



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL
REGIONAL POLICY
Conception, impact, co-ordination and evaluation

The New Programming period 2000-2006: methodological working papers

Working Paper 7 (October 2000)

Ex Ante Evaluation and Indicators for INTERREG (Strand A and B)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
STRAND A : CROSS-BORDER CO-OPERATION.....	4
PART 1: INDICATIVE APPROACH FOR THE EX ANTE EVALUATION OF INTERREG	5
1.1. <i>Learning from Past Experience.....</i>	<i>5</i>
1.2. <i>The Context of the Intervention.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Table 1 : Illustration of Assessment of Contribution to Problems/Potential.....</i>	<i>9</i>
1.3. <i>The Rationale and Overall Consistency of the Strategy.....</i>	<i>10</i>
1.4. <i>Quantification of Objectives.....</i>	<i>11</i>
1.5. <i>Estimate of Expected Impact.....</i>	<i>12</i>
1.6. <i>Implementation System.....</i>	<i>12</i>
PART 2: INDICATIVE METHODOLOGY CONCERNING A SYSTEM OF INDICATORS FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION	14
2.1. <i>Framework.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Table 2 : Indicators and intervention logic of a programme.....</i>	<i>15</i>
2.2. <i>Selecting appropriate indicators</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Table 3 : Examples of Interreg-specific Context / Impact Indicators</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Table 4 : Examples of Interreg-specific Output/Result Indicators.....</i>	<i>19</i>
2.3. <i>Programme Structures and Processes Indicators.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Table 5 : Examples of Interreg Programme Structures/Processes Indicators.....</i>	<i>25</i>
2.4. <i>Key Indicators.....</i>	<i>26</i>
2.5. <i>Sources of Information</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Annex 1 : Categorisation of areas of intervention.....</i>	<i>28</i>
STRAND B : TRANSNATIONAL CO-OPERATION.....	33
ISSUES.....	33
KEY ELEMENTS OF THE EX ANTE EVALUATION OF INTERREG III (STRAND B)	35
1. <i>Strengths, Weaknesses and Potential in the Area of Co-Operation</i>	<i>35</i>
2. <i>Appraisal of the Added Value of Interventions</i>	<i>35</i>
3. <i>Appraisal of the Implementation Procedures.....</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Annex 2 : Issues to be Dealt with in the Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses Arising from</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Priorities in the European Spatial Development Perspective.....</i>	<i>37</i>

INTRODUCTION

All Community Initiative programmes are required to fulfil the obligations for evaluation as set out in the Structural Funds regulations. General methodological advice on *ex ante* evaluation and on indicators for monitoring and evaluation has been prepared by the services of the European Commission for all types of programmes in the new programming period 2000-2006¹. The present working paper aims to provide specific guidance for programmes adopted under the Community Initiative Interreg III, to assist those responsible for programming and establishing the evaluation framework.

Interreg III (“trans-European co-operation intended to encourage harmonious and balanced development of the European territory”) has three strands. Strand A concerns “cross-border co-operation” with the aim of “promoting integrated regional development between neighbouring border regions, including external and certain maritime borders”. Strand B concerns the issue of larger co-operation, transnational co-operation, which contributes to a harmonious territorial integration throughout the community. The last strand (Strand C), which deals with interregional co-operation, responds to the objective of improving the effectiveness of policies and tools for regional development and cohesion.

¹ The New Programming period 2000-2006: methodological working papers.
No 2: The Ex-Ante Evaluation of the 2000-2006 interventions Objectives 1, 2 and 3
(http://www.inforegio.cec.eu.int/wbdoc/docoffic/working/sf2000b_en.htm)
No 3: Indicators for Monitoring and Evaluation: An indicative methodology
(http://www.inforegio.cec.eu.int/wbdoc/docoffic/working/sf2000c_en.htm)

Strand A : Cross-Border co-operation

The need for specific methodological advice for evaluation in the framework of Interreg IIIA arises from the weaknesses noted in the evaluation of many Interreg I and IIA programmes by comparison with other Structural Funds programmes, and from the specificities of this strand, especially:

- the dualism of its objectives, which cover both “regional development” and “cross-border co-operation and regional integration”;
- the transnational character of the institutional systems involved in the preparation and implementation of these programmes,
- differences in data availability on borders;
- and in the case of external borders, differences in regulations applying to community programmes on either side of the border, such as under Interreg on the EU side and Phare/Tacis cross-border co-operation on the other side.

The guidelines on specific objectives, eligible actions and working methods for Interreg IIIA are laid down in a Communication of the Commission² to the Member States. The present document reiterates the content of those guidelines.

The intention is to provide methodological advice in line with both the Commission Guidelines for Interreg IIIA and the general methodological approach adopted by the Commission for Structural Funds programmes. This “standard” advice will apply to the majority of Interreg IIIA programmes. However, given the diversity that currently exists in the border regions covered by Interreg, the document also takes account of adjustments or variations that may be necessary for the external borders of the Union, ie border zones with the adjacent countries eligible under Phare.

The paper comprises two parts:

- *Part 1* presents an overall methodological approach on *ex ante* evaluation, following broadly the structure of the Working Paper 2 on “The Ex Ante Evaluation of the 2000-2006 Interventions, Objectives 1,2 and 3”;
- *Part 2* provides practical suggestions on developing and managing a system of indicators, linked as far as possible to the methodology of Working Paper 3 on Indicators for Monitoring and Evaluation: An Indicative Methodology.

² Orientations INTERREG III : Communication of the Commission, COM (2000) 1101 Official Journal of 23.05.2000 (Serie C 143) (<http://www.inforegio.cec.eu.int/wbdoc/docoffic/official/interreg3/>).

PART 1:

INDICATIVE APPROACH FOR THE EX ANTE EVALUATION OF INTERREG

1.1. Learning from Past Experience

Evaluation is conceived as a cyclical process corresponding to the life-cycle of a programme. Therefore, the different phases of evaluation – ex ante, mid-term, and ex post – should be taken into consideration. Evaluation should also be closely linked to that carried out on predecessor programmes.

For most cases of Interreg IIIA programmes, there exist mid-term evaluations of predecessor IIA programmes. There may also be ex post evaluations of programmes under Interreg I. These evaluation studies, together with related documentation (strategy documents, programming documents, monitoring reports, etc) are likely to represent an important body of knowledge for the start of the evaluation cycle for the Interreg IIIA programmes. This body of knowledge can be useful in understanding:

- the existing socio-economic situation and the existing socio-economic links for each transborder region;
- the relevance of objectives to needs of the border regions;
- the degree of co-operation and/or integration;
- the project generation and implementation processes;
- the functioning of common co-operation structures;
- the availability of comparable data for either side of the border and of established evaluation indicators.

As IIA programmes have not yet reached the ex post evaluation stage the mid-term evaluations carried out in most programmes will most likely constitute an information base to be validated. A more general issue in the case of Interreg programmes regards the weakness of their indicator systems which is much less developed than for other Structural Funds programmes. These limitations reflect the special nature of Interreg interventions and the fact that this field of evaluation is a particularly difficult one.

