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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>Cross Border Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFTA</td>
<td>European Free Trade Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPO</td>
<td>European Patent Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPON</td>
<td>European Territorial Observatory Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC</td>
<td>European Territorial Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG</td>
<td>GreenHouse Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERREG</td>
<td>Community initiative aiming at stimulating interregional cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Investment Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUTS</td>
<td>Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Priority Axis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Small and Medium-sized Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEVI</td>
<td>Territorial Evidence Support for European Territorial Cooperation Programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Introduction

1.1 Objectives and Main Outcomes

This report serves as the interim delivery for the Territorial Evidence Support for European Territorial Cooperation Programmes. The main aim of this report is to provide an up-to-date view on the progress of the project. This includes providing an overview of the preliminary results of the stakeholder participatory process, the preliminary outputs of the territorial characterisation and reference analysis, as well as information on the keep.eu interface.

The specific aims of the ESPON TEVI study are fourfold. First, the development of a practical, user-friendly tool for managing the monitoring of ETC programmes is foreseen. Second, a baseline assessment and the development of synthetic indicators of twelve ETC programmes is planned, providing a “testing ground” for the application of the developed methodology. Third, the study aims to evaluate to what extent the developed indicators and methods are transferable to other ETC programmes. Fourth, the project contributes to the ESPON Scientific Platform and the Interact keep.eu database, by supplying updated indicators, as well as providing an interface between the two databases.

Twelve ETC programmes were selected by ESPON EGTC to participate in this project. The participating programmes comprise a mixture of INTERREG VA and VB programmes, whereas the latter is slightly more highly represented. The table below provides a list of the selected programmes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediterranean (INTERREG VB)</th>
<th>Italy-Croatia (INTERREG VA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North West Europe (INTERREG VB)</td>
<td>Austria-Czech Republic (INTERREG VA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Baltic (INTERREG VA)</td>
<td>Two Seas programme (INTERREG VA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-West Europe (INTERREG VB)</td>
<td>Italy-Austria (INTERREG VA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutschland-Nederland (INTERREG VA)</td>
<td>Central Europe (INTERREG VB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Baltic (INTERREG VA)</td>
<td>Sweden – Denmark – Norway (INTERREG VA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outputs of the projects are divided up into two broad categories (see Figure 1.1): outputs aimed at ETC stakeholders in general, and outputs designed for the twelve participating ETC programme stakeholders.

A keep.eu interfacing tool is designed, with which programme managers, joint technical secretariats, and policy makers who are involved in the preparation of an ETC programme are able to access relevant indicators from the ESPON database directly in keep.eu.

Stakeholders involved in the implementation of the programme of the ETC programmes will receive best-practice user guidelines, which are designed to help in the implementation process. The best-practice user guidelines will provide stakeholders with advice in regards to data and indicator handling of the KEEP database, data extraction and analysis from the database, as well as the process of collecting data and updating the database. Additionally, the guidelines supply the stakeholders with relevant information on the use and purposes of data, for example, in reporting, the targeting of calls for projects, impact evaluations, selection of future...
For the twelve selected programmes, a Territorial Evidence Report is drafted and presented. The Territorial Evidence Reports aim to provide a clear and unambiguous basis for policy intervention. The reports follow a common structure and include, for each programme, a territorial characterisation and reference analysis, as well as key territorial indicators. The reports pay close attention to the specificities of the territories, while simultaneously allowing comparisons between the programmes to be made, due to the common structure and methodology.

In addition, improved territorial indicators are developed, to support the monitoring of the programme implementation and evaluation. These indicators are developed in conjunction with input from stakeholder representatives of the selected programmes, and subsequently fed into the KEEP database interfacing tool. Stakeholders, such as representatives from the Managing Authorities, Joint Technical Secretaries or Programme Committees, provide valuable inputs in this regard, as they are able to provide information on the data collection, as well as their use of the KEEP database.

