

Common Interreg Indicators Post 2020

Seminar

May 14, 2019 Leuven

Introduction

Indicator system post 2020 (Violeta Piculescu, DG REGIO, Evaluation and Semester Unit)

Key Changes to period 14-20

- The new system of 5 policy objectives, 21 specific objectives and common indicators for output and results are introduced in order to enhance the result orientation of programmes, while also achieving simplification.
- Outputs and results are defined at intervention (project) level.
- The list of common output indicators is extended in order to ensure better policy coverage.
- Common result indicators are proposed in order to limit the extent of non-comparable data collected based on programme specific indicators.
- In Annex I, ERDF Regulation, *marks indicators that can be used in any specific objective.

Approach

- The common indicators proposed at EU level are to be used in programmes when relevant. Programmes will also have the possibility to use programme specific indicators when needed.
- The result indicators should be chosen such that they reflect the main objectives of the interventions. Indicators are just tools and should follow the logic of meaningful investments.
- While all common indicators proposed are defined at intervention level, there are different types of output and result indicators according to their use. First, the “generic indicator” (ex: RCO01, RCO02 etc), marked with * in Annex 1 ERDF and Cohesion Fund Regulation, can be used in any specific objective in the programme. Second, the thematic indicators not marked by * are relevant only for the specific objective for which they are listed in the annex. Third, the horizontal indicators are introduced in order to measure aspects of implementation. Fourth, the Interreg specific indicators (Table 2 in Annex 1, ERDF and Cohesion Fund Regulation) are tailored to the specific types of interventions in ETC programmes.
- Data reporting is covered in Annex VII to the CPR
- There are two sets of indicators in the Annexes to the ERDF Regulation
 - Annex 1: Common indicators for ERDF and Cohesion Fund (CF) which are to be used by the operational programmes
 - Annex 2: Performance information, including the indicators which will be used for corporate reporting. Annex 2 is based on indicators defined in Annex 1 as it is a compilation of 1-2 indicators on outputs and results per specific objective.

Annotations to measurement

- The set of common indicator is built in a way that data can be collected from

projects or directly from the monitoring system of the managing authority. For some of the result indicators (ex: SMEs), there could be also additional options for data sources such as administrative registries, surveys, or other national databased.

- It is intended to keep the option to report for 'partially implemented' or completed operations as in the current period. Partial implementation is interpreted in the same manner as in the current period, i.e. in terms of outputs and results achieved for operations which are not yet completed.
- (for programmes using eMS: there is a 'working agreement' from previous seminars to consider outputs as delivered if the outputs are subject of a report acknowledged by the JS)

Discussion process on the draft indicator set

- The Council delegated the discussion on Annexes 1 and 2 in ERDF and Cohesion Fund Regulation to the expert group of REGIO Evaluation Network.
- There has been an extensive consultation process on the common indicators proposed for ERDF and Cohesion Fund. Four meetings were organised during the period January - May 2019 for discussing in detail the common output and result indicators proposed for ERDF and Cohesion Fund for 2021+. Of these meeting, the fourth meeting dedicated to Policy Objective 5, horizontal indicators, and other horizontal issues is yet to take place on 20-21 May 2019.
- The discussions and recommendations of the current meeting with Member States for Interreg indicators will be taken into account for the changes implied for the list of indicators in Annex I in ERDF and CF regulation (to be considered by the Romanian Presidency). They will also help consolidate the definition and other metadata presented for each indicator in the fiches that are to be included in the EC guidelines on indicators.
- Following the consultations with the Member States, the changes implied for Annexes 1 and 2 in the ERDF and Cohesion Fund Regulation are to be submitted by May 22 to the Council.

Question & answer (Q & A)

Overarching issues

Q: Do you intend to include also a cohesion indicator? Cohesion policy (CP) is different from other European policies since it covers a wide range of intervention options? The current set does not address the territorial dimension.

A: That goes to the policy rationale and the structure of Cohesion Policy is rather unique. The overall performance orientation of the policy includes not only indicators, but also additional supporting elements such as the enabling conditions. It is important to understand that we need to enhance our evidence and communication on what the policy achieves; the focus of the narrative has gradually changed from the absorption of funds to investments and the returns to these investments.

The set of common indicators proposed is defined in terms of outputs and results at the level of interventions. Indicators on territorial imbalances are akin to impact indicators, more suitable for impact analysis of the territorial dimension. Territorial

cohesion has to be considered as an overarching impact of multiple policies not a direct result at intervention level. For example, even if regional disparities decrease evaluation is still needed in order to establish a clear causal effect of our policy interventions. Although impact indicators are not proposed in the legislative texts, we hope that programmes will use such indicator when defining the framework for their future impact evaluations - considerations on the territorial dimension and cohesion should be part of such evaluations.

