Intervention logic and indicators post-2020: Let's share & harmonise!

23-24 January 2020
Vienna, Austria

Content

European Regional Development Fund

Introduction

Aim of the event:
- Discuss the interpretation of the POs respectively the ISO(s)
- Identify areas within Policy Objectives well covered by Common Indicators on Outputs and Results (RCO, RCR), and
- Highlight major gaps implying the need for complementary, program-specific indicators.
- Propose harmonised programme-specific indicators to cover these gaps
- **Contribute to a shared process!** Currently we are to some extent in an iterative process working with draft documents and each side is learning from the other …

1. Update on intervention logic and indictors, Evaluation Unit, DG REGIO

DG REGIO update on post 2020 intervention logic and indicator by Irina Ciocirlan, European Commission, Evaluation Unit, DG REGIO: see ppt (Post 2020 programming and indicators – EC) under: http://www.interact-eu.net/library#2792-presentations-intervention-logic-and-indicators-post-2020-let-us-share-harmonise

Key messages:
General comments:
- The Council has issued its position on indicators (https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CONSIL:ST_10285_2019_INIT&from=EN); this is not the final list of indicators, as the Parliament still needs to provide their feedback.

Evidence for programming:
- The needs that the programme will address should be based on the needs for change for population on territory
- Source of data: monitoring data at project level could be used for programming

Intervention rationale:
- Specific Objectives (SO) are building blocks for programme linked to indicators
- When building the intervention rationale make sure all of these four questions have an answer:
    1. What is / are the need(s) that the programme will address?
       => "expected contribution to those specific objectives" chosen
    2. What is the change expected for beneficiaries?
       => Result indicator
    3. What will be the relevant actions to support beneficiaries to reach that change?
       => identify actions and output indicators
    4. What is the budget? How will it be used?
       => budget with breakdown by 3 categorisation dimensions (Intervention – Finance form – Territorial delivery + focus)

Programming by Specific Objective

- In comparison to output and result, the impact will not be quantified. The impact should be part of descriptive analysis in the frame of evaluation(s) at a later stage;
- In case of Interreg the expected change is not 'measured' at the territorial level but you should capture what you do for people
- Budget is broken down by Intervention fields / form of finance etc.

Indicator principles

- Definition of output and result indicators as well as the indicator concepts are defined in CPR – Art 2
- Concepts of results are no longer linked to impact. Results are a direct change for people, directly after project closure or in period of about one year after the project closure.
- Common output and result indicators will be explained in detail in the indicator fiches
- The intervention logic is quantified through indicators
- The definition of common indicators at programme level can be narrower than in fiche, but it should not be broader!
- Cost for data collection is eligible cost – same as cost of implementing the indicator system and data collection, either by programme or by beneficiary

REGIO Common outputs (RCO)

> **During Programming:**
> o **Identify** the actions to finance (linked to beneficiaries)
> o **Choose** common output indicators (or define specific output indicators)
> o **Baselines** = "0" (not applicable)
> o **Milestones** are obligatory for all outputs ("0" is possible when justified)
> o **Targets** are set target for all output indicators
> o The narrative will be partly set up by the Specific Obhjective ; the Common Interreg indicators could anchor the element of cooperation

- Evaluation unit recommends use of Common Output Indicators (COI) if relevant; first look into Interreg indicators before going to ERDF indicators
- If ERDF indicators will be used, make sure that, there is direct link between output and cost (e.g. the misinterpretations related to indicators on 'SME supported' in the current period; the indicator was meant for programmes directly supporting SMEs!)
- Link the output indicator to a specific type of action – choose what is relevant for you
- In case you use your own output indicators you need to prepare an indicator fiche for your added indicators and include them in the methodology for performance framework
- Milestones for 2024 and target 2029 are obligatory: Milestones can be 0 or more; if Milestones 0 a justification is required, e.g. programmes may opt to put 0 in case they will start in delay, hence there is little time left for calls;

- Commission proposed that programmes have to take into consideration the intended 5+2 rule when establishing the targets. However, the proposal of a 5+2 rule has been rejected by both co-legislators and thus is not likely to come (it would have meant that for the first 5 years, there is a set budget, whilst for the next 2 years the budget will be assigned after the mid-term review in 2025)