There are also specific issues applying to certain types of border or programme³. This is particularly the case in external border regions and the evaluation of Phare CBC programmes has shown some shortcomings associated with weak regional administrative structures and a lack of regional socio-economic data on which policies can be based.

When preparing and evaluating new programmes, valuable knowledge on innovation and good practice can be gained from the experience other Interreg regions..

³ e.g. large programmes covering the whole of a national border in Objective 1 regions (eg E/P, GR external borders) under Interreg I and IIA.

1.2. The Context of the Intervention

Border regions often lag behind in economic terms due to their remoteness from national economic centres and for other reasons. However, their problems cannot be considered to be the general problems of peripheral or disadvantaged regions. Their difficulties result additionally from their specific situation at a border, being cut off by institutional, social or cultural/linguistic barriers from areas across the border with which they could form an economically developing area.

Consequently, the situation of border regions has two dimensions:
their economic and social *development* is linked;
the situation depends on the level of *integration* and degree of co-operation between adjacent zones on either side of the border.

In terms of level of development, border regions are in situations corresponding to those recognised by the Structural Funds (lagging behind for Objective 1; facing challenges of economic restructuring for Objective 2); but unclassified regions could also be included. External border regions represent an important category due to the special problems which they face.

Integration of Border Zones

The notion of integration is complex, covering socio-economic, physical and institutional aspects. *Socio-economic* aspects cover a particularly wide spectrum ranging from the extent to which local businesses operate on the other side of the border to educational/cultural links. *Institutional* aspects can range in intensity : contacts/forums/working committees between counterpart bodies (eg public authorities, professional chambers, schools/universities) to the establishment of permanent cross-border structures. Finally, the absence of *physical* links can represent a basic shortcoming in cross-border integration, eg missing links between transport (road/rail), energy and other infrastructure networks.

The existing *degree of integration* may be “low”, “intermediate” or “high” but in all cases the overall logic in the context of European integration and cohesion is that border regions should be moving progressively towards higher levels of co-operation and integration. The degree of integration can be regarded as:

- *low*, if the two border regions operate as separate socio-economic units. This may also be reflected in some programmes under Interreg I or IIA that comprised two sub-programmes for each side of the border, which are effectively autonomous in terms of priorities/measures and management arrangements;
- *intermediate*, if various forms of co-operation between public institutions, private business and other interests from either side of the border exist and partly integrated or closely co-ordinated management of the Interreg programmes are in place;
- *high*, if the two sides of the border effectively function as a single socio-economic unit (cross-border region) with its own cross-border institutions, including a fully integrated Interreg programme (managed by a cross-border structure, with joint bank accounts, etc).

In order to achieve the aim of Strand A of “promoting an integrated regional development between neighbouring border regions” it is important to understand the dimensions of integration and also to link them closely together. Understanding the extent to which the border is a factor in a region’s development problems which could be overcome through co-operation and greater integration, and by exploiting common potential, is a precondition for a successful intervention through Interreg. In other words, cross-border co-operation and regional integration are of paramount importance for creating or strengthening *conditions for regional development*.

Analysis of the strengths, weaknesses and potential of the border regions

The situation in the border regions will need to be analysed in a systematic way in order to define the priorities of the intervention. This analysis should follow established methods, such as SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats). However, in the case of Interreg programmes it will be important to ensure that key points of specificity are respected.

The analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats should be carried out on a cross-border basis, i.e. a ***common analysis*** for the whole eligible area on either side of the border. This is important for arriving at common or jointly defined needs and priorities for action, but raises some practical issues which should be addressed as early as possible, such as the availability and compatibility of data, and institutional arrangements for cross-border working, eg joint working groups.

The analysis should identify separately ***problems associated with the border***, i.e. those that result from the barrier effect of the border or from the border situation of the regions concerned (peripheral in national terms). For example, “missing links” such as border crossings on external borders, cross-border river pollution, lack of mutual recognition of qualifications.

The analysis should clearly define the ***common potential*** of the border regions, i.e. the potential which can be exploited through cross-border co-operation, eg tourism promotion, management of natural resources.

In other words, the SWOT analysis or similar analysis should be conducted in a transparent manner allowing the *ex ante* evaluation and the programme document to show clearly which are the principal ***needs of the border regions*** concerned that should be taken into consideration.

The *ex ante* evaluation should also show clearly ***how the programme priorities/measures were chosen*** by reference to the results of the SWOT analysis. It is important that there is an assessment of the potential contribution of each field of action (contribution in enhancing co-operation/integration or in exploiting common potential) for each of the main objectives highlighted by the SWOT analysis.

Table 1 illustrates in a simplified way how this can be done by using a grid (matrix) of SWOT results and eligible fields of action. The main points of the SWOT analysis can be presented under “problems” (including weaknesses and threats) which are associated with the border and common cross-border “potential” (including strengths and opportunities). The fields of action⁴ can be those envisaged in the Interreg Guidelines for Strand A. The grid should be used to assess the contribution that each field of action can make - individually or in combination with other fields - towards solving each one of the problems or exploiting the areas of potential. Action may be needed in more than one field in order to tackle a particular problem/potential. For example:

- a combination of training actions and actions in favour of the recognition of these trainings at either side of the border and actions to improve public transport could contribute to solving problems of restricted cross-border access to jobs by unemployed people;
- a combination of actions in view of touristic SME development, environmental improvements and institutional co-operation can contribute to the exploitation of common cross-border tourism potential.

The assessment can be carried out initially at a broad level (with just a “tick” in each cell) and it can then be applied more rigorously by assessing for each cell of the grid the degree of contribution that particular elements/actions can make, within each field of action. As a full quantification of the potential contribution will not be feasible, at least an indication should be given of the major potential contributions. “Major” can be defined in terms of resources allocated to an action in the given programming period, or, on the other hand, for instance in terms of its contribution to the realisation of an objective.

The above approach can be followed for all types of borders. However evaluators will need to pay particular attention in the way that the analysis is conducted in the case of *maritime and mountain border regions*. In some cases the existing degree of co-operation/integration is too low⁵ to allow a genuine cross-border co-operation programme to be effectively implemented in the timescale of the programming period 2000-2006 and certain actions within the framework of Interreg may not be adequate to address major obstacles. For example.

⁴ The list of the fields of action is joined as annex IV to the Orientations INTERREG III : Communication of the Commission, COM (2000) 1101 Official Journal of 23.05.2000 (Series C 143) (<http://www.inforegio.cec.eu.int/wbdoc/docoffic/official/interreg3/>).

⁵ As expressed in context indicators, such as those in Table 3 (eg low frequency / high cost of passenger transport in certain maritime borders, or little cross-border citizens’ contact or business activity in certain mountain borders).