Q: Where should we discuss newly proposed indicators (in addition to the common indicators presented in fiches)?

A: The main objective for the meeting today is to agree on the names of the common indicators proposed and fine tune their metadata (definitions, measurement etc). As for additional indicators, we encourage Member States to continue the dialogue on good practice for programme specific indicators, and even consider harmonising definitions for those programme specific indicators that could prove useful for several programmes.

Q: Some of the indicators proposed raise the question if measurements will be in the end realistic? Compared to the approach in this period the approach is clearly better. But the challenge will be again the definitions. For example, number of enterprises supported: What does the term 'support' actually mean? It could be more or less intense, etc. Why not measure time of participation? In the end the focus on policy communication is quite important: story-telling might be even better as an approach to communicate the achievements of Interreg.

A: The narrative, the context of the programme and the interventions are key information that should be communicated. However, it is still important to communicate aggregated quantitative achievements.

Q: Cross-border investments (e.g. in infrastructure) are not considered in the proposed set?

A: The indicators available for the Interreg programmes are not limited to the list presented in Table 2. On the contrary, together with indicators on cooperation and specific challenges cross-border, the programmes are encouraged to use also the relevant generic, thematic and horizontal indicators listed in Table 1 in Annex 1 of ERDF and CF Regulation in order to monitor the outputs and results of the investments made.

Q: How to ensure that the thematic aspect related to one of the common Interreg indicators is not lost in communication?

A: We will ensure that communication of achievements is always firmly placed in the context of the relevant specific objective and the related policy objective.

Use of the proposed set

Q: How will the performance framework post 2020 look like?

A: The future performance framework will include all indicators; it will not consist of a selected sub-set like in this period. In future the term covers the complete measurement framework of the programme, being designed to help plan and monitor the progress in implementation over the programming period.

Q: What will be the role and position of programme-specific indicators - will these indicators be part of the programme?

A: All indicators will be in the programme. Furthermore, as in the current period, programmes will prepare a methodological document where the managing authority explains the choice of indicators, their definition (if programme specific) and the method applied for the calculation of the milestones and targets.

Q: How many indicators per project?

A: It is most important to focus on the measurement of what is representative, as it is rather counterproductive to come up with large numbers of indicators. Our recommendation will be to use a limited number of indicators per project, ideally one output and one result if these are representative for the intervention (ex: if they cover a substantial part of the financing allocated, with the remaining part for ancillary activities). In case of highly fragmented interventions, however, the number of indicators needed may be higher (it has been frequently observed that unclear objectives foster the tendency to use many indicators). In general no minimum standards will be recommended and the framework should be decided by the programme (and justified in the methodological document).

Q: What is the intended relation between thematic and Interreg indicators?

A: Interreg indicators should be used in order to reflect the aspects of cooperation in the programme for each specific objective; at the same time the other (generic, thematic) common indicators should be used to reflect the actual investment, as relevant.

Q: Could a programme choose to take up just one RCO e.g. the one on pilot actions for the programme? What is the opinion on target setting?

A: Programmes need to use indicators for both outputs and results for the interventions. The common indicators will be used whenever relevant as they have the advantage that they can be aggregated at the EU level across programmes. From this perspective, programme specific indicators, although useful for monitoring at the level of managing authorities, cannot be used at EU level for communicating achievements of the policy. For the current period we learnt that several programmes use very similar programme specific indicators but, because these indicators are defined slightly differently across countries, they cannot be used for analysis across programmes since the data is not comparable.

Targets are required to give an orientation for the direction to go. They will have to be provided for the indicators in the programme at the time of the programme adoption. In the forthcoming period there are no financial incentives linked to indicator targets at EU level. Moreover, if deemed necessary, there is the possibility to update the targets in the programme during the programming period (ideally at the time of the mid-term review).

Q: How to avoid double counting?

A: When it comes to participants in various activities, eliminating double counting would generate a significant administrative burden as it implies collecting personal data from these participants. For the common indicators of ERDF, we propose to count participations (ex: training places filled in) rather than participants such that there is no need to keep track of the identity of the participants.

We also propose, however, indicators measured in population, such as population benefiting from flood protection measures. In this case, it is possible that an area (with a given population) is covered by several projects. Therefore we cannot count

the same population several times. So far we have not identified an optimal solution to tackle this issue, but we are planning to continue working with Member States in order to identify possible approaches that the programmes could consider.

