries taken into account in Programme implementation? (operational?)

Interreg Europe

Priority 1: Research, Development, Technology and Innovation (RDTI)
IP 1A
SO: Improve the implementation of regional development policies and programmes, in particular programmes for Investment for Growth and Jobs and, where relevant, ETC programmes, in the field of research and innovation infrastructure and capacities notably in the framework of Smart Specialisation Strategies.

IP 1B
SO: Improve the implementation of regional development policies and programmes, in particular programmes for Investment for Growth and Jobs and, where relevant, ETC programmes, that support the delivery of innovation by actors in regional innovation chains in areas of "smart specialisation" and innovation opportunity.

Priority 2: Competitiveness of Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises
IP 3D
SO ..., supporting SMEs in all stages of their life cycle to develop and achieve growth and engage in innovation.

Priority 3 Low Carbon Economy
IP 4E
SO ... addressing the transition to a low-carbon economy notably in the framework of Smart Specialisation Strategies

Priority 4 Environment and Resource Efficiency
IP 6C
SO ..., in the field of the protection and development of natural and cultural heritage.

IP 6G
SO ... aimed at increasing resource-efficiency, green growth and eco-innovation and environmental performance management.

Task 2 Programme performance
Overall:
☐ To which extent the programme has contributed to achieve the EU 2020 strategy?

☐ To which extent the programme has contributed to territorial cohesion and reducing disparities?[9]

☐ To which extent the programme has contributed to the national and regional Smart Specialisation Strategies of the programme partner states?

☐ What are the success factors that contribute to achieving the programme's objectives? And what are the barriers? What are the recommendations for improving the results of the programme?

For each SO
☐ Does the programme influence the implementation of policies and programmes for regional development (Growth and Jobs and ETC programmes) through exchange of experience and policy learning among actors of regional relevance? If yes, how?

For each SO: projects results
☐ Are the new programme's requirements for projects (i.e. stakeholder group, action plans) relevant and sufficient to contribute to the project objectives?

☐ To which extent the projects contribute to the specific objective of the programme? To which extent the increasing capacity of people and organisations lead to policy change in particular to influencing the policy instruments addressed by the project? Is there any possibility to further define/categorise the notion of increased capacity?

For each SO: evaluation of the first territorial 'impact'
☐ To which extent the policy change achieved by the project has a territorial 'impact' (i.e. is there any evidence that the policy change led to improving the territorial situation, for instance in terms of job creation, CO2 emission reduced, percentage of natural areas protected)?

☐ Can this territorial 'impact' be measured and, if yes, how? Can INTERREG IVC projects help in this regards?

For each SO: Policy Learning Platform results
☐ Are the services implemented so far by the platform useful to reach the programme's objectives?

☐ To which extent the platform contributes to increased capacity of its beneficiaries?

☐ To which extent platform can contribute to policy changes?