Table 1 : Illustration of Assessment of Contribution to Problems/Potential

<i>main SWOT points:</i> fields of action:	Urban, rural, coastal development	Enterprise & SME development	Labour market & social inclusion	Research, technology, culture & health	Environment & energy	Transport & telecoms	Legal and administrative co-operation	Co-operation between citizens & institutions	Technical assistance
Problems									
<i>Problem No 1</i>					M ✓				
<i>Problem No 2</i>			M ✓			M ✓			
<i>Problem No 3</i>		M ✓		m ✓		m ✓			
<i>Problem No ...</i>							M ✓		
Potential									
<i>Potential No 1</i>		M ✓						M ✓	
<i>Potential No 2</i>	M ✓				m ✓				m ✓
<i>Potential No 3</i>	M ✓	M ✓	m ✓	m ✓					
<i>Potential No ...</i>							M ✓		m ✓

M ✓ : major contribution m ✓ : minor contribution

1.3. The Rationale and Overall Consistency of the Strategy

The *ex ante* evaluation should help understand how and to what extent individual parts of the programme (priorities / measures) correspond to the identified needs of the border regions concerned. It should also show how the priorities/measures of the programme will contribute to the aims of Strand A of Interreg, and will not merely be additional but identical actions to those included in mainstream Structural Funds programmes.

Relevance

Strand A of Interreg III is dedicated to “promoting integrated regional development between neighbouring border regions”. The priorities and measures of an Interreg IIIA programme must be contributing in a transparent way to these general aims of Interreg, through:

- the choice of relevant types of action from a wide range of eligible types of action specified in the Guidelines of the Commission⁶;
- the manner in which these actions are implemented through cross-border co-operation (jointly developed and implemented projects, with partners from the two sides of the border).

Consistency

Internal consistency must be maintained within the programme, including the programming complement, covering all its aspects including objectives, priorities and measures, as well as method of implementation (publicity/promotion, programme-level and measure-level selection criteria for project selection, co-funding, etc).

Greater consistency is likely to be achieved by:

- avoiding dispersion of actions and by ensuring that the intervention is focused on a small number of carefully chosen and defined priorities with appropriate and effective measures;
- having a clear understanding of how each “string” of objectives/activities /implementation methods ultimately leads to outputs/results/impacts, ie a clear cause-and-effect assumption as to why and how an action will lead to a change in the initial situation in the border regions concerned.

⁶ Cf. Annex IV Communication of the Commission, COM (2000) 1101 Official Journal of 23.05.2000 (Series C 143) (<http://www.inforegio.cec.eu.int/wbdoc/docoffic/official/interreg3/>).

Complementarity

In the case of Interreg programmes the *ex ante* evaluation should specifically aim to understand and to help state clearly the strategic links between the Interreg programme and any other regional development interventions pursued through the Structural Funds (and possibly other, national/regional, structural policy instruments).

In practical terms, for each priority/measure of the Interreg programme, it should be established whether it complements or enhances another measure in another programme (or *vice versa*). It will also be important to define the scale of any related interventions (eg financial resources), since proportionality is an important factor in selecting indicators and assessing results/impact of the intervention.

1.4. Quantification of Objectives

For all Structural Funds programmes the quantification of objectives is a crucial step that allows “the establishment of what a programme is supposed to achieve”. Past experience shows that this is much more difficult to achieve for Interreg programmes than for any other category of Structural Funds programmes. There are many explanations for this situation, including the following:

- there are certain Interreg programme objectives and actions which are intangible, eg “to create a climate of co-operation”;
- many of the effects (results/impacts) of Interreg programmes are of an indirect nature and can only be seen in the long term (eg “to create co-operation networks, achieve agreements, etc);
- it is difficult to distinguish the effects of Interreg programmes from effects caused by other programmes (either from those of other (often larger in financial resources) Structural Funds interventions or from those of other policy measures);
- heterogeneity and dispersal of measures and projects makes it more difficult to aggregate outputs/results/impacts through the use a small number of quantitative indicators.

Limitations on meaningful quantification represent one of the greatest challenges in Interreg evaluation and can be addressed up to a point through precautions such as:

- constructing a system of indicators specifically for Interreg purposes, as presented in Part 2;
- undertaking data collection on a cross-border basis, normally requiring surveys;
- using qualitative methods in combination with quantitative ones (preferably using mixed packages of qualitative and quantitative indicators for each “evaluation field” , (eg “cross-border partnership: quality and intensity of co-operation”), rather than relying on isolated indicators – see Part 2);

- investing in a thorough definition of the starting position (baselines), including definition of the degree of cross-border regional integration (preferably, in relative terms to other adjacent regions in the same Member State – see Part 2), and the prevailing conditions (and processes) for cross-border co-operation.

1.5. Estimate of Expected Impact

In accordance with the general aim of Strand A of Interreg III, the programmes will be expected to have an impact in terms of both dimensions, namely greater transborder integration and regional development. This presents the challenge of achieving an adequate “measurement” of the expected impact on social and economic cohesion.

In other words, it is not possible or appropriate to expect to measure their impact in simple “final impact” terms, such as GDP and jobs, as for mainstream Structural Funds programmes. A more complex and subtle set of “measurements” will be required to reflect the impact achieved by the programme, including intermediate impacts and qualitative elements.

Interreg programmes are implemented in most regions in parallel to other (and financially more important) structural interventions. Therefore, the complementarity and proportionality of the Interreg intervention are major additional factors in deciding how to estimate the impact of the intervention and in assessing the justification of the resources allocated (see also 1.3, above).

In the case of relatively small⁷ Interreg programmes, which are clearly focused on achieving greater cross-border co-operation and integration, it will therefore be more appropriate to ask for impacts in terms of changes in development conditions rather than development itself. (i.e. intermediate impacts). Conversely, if programmes were to be accepted under Interreg IIIA with a limited degree of cross-border co-operation and integration, greater emphasis would need to be placed on normal criteria, similar to those used for mainstream regional development programmes.

1.6. Implementation System

In the majority of the internal land borders and some maritime borders in Northern Europe, there are already fully integrated management structures and processes in place for Interreg IIA programmes. The Guidelines envisage that such arrangements will be put into effect for all Interreg IIIA programmes, and based on good practice in Interreg IIA they should include:

- a ***cross-border partnership*** of regional/local authorities, with participation if appropriate of national authorities, socio-economic partners and NGOs, will be involved in the

⁷ “Small” either as a proportion of total Structural Funds interventions in the regions concerned or as €/ inh

preparation of the programme proposal and for the *management of programme implementation*;

- A *management authority* in charge of preparing the decisions to be taken by the Monitoring Committee and the Piloting Committee(s) in charge of the selection and follow-up of the operations;
- A *financial management* system allowing a Feder bank transfer onto a single bank account of the clearance or managing authority;
- Where appropriate, a *convention between the different* authorities of the Member States participating in the programme which constitutes a formal agreement between the partners, covering all aspects of the implementation process;
- Where appropriate, a *convention covering the legal and financial responsibilities* of the different partners at project level;
- The *transborder character or significance* of the selected operations,
- *common monitoring and evaluation framework*;

The evaluators should pay particular attention to implementation aspects which are not normally required in mainstream programmes, such those mentioned above, as well as to the method of programme preparation, since preparation in an integrated cross-border way is the first condition for achieving effective co-operation and integration in implementation.

Ex ante evaluation should analyse if an integrated implementation system has been set up that is adequately prepared to operate effectively and efficiently from the start of the implementation period. In cases where such integrated arrangements are put in place for the first time under Interreg IIIA, adequate technical assistance provision should also be made.

