EVALUATION PLAN

Cooperation Programme Interreg V-A Slovenia-Austria
for the programme period 2014-2020

2 June 2016

www.si-at.eu

CONTENT:

1. INTRODUCTION

In the programme period 2014-2020, there is a strong focus on result-orientation for programmes funded from the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF). According to the European Commission (EC), programme evaluations in the past mostly focused on management and implementation issues and in most cases did not provide a proper understanding of what was achieved with the funding in the respective programme area. Therefore, the focus of programme evaluation lies on impact evaluation and on demonstrating the contribution to achieving the set objectives.

The Evaluation Plan of the Cooperation Programme Interreg V-A Slovenia-Austria was developed in compliance with the provisions of the following regulations:
- Common Provision Regulation (CPR) - Regulation (EC) No 1303/2013, in particular Preamble 54 and Articles 50, 54, 56, 110 and 114,
- European Territorial Cooperation (ETC) Regulation – Regulation (EC) No 1299/2013, in particular Preamble 26 and Article 14,

and the Commission guidance documents on Monitoring and Evaluation[1] and on Evaluation Plans[2].

According to the above mentioned regulations, the evaluations should serve to assess and improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the programme as well as its impacts. The Evaluation Plan is a strategic document that sets out the evaluation strategy for the entire implementation period of the programme in the period 2014-2020, taking into account lessons learnt from evaluations made in the previous programme period and the budgetary framework. The present Evaluation Plan defines the objectives of the evaluations and sets their framework.

According to the regulations, the Evaluation Plan shall be drawn up by the Managing Authority (MA) and submitted to the Monitoring Committee (MC) no later than one year after the adoption of the programme. The Cooperation Programme Interreg V-A Slovenia-Austria was adopted by the EC on 16 September 2015. The present Evaluation Plan was drafted by the MA with the assistance of the Joint Secretariat (JS) and submitted for approval to the MC at its 2nd meeting held on 2-3 June 2016. Following its adoption it will be sent to the EC for information through the *System for Fund Management in the European Union* (SFC). The Evaluation Plan is a public document, prepared and adopted in English language, and will be available on the programme website www.si-at.eu.

Progress in the implementation of the Evaluation Plan as well as the outcomes of the evaluation activities will be reported in the Annual Implementation Reports (AIR). By 31 December 2022, the MA will submit to the EC a report summarising the findings of evaluations carried out during the programme period.

This plan sets out the minimum evaluation activities. Should it become evident during the programme implementation that additional evaluation activities would be necessary to better meet the evaluation objectives; this plan might be adapted on the initiative of the MC.

---

[1] Guidance Document on Monitoring and Evaluation - European Regional Development Fund and Cohesion Fund, Concepts and Recommendations (March 2014):
http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/2014/working/wd_2014_en.pdf.
[2] Guidance Document on Evaluation Plans (February 2015):
http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/2014/working/evaluation_plan_guidance_en.pdf.

2. OBJECTIVES AND COVERAGE

2.1 Evaluation objectives

The CP Interreg Slovenia-Austria aims at "ensuring the harmonious development of participating cross-border regions by focusing on strengthening cross-border competitiveness, innovation and research, protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency and enhancing institutional capacity and an efficient public administration." In order to support this result orientation, the programme will carry out a number of evaluations that will reinforce its performance. According to the regulations, at least once during the programming period it needs to be evaluated for each priority axis how the ERDF support contributes to the objectives of the relevant priority axis. Reviews of the effectiveness and impact are essential for the attainment of information on the achievement of the programme and allow optimization of the programme during or after the programming period. Such evaluations constitute a core mean to illustrate the effect and benefits of the resources and add to greater transparency in the funding agencies and towards the general public.

The main objectives of the Evaluation Plan of the CP Interreg SI-AT are to:

- improve the quality of evaluations through proper planning, including identification and collection of necessary data,
- provide a framework to plan and implement interim and impact evaluations,
- ensure the availability of all necessary resources for funding and managing the evaluations,
- equip programme bodies with information necessary to facilitate informed programme management and strategic steering of the programme,
- ensure inputs for reporting to the EC on the level of the programme (annual and final implementation reports);
- facilitate the synthesis of findings from different Member States by the EC and from different programmes by the Member States.