1.2 Structure of the Report

The interim report is divided up into six distinct sections, covering the reporting requirement as stated in the Terms of Reference of the project. The first section provides a recap of the outputs and context of the project. Section two elaborates the methodology applied in to produce the territorial reference analysis and characterisation. The methodology used to assess the results indicators used by the selected twelve ETC programmes is explained, in addition to the methodology underlying the development of the new Key Territorial Indicators. In this section, the outputs of the indicator development are discussed in detail, including a list of the developed indicators. Section three offers an overview of the progress and outcomes of the stakeholder outreach and embedding processes. This section details, among other subjects, the outcomes of the workshops, challenges and solutions encountered. The developed prototype of the keep.eu interfacing link is presented in section four. Section five provides information on organisational matters, such as detailing measures taken in response to the feedback received, as well as a workplan up to the following delivery. A conclusion is provided in section six, outlining the steps ahead.
2 Overview of Methodology

2.1 Territorial Reference Analysis and Characterisation

The output of the territorial reference analysis and characterisation is the underlying socio-economic analysis which complements the assessment and development of result indicators. Together they form the main inputs for the Territorial Evidence Reports of the 12 selected INTERREG Programmes. The territorial reference analysis and characterisation foresees two main outputs: an updated socio-economic analysis of each of the programme area in the form of SWOT analyses, accompanied by a benchmarking exercise.

The SWOT analyses are presented in the accompanying draft Territorial Evidence Reports. The reports are to be augmented via the inclusion of a benchmarking of the programme area vis-à-vis a representative European average. This enrichment of the reports follows in the next delivery, Delivery 3, on 12 April 2019.

According to Article 27 of the Common Provisions EU 1303/2013, INTERREG programmes have to outline a strategy on the basis of the three EU strategy pillars, smart growth, sustainable growth and inclusive growth, which have to be achieved through territorial cooperation. The socio-economic analysis provides the basis for action for the interventions seen through via the programmes. The updated socio-economic analysis may as such underpin the interventions chosen by the programmes.

2.1.1 SWOT Analyses

The socio-economic analysis presented by the INTERREG Programmes in their respective Cooperation Reports is enriched and updated in this sub-task. A key output of this sub-task is the drafting of updated SWOT analyses along the three EU Strategy Pillars inclusive growth, sustainable growth, and smart growth.

SWOT analyses are an analytical tool to assess the efficiency of policies and to get an overview highlighting positive and negative aspects for different policy and development options. A SWOT-analysis provides a formal way of identifying strengths and weaknesses of each option, and of examining the opportunities and threats that arise from them.

On one hand, the SWOT analysis also shows which potentials are resulting from the combination of the internal strengths of a region with the possible opportunities, identified from external strategic documents or current trends. On the other hand, the analysis provides information on the way how difficulties in the analysed regions (weaknesses) can illustrate a possible potential, if combined with current trends and possible opportunities.

To conduct this analysis concerning the leading questions, both kinds of information for the SWOT analysis – the internal ones as well as the external ones – are going to be identified with the gained information from the desk research:

- Strengths and weaknesses which are labelled as internal factors represent information.
- Opportunities and threats represent the external information.
In a further step, the combination of these identified internal and external strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats will lead to potentials and barriers identified for a region.

Three SWOT analyses are produced, updating the information basis presented in the original SWOT analyses of the Cooperation Programmes. The evidence basis necessary to update the existing SWOT analyses stems from in-depth collection of quantitative indicators on NUTS-2 and NUTS-3 level. Additionally, academic studies, as well as reports used to draft the Cooperation Programmes, are reviewed to fill resulting information gaps, as well as enriching the qualitative evidence basis and to pinpoint data requirements. Quantitative indicators are collected from publically accessible databases, such as the Eurostat Database. The collected indicators mirror the ones presented in the original SWOT analyses or used as the evidence basis in relevant background studies.

The first step of the analysis foresees the collection of relevant reports which were used as inputs throughout the programming of the Cooperation Programme. Background studies commissioned by the Managing Authorities in the programming of the Programme are retrieved and analysed in terms of presented data and outputs.