PART 2:
**INDICATIVE METHODOLOGY CONCERNING A SYSTEM OF INDICATORS
FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

2.1. Framework

The Commission Working Paper N° 3: "Indicators for monitoring and evaluation: an indicative methodology", is here the frame of reference (structure, quantification, key-indicators). The examples of indicators described hereafter as well as in the attached tables aim to address the problems and the individual characteristics of the actions carried out in the field of cross-border co-operation.

It is recommended that the list of the Commission relating to the fields of intervention in Structural Funds categories, for the identification and the encoding of measures and projects (see Annex I), be used as far as possible.

The examples of indicators outlined below and in the accompanying tables is designed to fit the specific characteristics of Interreg IIIA, and to overcome or minimise the difficulties that have arisen to date in monitoring and evaluating Interreg programmes under Interreg I and IIA. Their overall approach follows the logic and terminology adopted in the Commission's Working Paper 3: Indicators for Monitoring and Evaluation: An indicative Methodology.

The logical framework is illustrated in *Table 2*, below, and includes suggestions for Interreg-specific indicators to meet the requirements of a number of aspects of evaluation, including all types of eligible action. In practice, those responsible for programming and for establishing the evaluation framework of a programme will be expected to identify a much smaller number of indicators. They can do so by selecting indicators from those presented in the tables below or by developing appropriate ones to suit the particular needs of the programme concerned. In addition, they will probably need to select and use, as appropriate, some of the standard indicators required for mainstream Structural Funds programmes. Suggestions can be found in the Working Paper 3.

Table 2 : Indicators and intervention logic of a programme

<i>Intervention logic</i> ⁸		<i>Examples of indicators</i>	
		<i>Mainstream</i>	<i>Interreg-specific</i>
<i>Global objectives</i>	Impacts	Reduction in unemployment amongst target groups	Increase in cross-border commuting / recruitment on other side of border
	↑		
<i>Specific objectives</i>	Results	Improvement in employability of target groups through training	Improved cross-border employability through dual qualifications (percentage of people with recognised qualifications)
	↑		
<i>Operational objectives</i>	Outputs	Provision of training to defined target groups	Number of people trained in recognised qualifications
	↑		
	Programme operations		

2.2. Selecting appropriate indicators

Context / Impact Indicators

These indicators are needed in order to define:

- the *situation* before the Interreg IIIA programme intervention (baseline⁹);
- the global *objectives* of the intervention; and
- ultimately the *impact* achieved by the intervention.

Table 3 presents a range of possible quantitative and qualitative indicators concerning the socio-economic, physical and institutional aspects of co-operation/integration. For example, enterprises with cross-border business activity of enterprises in the border regions concerned, labour force with recognised qualifications versus total student population, co-operation agreements between public services.

Additional indicators concerning the level of development or development problems can be used, eg from those presented in Working Paper 3 concerning mainstream SF programmes (regional GDP, employment, productivity, competitiveness).

⁸ see Figure 1, Working Paper 3 : Indicators for Monitoring and Evaluation : An indicative Methodology (http://www.inforegio.cec.eu.int/wbdoc/docoffic/working/sf2000c_en.htm).

⁹ Baseline data refer to the initial value against which a context or impact indicator is subsequently measured.

It is important to attempt to express indicators of co-operation / integration in relative terms, i.e. to measure the degree of contact/co-operation of a given border zone with the zone at the other side of the border as a ratio of measurement of contact/co-operation with the zones adjacent to that border zone within the same Member State.

Output / result indicators

These indicators are needed for the specific components of a programme, namely measures and, in aggregated form, priorities. To operationalise such indicators, one has to establish a “definition” for both quantitative and qualitative indicators, as well as an appropriate “measurement” for quantitative ones, as illustrated in the examples of *Tables 2 and 4*, and below.

If a measure has the operational objective of increasing the number of people with qualifications recognised at either sides of the border by offering training leading to such qualifications to certain target groups:

- the ***output indicator*** could be “number of people trained for or gained recognised qualification” (eg 200 people trained/obtained the qualification).
- the ***result indicator*** could be the “percentage of people in the labour force with recognised qualifications” (an increased percentage, say, a baseline value of 5% with recognised qualifications and a result value of 7%);

If a measure has the objective of reducing travel time between two cities on either side of the border by eliminating a missing link between the road networks (eg construction of a border crossing or length of road):

- the ***output indicator*** could be the creation of the missing link - border crossing or length of road (a “definition” without ”measurement” would be appropriate, e.g.: “to complete the construction of the link or “the link to be fully operational”, say, in case a lack of customs staff etc prevent operation, if the link is on an external border).
- the ***result indicator*** could be the average journey time (say, with a baseline value of 4 hours, and result value of 1 hour – i.e. reduction of journey time by 3 hours);

Table 4 suggests indicators by eligible type of action for Interreg IIIA, and others may be found in Working Paper 3. Some of the context/impact indicators may also be appropriate, if they correspond to a specific field of action chosen by the programme. For example, if the objective of a measure is to increase cross-border business activity, an appropriate indicator would be the turnover of SMEs obtained from the other side of the border (ie an indicator suggested in Table 3 for expressing the degree of socio-economic integration).

Using isolated indicators may prove too limiting and rather unsatisfactory for border regions which have already achieved deeper integration (eg euroregions). Already in Interreg IIA some of them have proposed in their evaluation studies a focus on certain “evaluation fields” (eg “cross-border partnership: quality and intensity of co-operation”, “cross-border identity / image”) using a combination of qualitative and quantitative indicators for each field.

Table 3 : Examples of Interreg-specific Context / Impact Indicators

	<i>Type of Indicator</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Measurement**</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Source of info</i>
1.	Institutional Situation				
1.1	Degree of co-operation in “essential” public services	Contact / co-operation between organisations responsible for emergency services, environmental protection, hospitals, natural resource management, etc	<i>% of organisations with:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>informal contacts;</i> • <i>ad hoc forums;</i> • <i>co-operation agreements (eg between fire services)</i> • <i>formal cross-border structures</i> 	QL / QT	1, 3
1.2	Degree of co-operation in other fields	Contact / co-operation between socio-economic organisations (eg chambers of commerce, training agencies, universities, etc)	<i>% of organisations with:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>informal contacts;</i> • <i>ad hoc forums;</i> • <i>co-operation agreements</i> • <i>formal cross-border structures</i> 	QL / QT	1, 3
2.	Physical Situation (Infrastructure and Utilities)				
2.1	Connections between networks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport networks (road, rail) • Utilities • Telecoms • Energy 	Elimination of missing links (or, integration of networks)	Completion and operation of missing links	QL	1
2.2	Cross-border public transport	Cross-border passenger services	Availability of cross-border passenger services	QL	1
		Passenger transport cost/frequency	Cost/frequency *	QT	3
2.3	Cross-border postal services	Cost/speed of postal service between adjacent regions	Cost/speed *	QT	3
2.4	Cross-border telecoms	Cost of telecoms between adjacent regions	Cost *	QT	3

3. Socio-economic Situation					
3.1	Citizens' cross-border affinity / activity	Inhabitants on one side understanding / using the language of the other side	% of population speaking other side's language % of population following other side's media: radio, TV, newspapers	QT	3
		Inhabitants on one side visiting friends, cultural facilities/events, shopping, etc on other side	% of population & frequency	QT	3
3.2	Cross-border business activity	Enterprises on one side of the borders with business interests on the other side	% with contacts on other side * % selling significant part (eg % of turnover) of their goods/services to the other side *	QT	3
3.3	Cross-border labour market activity	Workers involved in cross-border activity	% working on other side* % with dual qualifications	QT	3
3.4	Cross-border educational activity	Students involved in cross-border activity	% studying on other side* % studying for dual qualifications	QT	3

* Can be expressed as the ratio of the cross-border value over its equivalent value for adjacent region(s) in same Member State. Eg if 10% of enterprises sell services/goods to the region on the other side of national border and 40% to the equivalent adjacent regions in the same Member State, the ratio of integration is 25%. A target can be set to raise it to, say, 50% by the end of the programme.