REGIO Common Results ERDF-CF

During Programming:
- o <u>Identify</u> the change expected for beneficiaries (link to challenges / needs)
- o <u>Choose</u> common result indicators or define specific result indicators
- o <u>Baselines</u> may be zero or >0 (where known or to be estimated
- o <u>Milestones</u> are not obligatory
- o <u>Targets</u> are set for all results indicators
- o => Documented in PF Methodology
- o **Common results a novel element for 2021-2027 ERDF/CF**
- o **Target setting may be challenging: mid term modifications of targets possible**
- o **Narrative will be important for EC and MS / programmes.** There are lags in achievement, measurement and reporting of outputs and, even more so, of results for beneficiaries (cf. infrastructures)
- o **Narrative will be familiar**

- Mid-term review: there will be a significant shift towards the quality rather than the % of the achievements of the indicators as it was in the current programming period. Programmes will assess whether or not they achieved what they have foreseen and how (if) they will change the investment strategy.
- Results: baseline may be 0 but might be higher, e.g. already existing flood protection;
- Target setting for result indicators (RI) can be challenging: however programmes are not set in stone and there is room for adjustment; e.g. mid-term review is the moment to revisit targets

Methodology to set-up performance framework (Art. 13 CPR Regulation)

PF Methodologies to include …
- o Criteria applied to select indicators
- o Data, evidence, quality assurance
- o Factors that may influence achievement of milestones and targets, how they were factored in

Available on request to Commission
Added Value for programmes:
- o Documents the starting point, data and assumptions made;
- o Useful during implementation for programmers (institutional memory) and at programme modification
- o Useful to share with key stakeholders

- Methodology document will include all indicators. Additional indicators will need to have definitions. They should be made available to COM upon request.
- Performance Framework directly linked to indicator system

Example of an ERDF SO : (PO 2, SO iv - climate change, risk prevention and disaster resilience); Section 2.1.1.2 Indicators (example)

Outputs

Indicators	Milestone	Target
RCO81 Participations in joint actions across borders	200	1 000
RCO84 Pilot actions developed	1	10
RCO25 Coastal strip, riverbank and lakshore flood protection newly built or consolidated	0	25

Results

Indicators	Baseline	Target
RCR85 Participations in joint actions across borders after project completion	0	300
RCR35 Population benefiting from flood protection measures	0	1 000

- First look into Interreg indicators; baseline for RI is set at zero since there is no point of reference from the previous period
- List of RCO and RCR attempt to avoid overlapping, e.g. participations in actions and training: use mutually exclusive definitions
- RCO: could be seen like a pyramid
    o participations in public events (one off): low cooperation intensity
    o next stage participants in joint actions: Joint training schemes (not one-off); indicators indicate also intensity of cooperation
- RCR:
    o joint strategies: consider it at the bottom of pyramid;
    o next step could be obstacles alleviated

Q & A

Q: Should the OI and the RI be corresponding? E.g. new OI indicator close to PO5 – it lacks corresponding RI, in addition PO 5 only has one RI

A: In the revised fiche, not all indicators are indicated yet. Finally, each output indicator must be linked to a result indicator. However, there is flexibility in the system. You can link a RCO to a programme-specific result indicator. We recommend using at least the RCO but in case the fiche would not indicate, a corresponding RCR or the RCR does not adequately express your programme result you will have to develop a programme-specific result indicator.

Q: Template for the IP does not leave room to fill in the text for indicators. There is no room to justify the indicator in written: Will there be a guideline on how to fil it in?

A: Indeed no text boxes are foreseen, since the explanation should go to the methodology document; now we still do not have any no information on future options in SFC

Q: What is the optimal number of indicators? Coverage target?

A: There is no official position on that: the key factor is the relevance and the focus (there are no coverage targets)

Q: How will the programme specific objectives be written in the CP template?

A: The template has not been analysed yet; **Interact shall collect the comments of the programmes to the template and the Unit D1 and Unit D2 will check the comments/proposals**

Q: Are there no targets in performance framework?

A: The performance framework will include all indicators; there is a qualitative assessment foreseen; as for the current period, financial consequences in case of lagging performance are unlikely – but negotiations are still ongoing.

Q: When can we expect the updated fiche?

A: As to the updated fiches we wait for European Palrliament position not to rework it constantly

Q: As to the definition of COI, some of these seem to be rather short-term results. Will they still be sorted out? Is it possible to come up with new proposal for Common Indicators, e.g. an additional one on capacity building? Is it possible to mix common indicators for Interreg with those for Policy Objecitves (PO)? Is it possible to use both?

A: You can use both Interreg and PO-specific indicators. As to coming up with new indicators the indicators are more or less defined already.