In the following step, values for NUTS-2, and where appropriate NUTS-3 regions, are retrieved. The collected data is descriptively analysed to allow the researcher to assess trends and developments in the programme area, as well as to analyse whether the identified strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities presented in the Cooperation Reports remain valid.

2.1.2 Intervention Logics

An extensive analysis of the participating programmes was conducted within the first phase of the project. The analysis of the Cooperation Programmes produced a series of 15 ETC objectives. The objectives were identified from clusters of specific objectives of the programmes. An additional output of the analysis of the Cooperation Programmes was the intervention logics which were presented in the first round of workshops. The intervention logics were developed around the 15 identified ETC objectives and connected with the existing result indicators the programmes use.

The intervention logics seek create logical chains which connect the identified needs of the programme areas with the intended change of the interventions. At the onset, the first drafts of intervention logics were connected with the already existing result indicators the programmes use (see Figure 2.1). In an interactive setting in the first round of workshops, these intervention logics were discussed with the representatives of the participating programmes. At the focus of the discussion was the identification of potential gaps in the intervention logics.

A product of the first round of workshop was feedback on the appropriateness and coherence of the developed intervention logics, which was used for further refinement. In preparation of the second workshop, these refined intervention logics were augmented by including shortlisted result indicators instead of currently used result indicators. This allowed for the collec-
tion of additional feedback on any potential gaps between the intervention logics and the developed indicators. An example of an augmented intervention logic is printed below (further examples can be retrieved in Annex 2).

**Figure 2.1: Basic Intervention Logic “Support for SME access to cross-border or international markets”**

![Diagram showing basic intervention logic with boxes explaining the sustainability of businesses, SMEs challenged by low levels of international activity, and support for SMEs to enter new markets.](image)

**Figure 2.2: Augmented intervention logic “Support for SME access to cross-border or international markets”**

![Diagram showing augmented intervention logic with boxes explaining identified needs, intended change, and indicators.](image)

The intervention logics serve enhance the knowledge base of the project team on the specificities of the interventions seen through by the participating programmes. This allows the
project team to collect feedback on the existing and the developed indicators specific to the interventions, especially in terms of their appropriateness.

### 2.1.3 Benchmarking of Programme Area

In the next phase of the drafting of the territorial evidence reports, data necessary to map the developed results indicators are collected. Sources include Eurostat and the ESPON Scientific Database. Data requirements include availability on NUTS-3 level for the entirety of the programme areas. Two overarching methods of benchmarking are proposed for the final Territorial Evidence reports, namely the a benchmarking of the NUTS-3 performance vis-à-vis a European average region or an internal benchmarking vis-à-vis an average region in the programme area.

In the first case, a comparison with a representative average region in the European context, for every selected indicator a representative EU median value is constructed. In the subsequent step, the derivation per region from that representative value is calculated, both in relative and absolute terms. These values can then be mapped to illustrate the characteristics of the programme area relative to the overall EU context. The main advantage of this approach is that the maps enable an assessment of the characteristics of the regions of the programmes relative to an EU benchmark. Thus, this approach enriches the evidence basis accessible to stakeholders in terms of the main strengths and weaknesses of the programme area in comparison to the overall EU context. On the other hand, weaknesses include that the results of this analysis may be taken out-of-context and used in a direct comparison of one programme area with another. Additionally, this approach may not shed enough light onto programme-area internal disparities, which may be relatively more useful to the stakeholders.

In the second proposed case, the relative comparison is made to a fictional NUTS-3 region within the programme area. The indicator value for the programme area is constructed from the median value of the indicator. The deviation from the median value is calculated and mapped analogously as in the example above. The main advantage of that approach is that the mapping may display regional performances disparities within the programme area relatively more than intra-programme disparities. Additionally, this manner of mapping may convey a relatively more accurate picture of the state of the territory, than a EU benchmarking, as it takes the territorial specificities implicitly into account via the internal benchmarking. On the other hand, the uniformity of benchmarking is not guaranteed, as each of the programmes is benchmarked to a programme-specific value.
2.2 Assessment of Programme-Specific Results Indicators