2.2 Coverage

As stated in the Art 54 (1) of the CPR as well as in guidance documents from the EC the content of the Evaluation Plan concerns mainly the following areas:
- Implementation evaluations
- Impact evaluations

The geographic area covered by the Evaluation Plan is the programme area, which comprises 17 NUTS 3 regions; 8 Slovenian NUTS 3 regions and 9 Austrian NUTS 3 regions.

Time-wise coverage of the Evaluation Plan ranges until the year 2023 considering the final implementation report of the programme to be submitted to the EC.

2.3 Existing knowledge

The evaluations should consider the outcomes of previous evaluations and relevant analyses carried out by the programme in the period 2007-2013 and during the programming process for the present period. Most of the listed documents are available on the programme website.

The main reference document for the evaluations is the approved CP Interreg V-A Slovenia-Austria 2014-2020. There the programme strategy, priority axes, objectives, indicators, financing and basic programme structures and procedures are described.

The analysis of the programme area including the SWOT analysis which was carried out by external experts in the course of drafting the Cooperation Programme Interreg V-A Slovenia-Austria in 2014. The conclusions of this analysis are integrated in Section 1 of the approved Cooperation Programme.

The Final evaluation of the OP SI-AT 2007-2013 was conducted by external experts and will be published in 2016. The programme was evaluated alongside several evaluation tasks: direct comparison of programme objectives and results, evaluation of programme/project implementation using the programme/project indicators, evaluation of the programme strategy and analysis of the relevance of project results, evaluation of programme communication activities and functioning of programme structures.

The final evaluation report of the Ex-Ante Evaluation of the Cooperation Programme Interreg V-A Slovenia-Austria 2014-2020 was concluded in 2015 with the aim to provide an external perspective on the preparation of the Cooperation Programme in order to improve and strengthen the quality of the programme and to ensure optimised allocation of resources. External experts evaluated the programme strategy, internal and external coherence, intervention logic, horizontal principles, indicator system and financial allocations.

The Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Interreg V-A Slovenia-Austria Cross-border Cooperation Programme 2014-2020. The first part of the SEA report gives a description of the current state and includes: definition of programme impacts and alternatives and current state of the environment. The second part integrates the above within the description of: environmental objectives and indicators for monitoring whether these objectives will be obtained, criteria set up for the purpose of the assessment and the impact assessment itself, evaluation of the Cooperation Programme implementation impacts on the environmental objectives, mitigation measures, recommendations and environmental monitoring.

The Methodological document for indicators and performance framework. This document was prepared by the programme to describe the methodology behind the definition of the indicator baselines.

The Communication Strategy for the Cooperation Programme Interreg V-A Slovenia-Austria which sets out the objectives of the programme communication, its target groups and partners as well as means to reach them.

3. COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

3.1 Roles and responsibilities

Monitoring Committee

The MC has a controlling and decisive role in the creation and implementation of the Evaluation Plan. All programme partners are represented in the MC and can therefore directly influence the evaluation process.

The MC approves the Evaluation Plan and possible subsequent amendments and revisions that might arise from emerging needs. The MC reviews the progress made in the implementation of the Evaluation Plan and examines the follow-up given to findings of evaluations (Article 110 (1) (b) of CPR). The review of the Evaluation Plan will be combined with the approval of the Annual Implementation Report(s) in which progress made in implementing the Evaluation Plan will be reported.

Managing Authority

The supervision of the implementation of the planned evaluations lies in the responsibility of the MA. Explicitly, this means taking care of the evaluations, monitoring the transparency and correctness of the tendering procedures for the implementation of the respective evaluation by competent external evaluators, accompanying the drafting of the evaluation reports and ensuring appropriate follow-up. In addition, the MA enables the evaluators access to the information needed for conducting evaluations as far as possible.

Joint Secretariat

The functions of the JS include support and execution of all day to day necessary work in the field of evaluation. This includes work in the preparation, coordination and the ongoing revision of the Evaluation Plan and work in the design, coordination and monitoring of evaluations as well as reporting to the MC and the Commission. The JS also supports the external evaluators in gathering the necessary data for evaluations (from the e-Monitoring System (eMS), from beneficiaries, National and Regional authorities, etc.) and conducts some basic analyses. The JS also takes over the coordinating role between the MA, National and Regional Authorities and evaluators.