** or proof of fulfilment of objective, if qualitative indicator

QL: qualitative **QT:** quantitative

1: programme records / monitoring reports

2: statistical sources

3: survey / study

Table 4 : Examples of Interreg-specific Output/Result Indicators

<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Output Result</i>	<i>Type of Indicator</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Measurement* / Nature</i>	<i>Source of info</i>
1.	Promotion of urban, rural and coastal development				
1.1a	Output	Planning systems	Common planning for border regions (or specifically for urban or rural or coastal areas)	Establishment of co-operation between planning departments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning forums (QL) • joint working groups (QL) • joint studies (QL/QT) • common planning guidelines or plans (QL) 	1
1.1b	Result	Intensity and quality of urban, rural, coastal development	Balanced development of the cross-border area(s)	Achievement of balanced development in terms of eg building construction (QT), growth in jobs (QT), environmental/visual quality (QL), etc	2,3
2.	Development of entrepreneurship, SMEs, tourism and local development and employment initiatives				
2.1a	Output	SME cross-border networking	Contact / co-operation between SMEs	Number of SMEs involved in cross-border projects (QT)	1
2.1b	Result	SME cross-border networking	SMEs involved in cross-border co-operation	Increase in percentage of SMEs of SMEs with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • co-operation agreements (QT) • joint ventures (QT) 	3
2.2a	Output	Marketing of quality tourism	Common marketing strategy and marketing activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-operation structures between tourism offices (QL) • Joint information services (QL) • Joint promotion campaigns(QL) 	1
2.2b	Results	Marketing of quality tourism	Numbers of tourists	Increase in number of tourists: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in quality tourism (QT) • in visitors staying on both sides of the border (QT) 	2,3

3.		Integration of labour market and promotion of social inclusion			
3.1a	Output	Labour market services	Common employment services (eg EURES) or linking-up of employment services	Establishment of common employment services (placement services, databases of vacancies & training opportunities)	1
3.1b	Result	Labour market operation	People in cross-border training and commuting	Increase in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • number (or percentage) of people participating in cross-border training • number (or percentage) of cross-border job placements 	2, 3
3.2a	Output	Territorial employment pacts	Cross-border territorial employment pacts	Establishment and operation of territorial employment pacts (QL)	1
3.3b	Result	Employment development projects/initiatives	Cross-border employment development projects/initiatives (targeted on cross-border labour market integration etc objectives)	Number (and quality/relevance to objectives) of cross-border projects/initiatives for employment development (QT & QL)	1
4.		Co-operation in the domains of RTD, training, culture and health			
4.1a	Output	Co-operation between organisations	Co-operation between research centres and businesses from either side of the border in RTD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • establishment of cross-border co-operation structures (eg networks, forums) (QL) 	1
4.1b	Result	RTD projects	Development of cross-border RTD projects by research centres and businesses from either side of the border	Increase in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • number of cross-border RTD projects (QT) • improvement in quality of cross-border RTD projects (QL) • number of organisations participating in cross-border RTD projects (QT) 	3
4.2a	Output	Cultural events	Cross-border cultural events (festivals, exhibitions)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • number of events held (QT) • number of participants (QT) 	1
4.2b	Result	Cultural activity	Residents participating in cultural activities (not only Interreg projects) on other side of border	Increase in number (or percentage) of residents participating in cultural activities on other side of border (QT)	3

5.		Environmental protection and renewable energies			
9.1a	Output	Emergency response systems	Establishment of a cross-border emergency response systems (eg in a sea area, river estuary, forest)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> co-operation agreement between environmental protection etc agencies concerning response to emergencies (QL) installation of a network monitoring stations (QL) 	1
9.1b	Result	Emergency response systems	Emergency incidents	Reduction in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> number of emergency incidents (QT, QL) human and material losses arising from emergency incidents (QT, QL) 	2, 3
9.2a	Output	Water treatment	Installation of water treatment plants	Completion and operation of plants (QL)	1
9.2b	Result	River pollution	Presence of pollutants in cross-border river(s)	Percentage of reduction in pollutants in river water (QT)	3
6.		Basic infrastructure of cross-border interest			
6.1a	Output	Rail infrastructure	Construction of missing cross-border link between railway networks	Completion and operation of missing link (QL)	1
6.1b	Result	Time saved and convenience gained	Travel time between major cities either side of the border and convenience of travel	Reduction in travel time (QT) and improved convenience of travel (QL)	3
6.2a	Output	Public transport administration	Co-operation between organisations responsible for public transport on the establishment of cross-border public transport services (bus, rail)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> feasibility studies (QL, QT) joint production of co-ordinated time tables (QT) 	1
6.2b	Result	Public transport services	Cross-border public transport services	Establishment and operation of cross-border public transport services (QL)	1

7.		Legal and administrative co-operation			
7.1a	Output	Obstacles to the single market (eg as they affect cross-border consumers)	Preparatory work (pilot projects, studies) to address problems related to cross-border consumers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> co-operation (eg establishing working groups) (QL, QT) completion of studies and pilot projects (QL, QT) joint/bilingual publicity of consumers' rights (QL, QT) 	1
7.1b	Result	Obstacles to the single market (eg as they affect cross-border consumers)	Consumers awareness and complaints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> raised consumers rights awareness (QL, QT) reduction in consumers complaints ((QT) 	3 2,3
8.		Co-operation between citizens and institutions			
8.1a	Output	Co-operation between citizens and (private, voluntary) organisations	Contact/co-operation between civil organisation, eg youth groups, citizen right groups, consumer organisations	Numbers of individuals and organisations participating in cross-border projects (QT)	1
8.1b	Result	Co-operation between citizens and (private, voluntary) organisations	Knowledge and understanding of each other's history, traditions, etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> better knowledge of each other's history, traditions, etc (QL, QT) better mutual understanding (QL) 	3
8.2a	Output	Knowledge of neighbours' language	Language training	Numbers of participants in language training courses (QT)	1
8.2b	Result	Knowledge of neighbours' language	Usage of neighbours' language	Increase in proportion of (certain sections of) the population with good command of neighbours' language (QT)	3