2.2.1 Conceptual framework

The definition of reliable result indicators for INTERREG policies must be based on a set of objective criteria, able to overcome all the potential issues arising in this process. Figure 2.3 shows the conceptual framework developed by Politecnico di Milano within the Territorial Evidence project in order to guide policy makers in the identification of appropriate result indicators.¹

Figure 2.3 The logical model of public intervention and the criteria for the definition of appropriate result indicators

The logical model of public intervention and the criteria for the definition of appropriate result indicators

Source: adapted from Osuna et al. (2000)

The public intervention requires some logical steps, namely:

- the identification of the problem, on which the objectives of the public intervention focus;
- the policy tools for the implementation of specific actions to solve the problem;
- the identification of specific outputs (i.e. the specific actions) which, in turn, will lead to
- results, meant as the contribution of the policy to the achievement of the objectives defined.

Result indicators are those indicators measuring project results relative to project objectives, as they monitor the progress towards the explicit targets defined in the beginning of the logical chain (Mosse and Sontheimer, 1996).

The first step is to take into consideration rational issues for the identification of objectives that motivates the policy action.² In other words, these issues are preliminary to the definition of result indicators but, nevertheless, fundamental for their identification:

- the project objectives have to be defined in a clear and unambiguous way, fitting properly the problem they are related to. If this is not the case, it would not be possible to

¹ This framework was discussed in details in section 2.2 of the Inception Report.
² Examples of rational issues on the proposed results indicators in the 12 INTERREG Programmes are presented in section 2.2.2.
meaningfully measure the progress towards the targets of the policy, since the targets themselves would not be clear. The first issue in the identification of appropriate result indicators is defined as the rationality of the policy objective (Figure 2.3). Rationality measures the level of understanding, transparency and accurateness of the policy objectives relative to the societal problem addressed:

- the objectives have to have a clear focus on territorial cooperation, i.e. it must be evident that the INTERREG Programme is not just a substitute for a policy of any other kind (either regional or national) but, rather, its goal is strictly focused on a cross-border territorial dimension.

The second step is the definitional issues for results indicators:

- result indicators must be fully consistent with the objectives of the policy, as they have to correctly measure the targets set by the public intervention. In other words, there is an issue of coherence linking objectives and result indicators (Figure 2.3): if a mismatch arises between these two elements, the monitoring of the policy achievements would be flawed and arbitrary;
- at the same time, it is important for the result indicators to capture a result of the project, rather than an output. The difference between outputs and results must be made explicit, in order to avoid confusion between the two concepts. Outputs are the products generated by the policy in order to achieve certain results. In this sense, the output is not the final goal of the policy, but rather the mean through which the policy objective is pursued (OECD, 2009). The results, on the other hand, represent the extent to which the objective of a policy has been achieved. For instance, a transportation policy could involve the investment of some funds (tools) for the building of a new highway (output) in order to decrease travel time of commuters (result). A policy for unemployed people could invest public resources (tools) for the organization of training courses (output) which will make it easier the reintegration in the job market (result). The relevance of result indicators (Figure 2.3) measures the extent to which the indicator is capturing a result rather than an output;
- the last logical link in Figure 2.3 links the results of the policy to its impact on the society (Hempel and Fiala, 2011). The policy impact is defined by the long-term effects on specific dimension of well-being and living standards of the population targeted by the policy (McCann and Ortega-Argilés, 2015). These long-term effects depend on a variety of different factors, most of them not under the control of the policy maker (World Bank, 2004). The policy results, on the other hand, are short or medium-term effects, directly resulting from the outputs generated by the policy. In other words, the causal link between policy results and impacts is not as evident as the one between outputs and results. It is therefore extremely important, for the result indicators, to capture the net effect of the policy actions on the defined targets, obtained when the result is free from, and unbiased with respect to, other on-going actions and processes.

If rationality and the focus on territorial cooperation represent the prerequisites for the definition of the result indicators, since they relate to the specification of the policy objectives, relevance, coherence and unbiasedness refer to the appropriate definition of result indicators, and therefore they another conceptual level with respect to rationality and territorial cooperation in the logical framework showed in Figure 2.3.