Bilateral Working Group

The operational coordination of the activities of the MA, National and Regional Authorities and the JS concerning the evaluations will be carried out through the regular meetings of the Bilateral Working Group.

Involvement of programme partners

For the purpose of evaluations and participation of competent partners in the programme evaluation, national experts covering the thematic fields of the programme specific objectives may be engaged to provide specific inputs to the programme evaluation, its findings and follow-up measures. They could be the nominated advisors of the MC, competent in a certain thematic field or civil servants consulted during the drafting of the Cooperation Programme to establish the baseline values of the programme indicators.

In addition, other programme stakeholders and beneficiaries as well as general public will be contacted for the purpose of impact and operational evaluations through surveys, interviews and consultation events. The findings of the external evaluators will be cross-checked with beneficiaries and stakeholders. The results of evaluations will be shared through the programme communication channels.

3.2 Synergy with other programmes and initiatives

As stated in the Cooperation Programme, the programme will strive to create synergies with other EU programmes, in particular with nationally implemented ESI funds, Interreg and centralised EU programmes. Further synergies will be sought also with relevant macroregional strategies being the EU Strategy for the Danube Region (EUSDR), the EU Strategy for the Alpine Region (EUSALP) and the EU Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region (EUSAIR). This principle will be followed also in programme evaluation. Therefore, evaluators will also consider synergetic effects of projects funded by these different sources in the programme area as far as this will be possible considering the availability of data on both sides of the border. Evaluation reports of nationally implemented ESI funds and other Interreg programmes will also be considered by evaluators.

3.3 Sources of evaluation

As a general rule the evaluations are conducted by external experts. These experts are functionally independent from the programme bodies (Art. 54(3) of CPR).

External (including in-house) expertise in the implementation of evaluations

As far as necessary the programme will resort to external expertise for the implementation of evaluations, in particular when complex topics are concerned, for example to evaluate the programme impact where sophisticated methodologies are required for the collection and analysis of diverse data. Following the principle of objectivity external service providers are also more suitable for any evaluations concerning the programme processes and structures.

When selecting external service providers for the execution of evaluations national and EU public procurement rules shall be respected. At the same time, the procedure should allow participation of service providers from both sides of the border. In addition to price, quality criteria shall be applied, which can be set separately for each evaluation. The external service provider shall be in close contact with relevant programme bodies throughout the evaluation process.

Especially due to the limited budget of the programme for evaluations, the programme will also make good use of the independent expert evaluator employed by the Office of the Republic of Slovenia for Development and European Cohesion Policy, who will not be involved in the implementation and monitoring of the programme.

Internal expertise in the implementation of evaluations
When appropriate, some analyses are carried out internally by the programme bodies which include smaller status reports at the beginning of the programme implementation or gathering of data for evaluations (for example surveys with beneficiaries and stakeholders regarding the performance of programme bodies, functioning of programme implementation tools, effectiveness of programme communication, etc.).

The JS will provide external evaluators with relevant data from the programme monitoring system, programme documents, results of any internal evaluation activities and any other relevant information needed to execute the contracted evaluations.

An interactive exchange between the external evaluators and JS is foreseen. The JS will provide external evaluators with relevant data from the programme monitoring system, programme documents, results of any internal analyses and any other relevant information needed to execute the contracted evaluations

One JS employee is operatively responsible to follow the evaluation process according to the Interreg V-A Slovenia-Austria Evaluation Plan; others are called in upon necessity.

To ensure good knowledge on evaluations necessary for drawing up Terms of Reference of public procurements and to steer and monitor the evaluation process the JS staff will regularly take part in trainings offered, especially by Interact, carry out self-studies and exchange with other programmes.

3.4   Use and communication of evaluation results

Evaluation results will optimize the programme implementation and achievement of programme objectives; therefore, it is necessary to make them available to programme bodies.

They will be presented and discussed within the MC. The MA and JS will propose to the MC follow-up measures to meet relevant recommendations suggested by the evaluators. The implementation of measures approved by the MC is carried out by relevant programme bodies under the coordination of the MA and supervision of the MC.

Relevant results of evaluations will also be communicated to interested authorities for their use in policy development and decision making as well as to other programme partners and stakeholders.