9.		Technical Assistance			
9.1a	Output	Feasibility / preparatory studies	Cross-border studies	Number and quality of studies carried out (QT,QL)	
9.1b	Results	Cross-border projects	New cross-border project proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> increase in number of genuine cross-border projects (with parity between cross-border partners) (QT) improvement in the quality of projects submitted for funding (QL) and success rate (QT) 	1,3
9.2a	Output	Cross-border programme structures	Creation of structures for cross-border co-operation programmes	Establishment and operation of cross-border programme structures (QL)	1
9.2b	Result	Cross-border programme structures	Common cross-border management of programme	Achievement of genuine common management of programme (decisions taken by the two sides working together at all stages of the management process) (QL)	1,3

* or proof of fulfilment of objective, if qualitative indicator

QL: qualitative **QT:** quantitative

1: programme records/monitoring reports **2:** statistical sources **3:** survey / study

MS990154

2.3. Programme Structures and Processes Indicators

These indicators concern specifically the operation of the Interreg programme itself. Some suggestions are in *Table 5* At programme level, they mainly reflect the requirements of the Commission for Interreg IIIA programmes (see 1.6), such as the existence and operation of common cross-border structures for programme management (eg Management authority and common technical secretariat).

The table also includes some suggestions concerning indicators at project level, such as percentage of projects with cross-border partners, formal agreements or permanent cross-border structures. “Programme effectiveness and users’ (beneficiaries’) satisfaction” can become one of the evaluation fields, as suggested in 2.2, above.

Table 5 : Examples of Interreg Programme Structures/Processes Indicators

<i>Ref</i>	<i>Type of Indicator</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Measurement</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Source of info</i>
1.	Programme level				
1.1	Programme development	Common planning/programming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common strategy • Common programme document 	QL	1
1.2	Technical management of implementation	Common structure for programme management (technical aspects)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common / single secretariat • Cross-border steering / management committee • Formal cross-border agreement between Interreg partners 	QL	1
1.3	Financial management of implementation	Common financial management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint bank account for EU contribution only • Joint bank account for EU and national contributions • Formal cross-border agreement between Interreg partners 	QL	1
2.	Project level				
2.1	CBC project development and partnership	Cross-border partnership	Percentage of projects with cross-border partners	QT	1
		Cross-border co-operation arrangements	Percentage of projects with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal agreement • Cross-border structures 	QT	1, 3
		New (to cross-border co-operation) partners and resources	Number of new partners involved	QT	1, 3
			Amount of co-financing secured	QT	1, 3

* or proof of fulfilment of objective, if qualitative indicator - **QL**: qualitative **QT**: quantitative
1: programme records / monitoring reports **2**: statistical sources **3**: survey / study

2.4. Key Indicators

It will be useful to identify from the beginning a small number of key¹⁰ indicators, from amongst the large number of potential indicators.

Firstly, key indicators are needed to ensure that the context and eventually the impact of the intervention are clearly understood. In other words, two or three indicators should be selected from the context/impact indicators (see 2.2). An indicator expressing the time/cost of transport between the two sides of the border (relative to the equivalent time/cost for adjacent regions in the same Member State) can be of fundamental importance in establishing the conditions that exist for integrated regional development, especially in the case of *maritime and mountainous border regions*¹¹. Socio-economic indicators such as those expressing the degree of co-operation/integration of business activity and labour force (eg commuting, recognised qualifications) are also important. An indicator representing the extent of institutional co-operation (eg co-operation agreements between essential public services) will be appropriate for inclusion in the key indicators.

Secondly, they are needed in order to establish a global picture, even at “output” level¹², and to allow comparisons. In practical terms, a few indicators suitable for aggregation across measures/priorities (and ideally at programme-wide level) should be selected. The most readily available indicators and measurements are likely to concern the total numbers assisted or otherwise affected by the actions of the programme by broad target group: *enterprises* (through business support measures), *citizens* (through training, advice, etc measures), *institutions* (public authorities, professional chambers, schools/universities, community associations, etc though inter-institutional co-operation activities/agreements and participation in other actions).

2.5. Sources of Information

A general characteristic of the indicators presented in Tables 3, 4 and 5 is that they tend to require special gathering of information, eg from surveys. There might be a few exceptions when general statistical sources can be used (eg workers’ cross-border commuting) but the frequency of updating and level of detail are unlikely to suit the Interreg cycle¹³.

Data gathering can be less demanding for some types of action (eg one-off physical actions such as building a missing link between infrastructure networks) and for some other qualitative indicators (eg signing of cross-border agreements). Such information should normally come from programme records and monitoring reports. For other aspects, such as attitudinal aspects, information gathering can be much more sensitive, as the continuous

¹⁰ A more ambitious concept of “core” indicators is suggested for mainstream Structural Funds programmes (see Working Paper 3).

¹¹ In some cases this might show measurement below a threshold realistically required for a genuine cross-border programme raising doubts on the appropriateness of including certain regions under Strand A of Interreg III.

¹² Otherwise the only global estimate of activity will come from financial “inputs” to the programme.

¹³ The use of various systems and sources of information- adapted if necessary- for the same set of indicators should be envisaged. In this way, Interreg programmes should support the adaptation of sources of information to cross-border monitoring and evaluation needs.

monitoring of quality and sophistication of any on-going “observatory” of cross-border attitudes will need to be of a high standard to offer meaningful and reliable measurements of the results/impact of the Interreg intervention.

The sources of information represent a major constraint with serious implications, including the following:

- a selective approach is essential, focusing on as few as possible and the most relevant of indicators;
- ideally indicators should be combined by target group to simplify data gathering (eg businesses can be asked questions concerning several measures / indicators);
- special data gathering on a cross-border basis should be planned in the form of standardised and easy-to-repeat surveys or panels of respondents; the cost implications of the above should be recognised from the beginning, with adequate provision made in the programme, under implementation and technical assistance measures.

Categorisation of areas of intervention

The list below of areas of Structural Fund intervention is based on Article 36 of the General Regulation and has been compiled to help the Commission services report on Structural Fund activity.

In addition to its use in the annual reports on the Structural Funds and its contribution to clear communication on the various Community policies, such information by category would seem necessary to enable the Commission to respond to requests for information from EC institutions, from the Member States and from the public.

This breakdown into categories is part of the management and information activities related to the programmes, and is not meant to replace the breakdown on which the programme priorities, or the specific impacts identified and measures during the evaluation exercises, are based.

In drawing up the measures within the Structural Fund programmes, Member States retain the possibility of using a categorisation best suited to their own national and regional situation, which may, if they so wish, be based on the Commission's categorisation. It is important, however, that the Commission be in a position to draw up summaries on the Fund activities by different areas of intervention. Thus, the Programming Complement should show the link between each measure and the corresponding category in the Commission list. This link could, for example, be shown by applying the appropriate code to each measure or by clarifying the correspondence between national codes and the Commission's categories. The Annual Implementation Reports on the Programmes should also show the link.

The list is not totally new but is based on the 14 basic categories used by the Objective 1 Member States in the additionality exercise during the current programming period. Following an inter-service consultation on the list in the autumn of 1998, there is almost unanimous agreement between the services on the current version.