---

3 Examples of definitional issues on the proposed results indicators in the 12 INTERREG Programmes are presented in section 2.2.3.
Once result indicators are defined in terms of rationality, territorial cooperation, relevance, coherence and unbiasedness, the logical approach moves to a third level, concerning the empirical measurement of the indicators and the potential issues involved in this phase (Figure 2.3).

Moving from the general definition of a result indicator to its empirical measurement implies some critical issues, entering the problem of measurability. The criteria have to reflect specific characteristics that results indicators should have. Results indicators should in fact be:

- **objective**: results have to be measured in an objective way. They have therefore to be as insensitive as possible to different methodologies and approaches for their collection, and have to provide a straightforward interpretation of the change occurred. In this sense, quantitative indicators are preferable to qualitative ones;
- **consistent over time**: since result indicators should monitor the gradual approach towards the specific targets set by the policy maker, it is important for their empirical measurement to be regularly available over time, without long time lags (Schumann, 2016);
- **comparable**: to the broadest extent possible, indicators should allow a comparison with other policy contexts, so to understand whether the change occurred is more or less relevant.
- **available at affordable prices**: since the collection of indicators is a costly procedure, especially for qualitative data such as surveys and focus groups, the budget devoted to the measurement phase has to be carefully planned. Whenever possible, without decreasing the quality of indicators, existing data sources should be used for this purpose (OECD, 2015).

These criteria have been presented, discussed and validated with the stakeholders in the first round of workshops. In what follows, we will apply the different criteria to the current result indicators proposed by the 12 INTERREG Programmes, and highlight examples of high or low quality of the indicators suggested in the programmes according to the different criteria.

This analysis has two goals. First, it will inform about the fulfilment of the different criteria, pointing out the most relevant issues encountered in the definition of the current result indicators. Second, it will provide useful examples to be included in the guidelines for the policy makers, making them aware of the potential mistakes to be avoided.

While the assessment of the current result indicators was conducted on the whole set of indicators proposed by the 12 Programmes, in the following lines we will report anonymized examples of both unsatisfactory and satisfactory indicators. This is due to the objective of the project not being an evaluation of the Programmes but, rather, the development of a general approach to the definition of appropriate result indicators that could be applied to any INTERREG action.

This section is therefore organized as follows. The three levels of potential issues in the definition of appropriate result indicators (i.e. rational, definitional and measurement issues, see

---

4 Examples of measurable issues on the proposed results indicators in the 12 INTERREG Programmes are presented in section 2.2.4.
Figure 2.3) will be analysed separately. For each of them, a discussion of the single criteria will point out the weaknesses of the currently proposed result indicators, providing also some examples of best practices. Finally, the last subsection will provide general conclusions on the needs emerged from the assessment of the result indicators currently proposed.

2.2.2 Rational issues emerging from assessment of programme-specific results indicators

The first very important aspect to take into account concerns the clear and unambiguous definition of the projects’ objectives, consistently with the problem they are related to. The arising of inconsistencies between the societal problem that the Programme is aimed at solving and either the policy objectives or its final impact, would make impossible to measure the progress towards the targets of the policy, since the targets themselves would not be clear. Therefore, these issues do not directly concern the definition of result indicators but, rather, they are necessary prerequisites. These aspects are labelled in our framework as “rationale issues” (Figure 2.3).

The first issue at this conceptual level is defined as the rationality of the policy objective (Figure 2.3). Rationality measures the level of understanding, transparency and accurateness of the policy objectives relative to the societal problem addressed.

Table 2.1 reports some example of specific Programme’s objectives that are characterized by low and high levels of rationality.

In general, episodes of poor rationality occur often in thematic objectives involving intangible territorial element, like environmental quality, institutional capacity and social inclusion. In these policy areas it is often difficult to clearly identify the societal problem to be addressed and, as a consequence, to define policy objectives.