With regard to the transparency of the programme, the results of the evaluations carried out pursuant to Art. 54 (4) of the CPR will be available to the public. This is foreseen thorough the annual implementation reports, where the results of the evaluations are summarized alongside the progress of the Evaluation Plan (see section 4.1.). The annual implementation reports are published on the programme website. Single evaluation reports will also be published in summary form on the programme website.

As suggested in the EC Guidance Document on Evaluation Plans the evaluation reports accompanied by supporting documents will be uploaded to the SFC and made available to the EC.

3.5   Quality assurance

To ensure the quality of programme evaluations, sufficient time will be foreseen to plan and procure evaluations. Specific criteria will be defined in the terms of reference for the selection of evaluation experts. They will relate in particular to competences and expertise in evaluation, in particular evaluation of Cohesion policy and ETC programmes. Evaluators will be required to use a sound methodology in the performance of their tasks. They will also be required to produce inception, interim and final reports on the evaluations carried out. The MA with the assistance of the JS will be responsible for quality control of the outsourced evaluation activities.

The MC will be regularly informed about the progress on evaluation activities and their outcomes and will also receive the evaluation reports.

3.6   Financial resources

A total of approximately 100.000 EUR is available for carrying out evaluations according to the present Evaluation Plan for the outsourced external evaluators. The financing of trainings and in-house external experts is foreseen from the Technical assistance budget lines and is not part of the evaluation budget.

4.   TIMING AND PLANNED EVALUATIONS

4.1   Timeline

For the planned evaluations a schedule has been created, which is presented below. According to the Guidance Document of the EC, all information on evaluations that are planned more than three years in advance should be regarded as indicative.

Since results of evaluations are gathered in different reports that need to be submitted to the EC, the schedule below also shows how evaluations feed into these reports.

Table 1: Timeline of reporting about programme implementation and planned evaluations feeding into those reports

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Reporting about programme implementation								
Annual implementation report	AIR 2014/15	AIR 2016 larger report	AIR 2017 31/05/2018	AIR 2018 larger report	AIR 2019	AIR 2020	AIR 2021	
submission deadline	31/05/2016	30/06/2017		30/06/2019	31/05/2020	31/05/2021	31/05/2022	
Final implementation report								FIR
submission deadline								31/05/2023
Summarising evaluation report (Art. 114 (2) of CPR) submission deadline							Summary eval. report 31/12/2022	
Evaluations feeding into reports								
Implementation evaluations (Art. 56 (3) of CPR)		I.		II.				
Impact evaluations for priority axes 1-3 (Art. 56 (3) of CPR)					I.		II.	

4.2 Planned evaluations

4.2.1 Implementation evaluation of the programme

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess effectiveness and efficiency of the programme management system and programme implementation. <u>Efficiency</u> refers to the use of financial/administrative resources in relation to outputs and results. <u>Effectiveness</u> refers to the degree to which set objectives and targets are achieved.

Timing

The implementation evaluation of the programme will be performed two times during the programme duration. First one from mid 2016 to the beginning of 2017, to feed the AIR 2016 and the second one in from mid 2018 to the beginning of 2019, to feed the AIR 2018.

Focus of the evaluation I.

- programme management and implementation
- project application, selection procedures
- Communication Strategy

General guiding questions

The indicative guiding questions are available in the table below and will be defined in more detail in the Terms of Reference.

- How efficient is the programme structure?
- How efficient and effective are the programme procedures?
- How user friendly are programme procedures and forms?
- In how far was simplification and harmonisation of procedures achieved?
- Are there any improvements necessary in the programme procedures?
- Are there any bottlenecks identified in programme procedures and how could they be surpassed?
- What is the progress of the programme towards achieving the targets of the specific objectives?
- What is the progress in implementation of communication strategy and achievement of the set objectives?

Focus of the evaluation II.

- programme management and implementation
- management of technical assistance funds
- project reporting and reimbursement procedures
- first thematic achievements
- analysis of partnerships
- performance framework milestone 2018

General guiding questions

Further indicative guiding questions are available in the table below and will be defined in more detail in the Terms of Reference.

- How efficient is the programme structure?
- How efficient and effective are the programme procedures?
- How user friendly are programme procedures and forms?
- In how far was simplification and harmonisation of procedures achieved?
- Are there any improvements necessary in the programme procedures?
- Are there any bottlenecks identified in programme procedures and how could they be surpassed?
- What is the progress of the programme towards achieving the targets of the specific objectives?
- What are the highlights of project implementation?
- What are the features of the partnerships? Do they reflect the expectations of the programme?
- What is the progress in implementation of communication strategy and achievement of the set objectives?
- How is the programme perceived by target groups, especially relevant stakeholders and the general public?