In the context of the financial management of the operations, the Commission has indicated the type of information which the Member State must make available, namely whether:

- 1) the location of the project is (a) urban, (b) rural or (c) not geographically delimited;
- 2) the project (a) has the environment as its main focus, (b) is environment-friendly, (c) is environmentally neutral;
- 3) the project (a) has equality between the sexes as its main focus, (b) is positive in terms of male-female equality or (c) is neutral in terms of such equality.

The availability of this information in the context of financial management and the requirement to use the following categorisation will allow the Commission to meet the needs of Europe's citizens.

<p style="text-align: center;">Structural Funds: Areas of Intervention by category and sub-category</p>
--

1. PRODUCTIVE ENVIRONMENT

11 Agriculture

- 111 Investments in agricultural holdings
- 112 Setting up of young farmers
- 113 Agriculture-specific vocational training
- 114 Improvement of processing and marketing of agricultural products

12 Forestry

- 121 Investments in forest holdings
- 122 Improving the harvesting, processing and marketing of forestry products
- 123 Promoting new outlets for use and marketing of forestry products
- 124 Establishment of associations of forest holders
- 125 Restoring forestry production potential damaged by natural disasters and introducing prevention instruments
- 126 Planting of non-farm land
- 127 Improving and maintaining ecological stability of protected woodlands
- 128 Forestry-specific vocation training

13 Promoting the adaptation and the development of rural areas

- 1301 Land improvement
- 1302 Reparcelling
- 1303 Setting up of farm relief and farm management services
- 1304 Marketing of quality agricultural products
- 1305 Basic services for the rural economy and population
- 1306 Renovation and development of villages and protection and conservation of the rural heritage
- 1307 Diversification of agricultural activities and activities close to agriculture, to provide multiple activities or alternative incomes
- 1308 Agricultural water resources management
- 1309 Development and improvement of infrastructure connected with the development of agriculture
- 1310 Encouragement for tourist activities
- 1311 Encouragement for craft activities related to farms
- 1312 Protection of the environment in connection with land, forestry and landscape conservation as well as with the improvement of animal welfare
- 1313 Restoring agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters and introducing appropriate prevention instruments
- 1314 Financial engineering

- 14 Fisheries**
- 141 Adjustment of fishing effort
 - 142 Renewal and modernisation of the fishing fleet
 - 143 Processing, marketing and promoting of fisheries products
 - 144 Aquaculture
 - 145 Equipment of fishing ports and protection of the coastal sea-areas
 - 146 Socio-economic measures (including aids to the temporary stopping and compensation for technical restrictions)
 - 147 Actions by professionals (including vocational training, small coastal fishing)
 - 148 Fishery-specific vocational training
- 15 Assisting large business organisations**
- 151 Investment in physical capital (plant and equipment, co-financing of state aids)
 - 152 Environment-friendly technologies, clean and economical energy technologies
 - 153 Business organisation advisory service (including internationalisation, exporting and environmental management, purchase of technology)
 - 154 Services to stakeholders (health and safety, providing care for dependants)
 - 155 Financial engineering
- 16 Assisting SMEs and the craft sector**
- 161 Investment in physical capital (plant and equipment, co-financing of state aids)
 - 162 Environment-friendly technologies, clean and economical energy technologies
 - 163 Enterprise advisory service (information, business planning, consultancy services, marketing, management, design, internationalisation, exporting, environmental management, purchase of technology)
 - 164 Shared business services (business estates, incubator units, stimulation, promotional services, networking, conferences, trade fairs)
 - 165 Financial engineering
 - 166 Services in support of the social economy (providing care for dependents, health and safety, cultural activities)
 - 167 SME- and craft-specific vocational training
- 17 Tourism**
- 171 Physical investment (information centres, tourist accommodation, catering, facilities)
 - 172 Non-physical investments (development and provision of tourist services, sporting, cultural and leisure activities, heritage)
 - 173 Shared services for the tourism industry (including promotional activities, networking, conferences and trade fairs)
 - 174 Tourism-specific vocational training
- 18 Research, technological development and innovation (RTDI)**
- 181 Research projects based in universities and research institutes
 - 182 Innovation and technology transfers, establishment of networks and partnerships between businesses and/or research institutes
 - 183 RTDI Infrastructure
 - 184 Training for researchers

2. HUMAN RESOURCES

- 21 Labour market policy**
- 22 Social inclusion**
- 23 Developing educational and vocational training not linked to a specific sector (persons, firms)**
- 24 Workforce flexibility, entrepreneurial activity, innovation, information and communication technologies (persons, firms)**
- 25 Positive labour market actions for women**

3. BASIC INFRASTRUCTURE

- 31 Transport infrastructure**
 - 311 Rail
 - 312 Roads
 - 3121 National roads
 - 3122 Regional/local roads
 - 3123 Bicycle lanes
 - 313 Motorways
 - 314 Airports
 - 315 Ports
 - 316 Waterways
 - 317 Urban Transport
 - 318 Multimodal Transport
 - 319 Intelligent Transport Systems
- 32 Telecommunications infrastructure and information society**
 - 321 Basic infrastructure
 - 322 Information and Communication Technology (including security and safe transmission measures)
 - 323 Services and applications for the citizen (health, administration, education)
 - 324 Services and applications for SMEs (electronic commerce and transactions, education and training, networking)
- 33 Energy infrastructures (production, delivery)**
 - 331 Electricity, gas, petroleum products, solid fuel
 - 332 Renewable sources of energy (solar power, wind power, hydro-electricity, biomass)
 - 333 Energy efficiency, cogeneration, energy control
- 34 Environmental infrastructure (including water)**
 - 341 Air
 - 342 Noise
 - 343 Urban and industrial waste (including hospital and dangerous waste)
 - 344 Drinking water (collection, storage, treatment and distribution)
 - 345 Sewerage and purification
- 35 Planning and rehabilitation**
 - 351 Upgrading and Rehabilitation of industrial and military sites
 - 352 Rehabilitation of urban areas
- 36 Social and public health infrastructure**

4. MISCELLANEOUS

41 Technical assistance and innovative actions (ERDF, ESF, EAGGF, FIFG)

- 411 Preparation, implementation, monitoring, publicity
- 412 Evaluation
- 413 Studies
- 414 Innovative actions
- 415 Information to the public

Strand B : Transnational Co-Operation

ISSUES

1. Transnational co-operation aims to promote **economic and territorial integration** in different areas of co-operation and to contribute to balanced and harmonious development across the European Union.
2. It is the responsibility of evaluators to take into consideration the characteristics of this co-operation, namely:
 - the identification of common problems and challenges across the large groupings of neighbouring regions¹⁴ (interventions are led by at least two partners in two different countries; certain of the 13 selected areas of co-operation consist of up to 7 member States);
 - the global impact sought from the intervention which should benefit the entire zone of co-operation;
 - the nature of the interventions which comprise an integrated territorial strategy to respond to the stated problems, complementing the actions undertaken under development (objective 1) or conversion (objective 2) programmes.
3. Besides these characteristics, the evaluators should take into consideration the recommendations for the development of proposed programmes defined in the Commission Communication of 28 April 2000¹⁵, namely:
 - the ESPD (European Spatial Development Perspective) recommendations for territorial development which constitute the strategic framework for the development of proposed programmes (polycentric development and town/country relationships; access to infrastructure and know-how; environment and cultural heritage);
 - the priorities of community policies, such as transeuropean networks (TENs) and the development of the information society;
 - INTERREG II C achievements.
4. The financial resources for the transnational strand will in principle be less than those allocated to transfrontier co-operation but these allocations are much higher than those available for INTERREG IIC; they will thus permit financing of investment projects and not simply studies or the exchange of experience. As regards infrastructure, however, the Commission clarifies in its Communication that only infrastructure on a

¹⁴ Including where appropriate the candidate and other neighbouring countries.