->However, it was agreed in the event that Interreg programmes together with Interact can work on one indicator related to capacity building. Major comments related the indicators (e.g. data collection after project completion) can be sent to Interact. Interact will collect them until end of February 2020 and then forward them to the Evaluation Unit

2. Update on the interpretation of the Policy Objectives, Unit D2 Interreg, Cross-Border Cooperation, internal borders, DG REGIO

The new set of Policy Objectives and Interreg-specific Objectives by Dorotá Witoldson, European Commission, Unit D2 Interreg, Cross-Border Cooperation, internal borders, DG REGIO: see ppt (Intervention logic post 2020) under http://www.interact-eu.net/#o=events/intervention-logic-and-indicators-post-2020-let-us-share-harmonise

Key messages:

- Please note that legal provisions are still subject to negotiations in the trilogue.
- PO 1
    - Take S3-strategies into account at regional level and look for common points among the participating regions; provide a justifications if certain strengths are not covered in the programme
    - Still examples of projects detached from surrounding
- PO 2
    - Two most common ones now: Climate change and Biodiversity (Council included nature protection; European Parliament wants to add natural heritage)
    - Agreement: ERDF can invest also in rural areas only if it is justified; in case of Interreg it is always justified
    - Coordinated management and alleviation of obstacles as key point for Interreg
- PO 3
    - Crossborder mobility is the key point; EC would like to see less projects with limited cross border added value – when selecting projects you should mind the geographical distance from the border. It is obvious that local or regional roads far from the border are unlikely to have actual impact on border-crossing traffic. Roads financed from Interreg should be used by people crossing the border. The corresponding indicator might be simple - for example, X km of road improved - but the guiding question to ask is if this investment did improve people's life in the border region or not?
    - Owing to the limited funds in Interreg actual projects will rather target closure of gaps or the preparation of larger projects
    - Railways – study on missing CB links; 42 missing links identified all over Europe; in many cases it would make economic sense
    - Green deal as new buzzword; much more green and more sustainability should be considered everywhere
- PO4
    - Specific interpretation for Interreg
    - Still many obstacles in that field (see study on obstacles)
    - Multilingualism is very important, especially in border areas to have a feeling of community

- PO 5
  - There is the final stage of discussions: Council proposed that all types of territories should be addressed, keep it as simple and open as possible
  - PO5 is currently the only PO explicitly referring to culture and tourism: EP and Council have proposed to include it
  - Define the territory: this might refer to functional regions, or territories with specific needs and features – please note: territory is not the same as pogramme area! The programme needs to justify, why a certain territory is relevant in a cross-border context; these should be coherent areas selected for justified reasons; the territories should already be identified in IP
  - Territorial strategy is required: most likely, this will be a different one for each territory and the strategies should be multi-sectoral! (e.g. in tourism: strategy wider than just tourism. It should encompass closely interconnected sectors such as transport, education and skills development, visitors guidance for vulnerable nature areas, links to local and regional economies …)
  - Stakeholder respectively strategy-owners should be territorial bodies; the term 'strategy' does not mean top-down strategies developed or imposed by the MA and/or the central government – both cannot be labelled as territorial bodies. Strategy could include a list of planned projects but it is not compulsory
  - Process of setting up a strategy takes its time and it might not be ready upon submission of the programme. However, it has to be set up at the latest before projects are selected! Programme funds from current as well future period can be used to support strategy development: also funds from ISO 1
  - If you want to go for PO5 we recommend to start with partner involvement now!
  - The strategy has to be designed with the involvement of all the relevant stakeholders and the civil society in the border areas
  - As to the project selection the Council text Art. 23 CPR says when preparing strategies territorial bodies shall cooperate with MA in order to agree on the scope of projects (strategy owners should sit down with MA)
  - Territorial body does not have to be a legal body or a CB legal body but at least it should include relevant stakeholders from two different Member States
  - It is quite evident that these implementation settings are quite challenging for TNC!

- ISO 1 Better cooperation governance
  - This is a compromise proposals, including citizens, actors
  - Works similar to TO11 in the current period
  - Trilogue proposal includes people to people activities
  - Text is indicative list of activities – slides show additional ones

Thematic concentration
- European Parliament wants that Interreg programmes choose PO 2 and PO4 compulsory, but the Commission would not like to see that for Interreg
- Council wants ISO optional;
- When it comes to the alleviation of border obstacles the so-called B-Solution projects might be an inspiration (these are small projects addressing border obstacles directly awarded by DG REGIO – the award of small-scale projects is part of the

Communication on Border Regions). The initiative has been quite successful and there is a list of newly selected projects – many programme areas are involved!