Sources of data
- eMS
- as defined in Methodology for monitoring of programme result indicators
- public data registers
- project outputs and deliverables

Data collected by the MA and JS through the regular progress monitoring of projects (including information on project achievements, output indicators, performance framework and financial data) and documented within the programme monitoring system will serve as relevant input for both types of evaluations.

Possible methods
- data collection and analysis
- desk research
- surveys
- feedback questionnaires
- interviews

Estimated budget
Budget for both evaluations is estimated at 40.000.

4.2.2   Impact evaluation

The impact evaluation assesses how support from ERDF has contributed to the objectives for each priority axis. The impact of the programme shall be evaluated and disentangled from any other trends and developments in the programme area.

Timing

By 2020 a significant number of project results will be available, therefore impact evaluation I will be carried out by the beginning of 2020. Its results will be included in the AIR 2019 and will also be used for the programming of the next financial period. Impact evaluation II will be carried out until the beginning of 2022. Its results will feed into the AIR 2021 and the Summary evaluation report.

Focus of the evaluation I. and II.

It is the focus of the evaluation to assess the impact of the programme on the programme area by evaluating it apart from other trends and developments in the region. It should capture the effects of the programme as a whole and its performance as regards each specific objective. In more detail the evaluations will focus on:

- Impact evaluation of priority axes 1-3
- result indicator values by beginning of 2020 and 2022 respectively
- target groups, indicative activities and types of beneficiaries
- guiding principles
- horizontal principles
- (socio-economic and SWOT analysis of the programme area by the beginning of 2020)
- contribution to the EU 2020 Strategy
- Communication Strategy

General guiding questions

Further indicative guiding questions, including questions by specific objective, are available in the table below and will be defined in more detail in the Terms of Reference.

- How well are the project objectives, outputs and results aligned with expectations of the programme as set in the CP (intervention logic)?
- What is the progress of the programme towards achieving the targets of the specific objectives in terms of expected results, activities, target groups, types of beneficiaries and indicators?
- What change was achieved in the programme area in terms of meeting the needs and challenges of the programme area as identified in CP 2014-2020 (considering the scope and characteristics of the programme)?
- Identification of gaps between what was achieved and what are the remaining/emerging needs of the area at the time of the evaluation.
- How well did guiding principles lead the projects towards expectations of the programme?

- How well was the integrated approach to territorial development followed?
- How well was the territorial balance respected?

Sources of data

- eMS
- as defined in Methodology for monitoring of programme result indicators
- public data registers
- project outputs and deliverables

Possible methods

A theory based approach as defined in the EC Guidance Document will be used for the impact evaluation. This approach follows each step of the intervention logic identifying causal links and mechanisms of change, answering the question why and how an intervention works.

- desk research
- interviews
- surveys
- feedback questionnaires
- SWOT analysis

Estimated budget

Budget for both evaluations is estimated at 60.000 EUR.

Table 2: Summary of planned evaluations and evaluation questions

Deadline	Reporting of the pro-gramme imple-mentation	Evaluation theme	Subject of the evaluation	Possible methods	Indicative evaluation questions
30/06/2017	AIR 2016 (larger)	Implementatio evaluation of the programme	✓ programme management and implementation ✓ project application, selection procedures ✓ Communication Strategy	✓ data collection and analysis ✓ desk research ✓ surveys ✓ feedback questionnaires ✓ interviews	<u>Programme level</u> Did the Implementation Manual for Beneficiaries and Application Pack enable the potential beneficiaries to prepare well written applications? What can be improved? Are the project assessment, selection and contracting systems efficient? Can project assessment, selection and contracting be accelerated? Is the project monitoring system efficient? What can be improved? Is the overall management and control system efficient? What can be improved? Did the use of simplified cost options prove to be efficient? What can be improved? Is the right balance of relevant stakeholders involved in the implementation of the programme, including as regards their participation in the MC, from the point of view of applying the partnership principle?