¹⁵ JOCE n° C 143 du 23.5.2000.

small scale can be considered because of the limited financial resources; motorways, the construction of primary routes and other similar infrastructure is excluded.

5. The establishment or deepening of common structures of co-operation¹⁶, as well as the exercise of transnational partnerships enlarged to include socio-economic partners and other competent organisations, such as NGOs, representatives of universities, etc., likewise constitute the provisions which have been strengthened for the new period.
6. For each programme, specific objectives must be defined. The evaluation of INTERREG B implies a need to verify the extent to which the priorities at point 3 above are taken into account when the programme is development, whether in the analysis of strengths and weaknesses of the co-operation areas or in the definition of objectives and expected impact¹⁷.
7. The appraisal of the coherence, relevance and impact expected of these specific objectives will form an integral part of the ex ante evaluation. Insofar as these objectives form an integral part of the selection criteria defined by the programme, they will equally form a part of the ex ante evaluation.
8. A list of key elements for the evaluation of INTERREG IIIB is attached at annex 1. To encode the measures and projects and for examples of indicators, please refer to the first part of the document on strand A (transfrontier co-operation). The indicators proposed by the Commission in working document N^o 3 for the evaluation of Objective 1 and 2 programmes should also be taken into consideration.
9. The degree of co-operation existing between the regions concerned can vary, but the logic of the objective of the policy of cohesion and of this strand of INTERREG in particular is that the regions concerned should evolve towards a higher level of co-operation and integration in their actions.
10. As indicated in the General Regulation, all operations cofinanced by the Structural Funds must be in conformity with other community policies, including the rules on competition, the award of public contracts, the environment and equality of opportunity.

¹⁶ Responsible for the development of programmes, animation, the selection of operations, overall management, co-ordination and monitoring of the implementation of the programme and, where appropriate, common mechanisms for the management of measures and operations.

¹⁷ In its analysis of proposed programmes, the Commission will have regard to the manner in which the priorities of the ESDP (see Annex 1) have been taken into consideration.

KEY ELEMENTS OF THE EX ANTE EVALUATION OF INTERREG III (strand B)

1. Strengths, Weaknesses and Potential in the Area of Co-Operation

- ☉ Appraisal of the analysis of the situation prevailing in the geographical area of transnational co-operation where the programme will take place and in particular of the socio-economic situation, as well as the characteristics and specific needs of the area in relation to the specific priorities of strand B of INTERREG.
- ☉ Prioritising the opportunities/challenges for economic and territorial integration in the area of co-operation.
- ☉ Lessons drawn from actions possibly undertaken under INTERREG II C or pilot actions under Article 10, notably in territorial development and, where relevant, from the linkages with external co-operation tools: PHARE, TACIS, ISPA, SAPARD, MEDA, EDF or CARDS.

2. Appraisal of the Added Value of Interventions

- ☉ Appraisal of the added value of interventions in the area of co-operation, from the point of view of economic and territorial integration; the added value should be appraised according to the types of actions and co-operation recommended:
 - Projects and Groups of Projects
What is their contribution with regard to transeuropean transport networks (“missing links”), leverage effects, reduction in negative externalities linked to the activity/intervention or to the absence of the activity/intervention.
 - Studies
To what extent do they throw light on the common opportunities and challenges identified on a scale for the area of co-operation and on useful solutions (the evaluator will particularly appraise the practical organisation of these studies and the commitment of the partners involved in them).
 - Networks
To what extent is it a question of putting in place or of strengthening existing networks of co-operation (enterprises, protected areas, public transport, universities, organisations responsible for the promotion of equality between men and women, administrations, metropolitan areas, co-operation between neighbouring towns, urban/rural, etc.)? The evaluation should focus on the functional aspects, the operational character and the relevance of the area basis of the network.
 - Quality of Common Structures of Co-Operation
The evaluation should draw conclusions on the planning structures for the programme, and the common structures for financial management, monitoring

and evaluation. The examination of progress achieved in comparison to the previous period or the former situation¹⁸ is a key element of the analysis.

- ☉ Appraisal of the contribution of the objectives of the programme to the achievement of the global objectives of the community initiative.
- ☉ Expected impacts of the projected priorities for action in relation to the original situation. This evaluation must appraise the expected impacts of the programme compared to its objectives, including challenges for the environment and for equal opportunities between men and women.
- ☉ External coherence in relation to other interventions, including the relationship with the tools of external co-operation (PHARE, TACIS, ISPA, SAPARD, MEDA or EDF
- ☉ Finally, appraisal of the internal coherence between the needs, the defined objectives and the resources allocated.

3. Appraisal of the Implementation Procedures

- ☉ Appraisal of the procedures for selection criteria, including their conformity with the framework of reference cited at point three of the “issues”.
- ☉ Appraisal of the projected measures to associate/involve/inform the regional or local authorities in the geographical area of transnational co-operation, as well as socio-economic organisations.
- ☉ Appraisal of the participation of the private sector in total expenditure (leverage effect).
- ☉ Involvement of those responsible for the tools of external co-operation (PHARE/TACIS/MEDA...) in the development of the programme and the selection of projects.
- ☉ Verification of the monitoring, evaluation and management procedures, including the definition of indicators and quantification of objectives.

¹⁸ If the area of co-operation is new and has not been the subject of a programme of co-operation under Interreg IIC.

**Issues to be Dealt with in the Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses Arising from
Priorities in the European Spatial Development Perspective**

- **Polycentral Development and Town/Country Relations**

- Existence of growth points capable of contributing to a more polycentric structuring of the area concerned.
- Analysis of the urban system: comparative advantages of towns, existence of networks of co-operation between towns, urban expansion, the phenomenon of exclusion of certain social groups, the urban ecosystem, accessibility.
- Analysis of the relations between town and country.

- **Access to Infrastructure and Know-How**

- Analysis of transport flows: access to transeuropean networks, principal modes of transport used (road, rail, waterways, sea, air), territorial organisation of transport networks, presence of multi modal centres.
- Analysis of the capacity for innovation.
- New information and communication technologies: territorial coverage, degree of equipment, quality of the network.

- **Environment and Cultural Heritage**

- Description of environmental opportunities (situation with regard to community policy on the environment and specific opportunities, for example: preservation of water resources, desertification, integrated management of sensitive ecological zones, creation of “green corridors”, etc.).
- Analysis of cultural heritage and the common development.