Q & A

Q: Initially TN programmes considered PO5 as an opportunity for an integrated approach. Due to the current approach TN programmes might refrain from PO5.

A: PO5 was designed with the mindset of mainstream programmes. The strategy has to address specific territories having common needs, specific features and strategy building has to involve players at the sub-national level; it is evident that these requirements become a challenging venture across a transational programme area. Now that we have a proposal, we have to facilitate it – we want to make it possible! It is acknowledged that in TN programmes it is difficult to deliver. In CBC programmes we don't start from the scratch since existing strategies can be used.

Q: PO 5 sounds very interesting for cultural heritage, but this approach sounds very complicated. Is there another way to deal with tourism?

A: Culture is also possible under other PO provided the focus of the project is relevant for the Specific Objective.

Q: The Danube programme always looked for integrated approach; but now requirements seem rigid; different interpretations are running around; we would like to know what is possible under PO5. The orientation paper proposed democracy under PO 5. Guidance would be appreciated soon.

A: Now the final stage of discussions has reached. It is not known when everything will be ready; statement today is result of tentative agreement among legislators; orientation paper is not a position paper but an input for the dialogue in the programming phase.

Q: For the MED-Programme the orientation paper proposes that the Green Energy Strategy could be used to finance projects under PO 5. Would that be possible?

A: We still have to see which level of flexibility can be achieved.

Q: Does ISO 1 (Better cooperation governance) still include capacity-building for MRS / SBS?

A: Yes, it is still there!

Q: Can people-to people-activities (p-t-p) be linked to ISO 1 (Better cooperation governance)? Is the minimum allocation of 15% to an ISO compulsory or not? As regards thematic concentration minimum 60% for three policy objectives (cf. Article 15 of draft ETC Regulation) sounds like no restriction at all?

A: Co-legislators proposed to anchor p-t-p explicitly in ISO 1. But it is possible to go for p-t-p projects also under any other PO where it makes sense. It is not yet clear if the use of ISO will be compulsory or not (Council rejects to have it as obligation; EP wants a different percentage). As regards thematic concentration, COM did not want to impose heavy concentration requirements on Interreg programmes.

3. Evidence for programming

Follow up on the analysis 'Territorial effects of TN cooperation and their measurability' by Sina Redlich (BBSR): see presentation (Interreg Indicators post 2020): http://www.interact-eu.net/library#2792-presentations-intervention-logic-and-indicators-post-2020-let-us-share-harmonise

<u>Key messages:</u>

- Options for joint indicators for TNC
- New territorial agenda 2030 was currently revised and agreed in December. this year during meeting of Ministers; important framework for Interreg – Just Europe; Green Europe www.territorialagenda.eu
- Support for TNC-Programmes where DE participates; part of the study focuses also indicators
- Strong role of indicators for steering in and of projects is acknowledged
- Indicators should be close to narratives
- 6 TNC-programmes indicators cover a wide range. Programmes used on average 3 out of 46 CI, which does not allow an aggregated message;
- The programme-specific indicator sounded very differently but there were many overlaps.
- Post 2020: RCO proposed set is useful to establish common grounds but the RCR don't cover Interreg-specific aspects; that is why there is the proposal to further add RCR
- Proposal for set of indicators – same across TNC – even if PO 5 not feasible in TNC – use of e.g. RCO 75
- Exchange as a valuable element – unfashionable in a result-oriented world
- Add indicator on capacity and cooperation intensity – scaling required – projects should use a sheet to estimate impact … tool to capture such effects
- RI on capacities – used by BSR all through the Programme
- Study (in English and German) is attached to the follow up e-mail of the event

4. Group work

Steps

1. Select the most relevant Specific Objectives for Policy Objectives
2. Identify potential types of actions for each Objective
3. Select the 3 to 4 most frequent types of actions / the ones which are of interest to everybody
4. Check the available RCO and RCR which might be used
5. Discuss the need for programme-specific indicators (output, result)
6. If a new indicator is required: please make an attempt to agree on 1 or 2 programme-specific indicators
7. If you are incredibly quick: please start working on the fiche for the new programme-specific indicator

Rules of the game

- We talk about limited numbers of indicators for the programme - 1 to 2 per SO
- These indicators should cover the ‚mainstream‘ of projects under the SO – thereby trying to stay in line with the overall coverage target of 70% …
- If possible use Common Indicators; you might also use the RCO and be more specific when it comes to results