Q: Some indicators include the explicit requirement to report one year after project completion. It imposes an extra burden on beneficiaries and programme management and it is in many cases too short to capture the result. The proposed option to use an 'informed forecast' at project end instead of a reporting and monitoring loop has not been considered?

A: The regulation refers clearly to outputs and results achieved. Therefore, forecasts cannot be interpreted as results achieved, even if made by the end of the project. There are several methods to collect data on results by end project, from direct measurement, surveys, use of administrative registries or other databases. As regards the time of measurement, this is likely to differ across indicators. For some interventions, the results are immediate and can be recorded at project completion (ex: training completed). In other cases, however, it may be necessary to wait for a given period (we propose a year) before results can be observed and recorded (ex: users of broadband).

Interreg Europe explained that, in order to collect data on policy learning results, they extended the implementation period beyond completion of investment, with a high administrative burden for the period allocated for collection of data in results and a lump sum to cover the associated cost. Another option might be to retain 5% of total project financing to be paid at the time when the data is reported.

Q: How to interpret the term 'joint'? Very often projects exchange and share ideas and elements of their strategies but in the end the partners develop or amend their strategies or develop their action plans.

A: It requires a shared and pragmatic definition (and the definition should be coherent with the definition of cooperation criteria - a neglected aspect but still in the end 'the trademark' of Interreg). It could be defined in way that the minimum requirement to label an action or strategy as 'joint' is the shared development of the pilot action or the strategy.

BBSR project

Measuring territorial effects of transnational cooperation

See ppt attached, the project started in November 2018 and is scheduled until mid 2020

- Project covers 6 transnational (TN) programmes where Germany is involved
- A major part of the project is a survey among German stakeholders and beneficiaries of the programmes
 - One can see a limited uptake of common indicators by the programmes in 2014-2020
 - But programme-specific indicators used by the programmes reveal marked similarities; using in part only slightly different terminology and definitions
- In principle there is a sound basis to come to joint programme-specific indicators in future
- Survey results indicate that improvement of living conditions is a major expectation from future projects
- The new PO 5 might be used to cover integrated territorial development activities
- Also the common indicators for PO5 should pick it up; e.g. urban-rural issues; the proposed set is looking rather at results but not on how cooperation emerges
- The six programmes reveal interesting differences: in Central Europe and DANUBE Programmes economically weaker regions are strongly involved; that is in sharp difference to the situation in Baltic Sea Region (BSR) and North Sea Region Programmes and North-West-Europe
- The project will provide suggestions for indicators
- Next steps: focus groups will discuss the survey results and future expectations aiming at a joint understanding within Germany. Then the informed representatives will bring the results to the programming process thus eventually fostering a shared approach among TN programmes

Discussion of the proposed set of common indicators

Please note that for the discussion we addressed packages and not all indicators could be covered due to time constraints:

- Indicator package on participants: RCO 81, RCO 81B, RCO 82, RCR 85, RCO 85
- On joint strategies action plans and pilot activities: RCO 83, RCR 79, RCO 84
- On participants in training: RCO 85, RCR 81
- On legal obstacles and agreements: RCO 96, RCO 86, RCR 82
- On organisations cooperating: RCO 87, RCR 84

RCO 81: Participants in joint actions across borders

Definition: *The indicator counts the number of participants in joint actions across borders implemented in the supported projects. Cross-border joint actions could include, for instance, exchange activities or exchange visits, small-scale event organized with partners across borders. Participants include individuals (e.g citizens, volunteers, students, pupils, trainees, public officials etc). ~~An individual should be counted once if participating in several joint actions organised by the same project.~~*

Issues in discussion

- Participants as RCO not as RCR? The output indicator measures the number of participations in training, while the result indicator refers to completions of trainings.
- The focus on visits and events in the definition blurs the intent of the common indicator as it can overlap with RCO 81B. In Vienna we agreed on a demarcation rule. Indicator RCO81 will include events for which the number of participants can be measured directly (based on attendance lists in workshops, for instance), while indicator RCO81B will refer to public events with free entry, where the number of visitors can be at best estimated.
- ‘Joint actions’ as overarching category and other elements such as training schemes as sub-set of it? In principle one could use only ‘joint actions’ as a programme if understood as a comprehensive term. The pragmatic approach is to be as concrete as possible in describing the outputs and results - but demarcation lines have to be clear in order to be able to explain it to beneficiaries.