					Is the use of funds properly addressing the current development needs of beneficiaries in the programme area? Are there more stringent uncovered needs that could be tackled under a future cross-border programme? Is there any de-commitment expected to take place at programme level? What specific actions should be taken in order to minimize the de-commitment risk? Are there any risks/unsolved problems hindering the smooth programme implementation that are emerging both in programming period 2007-2013 and the current one and what could be done, in order to mitigate/overcome them? Project level Are there any patterns that could be identified for successful project implementation? In case weak points (e.g. irregularities, budgetary corrections, etc.) have been detected within project implementation, could a pattern be identified in relation to their cause and their influence on the overall implementation of the programme's specific objectives? What are the major difficulties faced by the applicants/beneficiaries? What measures could be taken to overcome them?

					Are the applicants/beneficiaries sufficiently supported to prepare projects and implement them? Are the actions taken in order to reduce the administrative burden on applicants/beneficiaries working? What can be improved? To what extent have the objectives of the projects financed under this programme been achieved or are about to be achieved? What are the possible internal and external factors affecting the achievement of the objectives (e.g. human resources, financial capacity)? How do the co-financed projects contribute to the application of equal opportunities and non-discrimination horizontal principle, especially as regards the equality between men and women?
31/05/2018	AIR 2017	Evaluation of the implementation of the Communication Strategy	Communication Strategy (indicators)		Do the communication activities carried out by the programme authorities lead to the achievement of the general and specific objectives set out in the Communication Strategy? Could more effect be achieved by using different instruments or actions? Which actions or tools were the most successful in spreading the information about the Programme and which could be considered as excessive or ineffective? Do communication activities have sufficient impact on the awareness of the beneficiaries/potential beneficiaries of the Programme?
30/06/2019	AIR 2018 (larger)	Implementation evaluation of	✓ programme management and implementation	✓ data collection and analysis ✓ desk research	See questions in column AIR 2016 and AIR 2017.

		the programme	✓ management of TA budget ✓ project reporting and reimbursement procedures ✓ first thematic achievements ✓ analysis of partnerships ✓ performance framework milestone 2018 ✓ Communication Strategy	✓ surveys ✓ feedback questionnaires ✓ interviews	Which is the actual implementation progress as regards each specific objective? Which is the achievement level of programme indicators? Which is the achievement level of performance framework indicators as compared to the milestones for 2018? Will the progress to date (given the current trends) lead to the achievement of target values of programme and performance framework indicators? Are there any specific factors hindering the effective use of TA funds? Are there any steps in the use of TA funds that could be made more efficient?
31/05/2020	AIR 2019	**Impact evaluation** including evaluation of the implementation of the Communication Strategy	✓ thematic and territorial impacts of programme implementation for priority axes 1-3 ✓ Communication Strategy (indicators)	theory-based impact evaluation: ✓ desk research ✓ data analysis ✓ surveys ✓ feedback questionnaires ✓ interviews	See questions in column AIR 2017. To what extent does the programme add benefits to the cross-border regional development and complement and enhance the effect of other related policies or strategies? How does this mechanism work and what can be improved? What is the current and estimated aggregated effect of the programme in the eligible area? Are the programme's outputs and results sustainable on long term? How well are the horizontal principles addressed?

					Are there any synergies with other EU programmes and initiatives? How can future programming be streamlined in order to achieve higher impact and ensure sustainability of the financial assistance provided? PA 1 IP 1(b) SO 1: Strengthening R&I in technological and economic fields of strength through CB cooperation of relevant stakeholders What is the progress in strengthening R&I in technological and economic fields of strength through CB cooperation of relevant stakeholders? What is the current and expected contribution of the interventions under the programme to this progress? What are the factors facilitating that contribution? Are there any unintended effects of the programme in this field? PA 1 IP 1(b) SO 2: Broadening the basis of innovating enterprises in the programme area What is the progress in broadening the basis of innovating enterprises in the programme area? What is the current and expected contribution of the interventions under the programme to this progress? What are the factors facilitating that contribution? Are there any unintended effects of the programme in this field? PA 1 IP 1(b) SO 3: Increasing the level of internationalization of enterprises, especially SMEs in the programme area What is the progress in increasing the level of internationalization of enterprises, especially SMEs in the programme area? What is the current and expected contribution of the interventions under the programme to this progress?