4.1. PO 1 Smarter Europe

i. Enhancing research and innovation capacities and the uptake of advanced technologies;
iv. developing skills for smart specialisation, industrial transition and entrepreneurship;

Proposed types of actions

- Crossborder research projects (transfer of know-how, expertise)
- New products, systems, processes etc. designed or produced
- Cooperation to develop new products/services
- Build & exploit shared research infrastructure
- Clustering of entrepreneurs for further development and capacity building
- Build up and upgrade common data and information systems
- Enhancing export capacities & cooperation of entrepreneurs / SMEs
- Joint services for SMEs
- Facilities / services for SMEs to test new products, systems, processes
- Creation and implementing of cooperation networks and clusters for SMEs in key sectors for cross-border or transnational areas
- Formulation of common strategies
- Establishment of cross-border networks
- Development of support actions for SMEs to engage in innovation across borders
- Innovations in SMEs – technological, organisational through cooperation with research institutions, cooperation between SMEs
- Carrying out research activities between institutions of two countries
- Preparing and implementing pilot actions / demonstration actions & feasibility studies (technology transfer)
- investment in physical / e-infrastructure for delivery of innovation
- Investment along Regional Innovation Strategies (RIS3) and Key Enabling Technologies (KET)
- Shared joint research infrastructure (research centres jointly used)
- New technologies/solutions development by cooperation
- Build up research and innovation capacities

4.2. PO 2 Greener Europe

vii. enhancing nature protecton and biodiversity, green infrastructure in particular in the urban environment, and reducing pollution;

Proposed types of actions

- Raising awareness in environmental issues
- Ensuring access to natural resources (physical accessibility and awareness raising)
- Participation formats for joint approaches in nature and landscape maintenance
- Rehabilitation of green and abandoned areas across borders
- Strategies to secure Natura-2000 areas
- Sea protection
- Pilot actions to improve bio-diversity
- Improvement of governance in the field of bio-diversity
- Joint management of natural resources (lakes, river basins)
- Small-scale green infrastructure promotion in suburban areas
- Solutions for waste management (incl. Investment)
- Development & improvement of existing environmental infrastructure
- Making the environment attractive to locals, tourists & businesses
- Joint organisation of public events

Indicators identified as most suitable ones:

Interreg indicators
RCO 87 – Organisations cooperating across borders
RCO 115 – Participations in public events across borders
RCR 84 – Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion
RCO 84 – Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects
RCO 83 – Strategies and action plans jointly developed
RCR 95 – Population having access to new or improved green infrastructure in urban areas

PO 2 Greener Europe

iv. promoting climate change adaptation, risk prevention and disaster resilience;

Proposed types of actions

- Joint intervention flood/fire
- Joint trainings for automated disaster alert and response systems
- Coastal defence small-scale infrastructure (to protect the coastline against erosion)
- Water storage facilities in mountain areas
- Water retention systems in areas prone to drought
- Alert / monitoring response systems
- Afforestation e.g. in wetlands along Danube
- Equipment f. civil protection
- Promoting nature based solutions
    - ➔ Climate resilience in cities

Indicators identified as most suitable ones:

Thematic indicators
RCO 25 – Coastal strip, river bank and lakeshore flood protection newly built or consolidated
RCO 24 – Investments in new or upgraded disaster monitoring, preparedness, warning and response systems
RCO 26 – Green infrastructure built or upgraded for adaptation to climate change
RCO 36 – Green infrastructure supported in urban areas
RCO 37 – Surface of Natura 2000 sites covered by protection and restoration measures
RCO 39 – Area covered by systems for monitoring air pollution installed

Interreg indicators
RCO 84 – Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects
RCO 87 – Organisations cooperating across borders
RCO 116 – Jointly developed solutions
RCO 117 – Solutions for legal or administrative obstacles across border identified

4.3. PO 4: A more social Europe

Proposed types of actions

- International pre-school
- Language training
- Life-long Learning for seniors
- Improving health infrastructure
- Health training and screening programmes for regional population
- Health programmes
- Medical equipment
- E-health tele-medicin
- Joint teams of doctors
- Removing legal obstacles

Indicators identified as most suitable ones:

Thematic indicators
RCO 69 – Capacity of new or modernised health care facilities
RCO 67 – Classroom capacity of new or modernised education facilities

The indicators stand for projects from Interreg programmes represented in the Group. Evidently, these indicators would require a critical mass of similar projects in order to produce visible numbers. Thus the use of Interreg indicators seems the better choice since it allows to cover a wide range of more diverse project types (and half of the narrative is told by the Specific Objective …