Conclusions

- Replace “participants” by “participations” in name. This ensures that there is no need to collect personal data for participants.
- Remove reference to “small scale events” and explain better the demarcation from public events measured in RCO81B.
- Include a clearer demarcation rule relative to RCO82.

RCO 81B: Participants in large events across borders (‘participants at public events’)

Definition: *Participants in large events organized across borders ~~by the supported projects.~~*

Issues in discussion

- Again participant should be replaced by the number of participations
- Why not to count events according to size categories? In internal discussions we found out that the scale of events might differ between projects depending on the context (e.g. a small cultural festival compared to a concert in a cross-border conurbation ...). The CI should be kept simple - thus no size categories.
- Should we add the word 'estimated' to the title? This would be confusing for people not knowing the technicalities (it is an ex-post estimate owing to the large numbers and the character of the events)

Conclusions

- Replace "large events" by "public events" in name
- Learn from professionals how to estimate the number of participants at larger events. One Member State indicated a possible example of a tool used by journalists: <https://www.mapchecking.com/> .

RCO 82: Participants in joint actions promoting gender equality, equal opportunities and social inclusion

Definition: *The indicator reflects joint activities addressing horizontal principles (gender equality, equal opportunities and social inclusion)*

Conclusions

- Replace "participants" by "participations" in name
- It is necessary to establish a clear demarcation rule. Since these horizontal principles are likely to apply to all projects implemented in Interreg programmes, we recommend using it RCO82 only in situations where the main objective of the project is to develop activities focused on gender equality, equal opportunities, or social inclusion.

RCR 85 Participants in joint actions across borders after project completion

Definition: *Number of participants in joint actions across borders organised after project completion as a continuation of cooperation.*

Conclusions

- Replace "participants" by "participations" in name
- Issues related to measurement after project end will be taken into account

RCO85 Participants in joint training schemes

Definition: *Number of participants in joint training schemes ~~organised by supported projects.~~*

Key issues in discussion

- Besides training there are several other ways to build capacities such as coaching, advising, peer learning - the result are persons with increased knowledge
- Small internal training (without a certificate for completion) should not be counted

- This indicator is defined for trainings activities which provide a certificate of completion
- On the other hand: certificates might be considered as additional burden and persons working in public authorities usually care less about formal confirmations

Conclusion:

- Change “participants” by “participations” in name
- It is necessary to maintain a clear demarcation rule relative to indicator RCO81, where other forms of (more informal) trainings can be included.

RCO 83 Joint strategies/ action plans developed

Definition: The number of joint strategies or action plans developed by supported projects.

Key issues in discussion

- Separation of indicators into one on strategy and one on action plan? In principle, both are planning tools and therefore could be combined in one indicator. Separate indicators would be considered if there is a compelling argument for separate measurements. In principle, we should not increase the number of indicators included in the legislative basis unless it is absolutely necessary.
- Add the term ‘adopted’? We discussed the issue on “adopted” and reached the conclusion that adoption may be outside the remit of the project implementers. As this is an output indicator, it should be confined to what can be achieved by the project.
- Action plan is understood as the continuation of a strategy - how to count it if one strategy results in several action plans? We propose to count the strategy and all the action plans developed.
- What if the strategy or action plan has been developed in a previous project? This indicator should be used for projects which have as an objective the development of a strategy or an action plan.
- Is a joint strategy also a strategy for one of the partners where other partners contribute to it? Yes, what is important is that the strategy/ action plans are developed jointly by the partners.

Conclusions

- Change the name to “strategies/ action plans jointly developed”

RCR79 Joint strategies /action plans taken up by organisations

Definition: Number of joint strategies or action plans adopted and implemented by organisations after project completion.

Key issues in discussion

- Implementation might mean very different things depending on the theme of the strategy - it is hardly credible to fully implement any strategy during a project

Conclusions

- The definition should be revised in the sense of ‘being adopted during or before the end of the project’ and making it clear that it needs not be complete implementation. What is important is that implementation has started.

RCO 84B Solutions developed through joint pilot actions (‘jointly developed solutions’)

Definition: *Number of solutions developed through joint pilot actions across borders. The indicator is a proxy measure of cooperation in terms of solutions developed through the implementation of pilot actions for innovative tools in supported projects across borders*

Key issues in discussion

- The term ‘solution’ has been developed as a broader term including also tools and other typical decisive project outcomes defined by programmes
- But the logic is rather that ‘pilot action’ means testing a new solution (tool) in the specific local/regional context - this should be reflected in the title!