						What are the factors facilitating that contribution?
						Are there any unintended effects of the programme in this field?
						<u>PA 2 IP 6(c) SO: Achieving sustainable development of natural and cultural heritage</u>
						What is the progress in sustainable development of natural and cultural heritage and in improving tourism in the cross-border area?
						What is the current and expected contribution of the interventions under the programme to this progress?
						What are the factors facilitating that contribution?
						Are there any unintended effects of the programme in this field?
						<u>PA 2 IP 6(f) SO: Innovation in sustainable management and utilization of water resources</u>
						What is the progress in innovation in sustainable management and utilization of water resources?
						What is the current and expected contribution of the interventions under the programme to this progress?
						What are the factors facilitating that contribution?
						Are there any unintended effects of the programme in this field?
						<u>PA 3 IP 11(b) SO 1: Improving cooperation in the field of risk management, energy, health and social cohesion</u>
						Have the interventions under this PA led to achievement of any effects, intended or unintended?
						How much of the effects identified are directly attributable to interventions under the programme?
						What are the factors facilitating this direct effect?
						<u>PA 3 IP 11(b) SO 2: Improving interactions among municipalities and citizens within the CB region</u>
						Have the interventions under this PA led to achievement of any effects, intended or unintended?

					How much of the effects identified are directly attributable to interventions under the programme? What are the factors facilitating this direct effect?
31/05/2022 31/12/2022	AIR 2021 Summary evaluation report	**Impact evaluation**	thematic and territorial impacts of programme implementation for priority axes 1-3	theory-based impact evaluation: ✓ desk research ✓ data analysis ✓ surveys ✓ feedback questionnaires ✓ interviews	To what extent does the programme add benefits to the cross-border regional development and complement and enhance the effect of other related policies or strategies? How does this mechanism work and what can be improved? What is the current and estimated aggregated effect of the programme in the eligible area? Are the programme's outputs and results sustainable on long term? How well are the horizontal principles addressed? Are there any synergies with other EU programmes and initiatives? How can future programming be streamlined in order to achieve higher impact and ensure sustainability of the financial assistance provided? PA 1 IP 1(b) SO 1: Strengthening R&I in technological and economic fields of strength through CB cooperation of relevant stakeholders What is the progress in strengthening R&I in technological and economic fields of strength through CB cooperation of relevant stakeholders? What is the current and expected contribution of the interventions under the programme to this progress?

						What are the factors facilitating that contribution?
						Are there any unintended effects of the programme in this field?
						PA 1 IP 1(b) SO 2: Broadening the basis of innovating enterprises in the programme area
						What is the progress in broadening the basis of innovating enterprises in the programme area?
						What is the current and expected contribution of the interventions under the programme to this progress?
						What are the factors facilitating that contribution?
						Are there any unintended effects of the programme in this field?
						PA 1 IP 1(b) SO 3: Increasing the level of internationalization of enterprises, especially SMEs in the programme area
						What is the progress in increasing the level of internationalization of enterprises, especially SMEs in the programme area?
						What is the current and expected contribution of the interventions under the programme to this progress?
						What are the factors facilitating that contribution?
						Are there any unintended effects of the programme in this field?
						PA 2 IP 6(c) SO: Achieving sustainable development of natural and cultural heritage
						What is the progress in sustainable development of natural and cultural heritage and in improving tourism in the cross-border area?
						What is the current and expected contribution of the interventions under the programme to this progress?
						What are the factors facilitating that contribution?
						Are there any unintended effects of the programme in this field?
						PA 2 IP 6(f) SO: Innovation in sustainable management and utilization of water resources

					What is the progress in innovation in sustainable management and utilization of water resources?
					What is the current and expected contribution of the interventions under the programme to this progress?
					What are the factors facilitating that contribution?
					Are there any unintended effects of the programme in this field?
					PA 3 IP 11(b) SO 1: Improving cooperation in the field of risk management, energy, health and social cohesion
					Have the interventions under this PA led to achievement of any effects, intended or unintended?
					How much of the effects identified are directly attributable to interventions under the programme?
					What are the factors facilitating this direct effect?
					PA 3 IP 11(b) SO 2: Improving interactions among municipalities and citizens within the CB region
					Have the interventions under this PA led to achievement of any effects, intended or unintended?
					How much of the effects identified are directly attributable to interventions under the programme?
					What are the factors facilitating this direct effect?