Interreg indicators
RCO 84 – Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects
RCO 87 – Organisations cooperating across borders
RCO 85 – Participations in joint training schemes
RCO 86 – Joint administrative or legal agreements signed

4.4.   PO 5 Europe closer to citizens

i. fostering the integrated social, economic and environmental local development and cultural heritage, tourism and security in urban areas;
ii. fostering the integrated social, economic and environmental heritage, tourism and security in areas other than urban areas;

Proposed types of actions

- Investments (building/ preparing)
- Pilot actions
- Strategies (building / preparing, fine-tuning)
- Exchange of knowledge
- Development of integrated tourism offers / theme paths
- Accessibility to ICT
- Offices for cross-border labour market
- Digital health projects
- Integrated public transport (if based on sectoral strategy better under PO 3)

Comments:

- all participating CBC programmes of this working group are considering PO 5
- Pragmatic definitions of urban / functional area would be required; important tro explain the perspective on respectively the approach to it
- Strategy versus types of action: what should be first? Types of action should be defined in the Programme; the strategy should be there prior to project selection
- Interreg – specific more relevant than PO indicators
- Use of ITI / CLLD is difficult → strategy

Indicators identified as most suitable ones:

General ones:
RCO 26* - Green infrastructure built or upgraded for adaptation to climate change*
RCO 74* - Population covered by projects in the framework of strategies for integrated territorial development*
RCO 75* - Strategies for integrated territorial development supported*
RCO 77*- Number of cultural and tourism sites supported*
RCO 80* - Community-led local development strategies supported*
RCO 97* - Renewable energy communities supported

Thematic indicators:
RCO 76 - Integrated projects for territorial development
RCO 112 - Stakeholders involved in the preparation and implementation of strategies for integrated territorial development

Interreg indicators
RCO 81 - Participations in joint actions across borders
RCO 83 - Strategies and action plans jointly developed
RCO 84- Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects
RCO 85 - Participations in joint training schemes
RCO 87 Organizations cooperating across borders (would be suitable for CB labour market offices)
RCO 115 - Public events across borders jointly organized (e.g. if SPF

4.5. ISO1 + ISO2

Comments:
- ISO 2: no interest so far
- ISO 1 : no SPO -> how to consider the I., II., III.,
  PO has to be considered as a building block and bullet points as possible actions
- Interest in people to people actions & SPF (small project funds)

Type of actions
Exchange of knowledge
Pilot actions
Strategy

Indicators:
No generic indicators* but rather Interreg-specific indicators will be relevant for the programmes.

4.6. Outcomes of the transnational and interregional group discussions

The participating transnational programmes and Interreg Europe discussed how to make the best use of proposed indicators. This is the summary of the discussion:

- Interreg-specific indicators seem the most appropriate indicators to be used in transnational and interregional programmes because of the nature of their projects. See more information below.
- A limited number of common indicators can be potentially used. It depends on the definition of common indicators, which we have not seen yet.
- Most programmes agree that they will not use indicators that require measurement after the end of the project.
- Programmes identified two result indicators that would be very useful and are missing on the list from the regulation. These are: Organisations with enhanced capacity thanks to cooperation and Individuals with enhanced capacity thanks to cooperation. The group will work on the definition for these two indicators. The basis for this will be the current methodology from BSR (organisations) and Interreg Europe (individuals).
- Impact indicators and the possibly to agree on them together (outside of the CPs) was discussed but no conclusions were made.
- Based on the latest information about PO5 presented at the event, the programmers doubt that the approach will work for them.

Programmes will most likely use these indicators:
- RCO116 Jointly developed solutions – RCR 104 Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organization
- RCO83 Strategies and action plans jointly developed – RCR 79 Joint strategies and action plans taken up by organisations
- RCO 84 Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects – RCR 85 Participations in joint actions across borders after project completion
- RCO 118 Organisations cooperating for the multi-level governance of macroregional strategies – corresponding RCR not in the regulation

These indicators can also be used but they will be monitored by the programme and not collected from projects:
- RCO 87 Organisations cooperating across borders – RCR 84 Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion
- RCO 90 Projects for innovation networks across borders (depends on the definition of this indicator)

Depending on the focus of the programme also these indicators could be used:
- RCO 85 Participations in joint training schemes – RCR 81 Completions of joint training schemes
- RCO 86 Joint administrative or legal agreements signed

Other Interreg specific indicators do not seem to be relevant for the programmes present.