Conclusions

- The title should be reworded into “jointly developed solutions”

RCR 80 Solutions of joint pilot actions taken up or upscaled by organisations (‘solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations’)

Definition: *Number of solutions developed through pilot actions, and which are adopted or up-scaled after project completion.*

Conclusion

- Adjust the definition such that solutions can be taken up or upscaled also during or before the end of the project
- The title of the indicator should be reworded: “solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations”

RCO 96: Solutions for legal or administrative obstacles across borders identified (revised from “legal or administrative obstacles identified”)

Definition: *Number of solutions for legal/ administrative obstacles across borders identified by supported projects*

Legal or administrative obstacles refer to rules, laws or administrative procedures which obstruct everyday life and the development of cross-border regions. The indicator counts the number of solutions identified for resolving/ alleviating such legal or administrative obstacles across borders. If a given legal or administrative obstacle is also alleviated or resolved within the scope of the supported project, then it would be counted in the result indicator RCR82.

Key issues in discussion

The participants in the meeting were consulted whether there is any objection to the replacement of the indicator “Legal or administrative obstacles identified” proposed initially by the new version proposed by participants in Vienna “Solutions to legal or administrative obstacles across borders identified.”

Conclusion

- The definition of the revised indicator should be kept as proposed

RCO 89: Organizations cooperating for the multi-level governance of macro-regional strategies

Definition: Number of organizations cooperating for the implementation of macro-regional strategies. Involvement of organisations in the multi-level governance for macro-regional strategies.

Key issues in discussion

- There are programmes with projects having MLG as key objective since the programmes have anchored Specific Objectives (SO) related to it
- If RCO 89 is strictly related to macro-regional strategies (MRS) there can be a separate indicator on multi-level governance (MLG). The problem with a general MLG indicator, however, is that it would be very broad since many projects imply multi-level governance.
- The concept of multi-level governance in the context of macroregional strategies should be clarified.
- Counting projects versus counting organisations? ‘Projects improving MLG’ might be an approach but the number of projects does not say much since there might one project with a volume of 5 MEUR actually rising momentum as compared to 20 projects with a volume of 50,000 EUR which do not leave a visible footprint ... Incentivising institutional cooperation is among the key tasks of Interreg.
- In case it relates to MRS it needs to be clarified if it relates to ‘Technical Assistance’ in order to finance structures for MRS or also to implementation; in case it should cover also implementation it raises the next question since draft regulations intend to align transnational programmes with MRS - thus most transnational programmes could as default option take all projects

Conclusion

- The indicator requires further internal clarification with the policy unit

Outlook - next steps

- Interact will make an attempt to foster the harmonisation of programme-specific indicators; the project initiated by BBSR on measuring territorial effects of transnational cooperation might provide important inputs for the process.
- Interact will also establish a link to the core group developing the future monitoring system offered by Interact in order to make sure that the future system allows for efficient handling of indicators
- All comments received for and during the meeting on the revised fiches for Interreg indicators will be considered for a further revision of the indicator fiches.

ANNEX: Results of the technical meeting (19-20 February 2019) Indicators which have not been discussed on May 14

RCO84 Joint pilot activities implemented in projects

Definition: *Number of test cases implemented by supported projects. The indicator counts the joint pilot test actions developed by supported projects. The scope of a pilot test action could be to test procedures, new instruments, tools, experimentation, and transfer of practices. In order to be counted by this indicator, the implementation of the pilot action should be finalised by the end of the project.*

Conclusions

- The title might be rephrased into ‘pilot actions developed jointly’
- The definition will be revised accordingly
- Even a new indicator on ‘developed and tested’ solutions might be introduced

RCR 81 Participants completing joint training schemes

Definition: *Number of participants completing joint training schemes organised by supported projects. The indicator counts the number of participants who complete joint trainings organised by supported projects. Completion should be documented by a certificate of training completion. Double counting of participants in more than one training schemes organised by the same project should be excluded.*

Key issues in discussion

- Small internal training should not be counted
- Together with RCO 85 it might lead to the calculation of ‘absence rate’
- Interreg is about cooperation and cooperation is all about people: that is why it is good to have some indicators showing that (for communication issues)

RCO 86 Joint legal or administrative agreements signed

Definition: *Number of legal / administrative agreements signed in the context of supported projects. The indicator counts the joint administrative/ legal agreements related to cross-border cooperation targeted at alleviating legal/administrative obstacles across borders, and which are addressed in the supported projects. The adoption / signature of an agreement counted should be accomplished by the time of project completion.*

Key issues in discussion

- There might legal agreements not related to obstacles but to cooperation - a fact which is of similar importance for Interreg as policy message
- Counting agreements might be difficult - in particular in a transnational context

RCR 82 Legal or administrative obstacles addressed or alleviated

Definition: *Number of legal / administrative obstacles addressed or alleviated in the context of supported projects. Legal or administrative obstacles refer to*

rules, laws or administrative procedures which obstruct the inherent development potential of cross-border cooperation. The indicator counts the number of legal or administrative obstacles identified in supported projects and addressed or alleviated within one year after project completion.

Conclusions

- The title might be rephrased into ‘legal obstacles alleviated or resolved’
- The definition will be revised accordingly

RCR 83: Persons covered by joint agreements signed

Definition: *The indicator counts the number of potential beneficiaries of the opportunities provided by joint agreements signed. The indicator counts the number of persons who could potentially benefit from the opportunities respectively services established by the joint agreements signed in the context of the supported projects. In line with the corresponding output indicator RCO86, the joint agreement signed should refer to cross-border obstacles. For a given NUTS3 region, the number of potential beneficiaries cannot be higher than the population of the region.*

Key issues in discussion

- The added value might be limited since in many cases it might mean - by default - that the whole population is in the end covered by agreements signed for different topics
- Counting might turn into a problem
- Eventual overlaps with similarly constructed thematic CI such as RCR 35 (persons benefitting from flood prevention), 36 (forest fire protection) and 37 (other protection measures against climate related natural disasters) or RCR 96 (protection measures against non-climate related natural risks and risks related to human activities) which are found under PO2? The first recommendation is to use both types provided that the thematic one would lead to visible numbers in achievements; a tentative demarcation line could be as follows: if no investment use Interreg-CI and if investment use thematic CI indicator - this will be further elaborated in the fiche
- It is proposed to exchange on pragmatic solutions for the population counting

RCO 87: Organisations cooperating across borders

Definition: *Number of organisations cooperating across borders. The indicator counts the organisations cooperating formally in supported projects. The organisations are legal entities involved in project implementation, and the cooperation should be based on a structured agreement between project participants.*

Key issues in discussion

- It should not be restricted to the project partnership: the underlying definition should include a wider scope of cooperating institutions; the term ‘associated organisations’ might be used [in many programmes such organisations provide also a Letter of Intent (LoI)]
- In practice even counting of partners might not be that easy - in particular in larger programmes since the same institutions tends to be spelt differently

across projects and harmonisation in the Monitoring System is quite time-consuming

Conclusions

- The indicator should be used to count legal entities - e.g. department or university; long discussion about the term 'organisation' under PO1 related to Smart Specialisation Strategies (S3) and organisations involved in it; it is understood that it is easier to count organisations than persons; number of organisations; eliminate those counted twice
- double counting at level of the Specific Objectives (SO) should be avoided to the extent possible; the definition will be changed into 'partners and associated organisations (as mentioned in the grant agreement or the application) and/or target groups involved in implementation'
- However, it has to be acknowledged that there is a certain degree of double counting - proportional efforts to avoid it should be taken
- For the next meeting it would be useful to bring practical examples in order to see where they could fit

RCR 84: Organisations cooperating across borders 6-12 months after project completion

Definition: Number of organisations continuing the cooperation for at least one year after project completion. The indicator counts the organisations cooperating after the completion of the supported projects. The organisations are legal entities involved in project implementation, and the cooperation should be documented based on structured agreement between project participants.

Conclusions

- It should also be used in case the continuation of cooperation is financed from other funds
- The sustained cooperation does not have to cover the same topic as addressed in the previous project (thinking of the example of a Local and Regional Authority (LRA) having a broad scope of tasks)

RCO 88: Projects across national borders for peer-learning to enhance cooperation activities

Conclusions

- Due to overlaps with RCO 84 joint pilot activities it is proposed to skip this indicator

RCO 90: Projects across national borders leading to networks/ clusters

Definition: Number of projects creating or enhancing cross-border clusters and networks for enterprise innovation. Number of projects creating or enhancing cross-border clusters and networks for enterprise innovation.

Conclusions

- The term 'across borders' will be used and it will be moved to the end of sentence in the definition

RCR 86: Stakeholders/ institutions with enhanced cooperation capacity beyond national borders

Conclusions

- Due to overlaps with RCR 84 joint pilot activities it is proposed to skip this indicator