A couple of examples are reported in Table 2.1. In the first one, the specific objective concerns the sustainable planning and management of natural areas. This definition, however, is too general and it is necessary to accurately define what is meant by the term “sustainability” in order to set the Programme’s objective in a clear way. A similar issue arises in the second example, where the Programme is aimed at promoting multilateral coordination actions in order to face common challenges. Also in this case, a precise definition of the challenges (i.e. societal problems) addressed by the Programme is necessary for the identification of the objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific objective</th>
<th>Rationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainably planned and managed natural areas.</td>
<td>LOW – The objective is quite generally defined: what is it meant by “sustainability”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support the process of strengthening and developing multilateral coordination frameworks in the area for joint responses to common challenges.</td>
<td>LOW – It is not clear form the objective what are the common challenges addressed by the Programme and, as a consequence, what common actions are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To maintain biodiversity and natural ecosystems through strengthening the management and net-</td>
<td>HIGH – It is clear that the objective is focused on specific elements of the natural capital of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specific objective | Rationality
---|---
working of protected areas. | the regions.
Improve the environmental quality conditions of the sea by use of sustainable and innovative technologies and approaches. | HIGH – The dimension of sustainability is identified with environmental quality of specific natural resources (sea and coastal areas).

The last two rows in Table 2.2 provide a couple of examples of best practices, as far as the rationality criterion is concerned. Both examples focus on the thematic objective of environment protection and preservation. Compared with the previous cases, however, a fully understandable definition of the specific objective is provided. In the first example, the objective is represented by the maintenance of biodiversity and natural ecosystems, while in the second one the focus of the Programme is on the marine environmental quality.

The second potential issue at this conceptual level is the degree of territorial integration characterising the Programme. The dimension of territorial integration among Member States represents the peculiarity of INTERREG actions, differentiating them from policies undertaken by regional and national authorities. Therefore, this aspect must be defined in a clear way, in order to point out how cross-border cooperation is contributing to the achievement of results that could not have been obtained through policies promoted by single regions or countries. Cross-border cooperation may take different forms and intensities. Table 2.2 shows, at a theoretical level, the different levels of territorial cooperation between territories, from the easiest one (information sharing) to the most complex one, the reaching of a critical mass and common organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of cooperation</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0. No cooperation</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Information sharing</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Exchange of good practices</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learning</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordination of actions</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sharing markets – adding variety</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Synergies in the present state of the organization</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reaching critical mass – common organization</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This classification was developed in order to assess the current result indicators proposed by the 12 Programmes, but also to provide policy makers with a scheme of the various forms of cooperation that a cross-border action may take. In the definition of the specific objective of a policy, some reflection is therefore necessary on the extent to which territorial cooperation is supporting the achievement of the objective and through which mechanisms among those listed in Table 2.2.

Table 2.3 reports some examples of low and high territorial cooperation. The first two rows of the table, for instance, report cases in which the statement of the Programme’s specific objective does not provide details about the level of territorial cooperation expected to occur. This
does not mean that territorial cooperation could not help in achieving the specific objectives of the policy. Consider for instance the first case, focused on the development of the area’s natural and cultural resources as tourist destinations. Cross-border cooperation could be effective and take very different forms, from the exchange of good practices (such as successful regional policies undertaken in the past) to a common organization (as the joint development of package travels involving sites in cross-border regions or countries). The same reasoning holds for the second example, about a policy focused on the development and implementation of solutions for increasing energy efficiency and renewable energy usage in public infrastructures. Also in this example, it is not clear how territorial cooperation is expected to occur, and how it is expected to support the achievement of the objective.

Table 2.3: Low and high territorial cooperation: examples from current INTERREG Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific objective</th>
<th>Territorial cooperation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased development of the area’s natural and cultural heritage assets into sustainable tourist destinations.</td>
<td>LOW – It is not fully clear how territorial cooperation will help achieving this result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop and implement solutions for increasing energy efficiency and renewable energy usage in public infrastructures.</td>
<td>LOW – It is not fully clear how territorial cooperation will help achieving this result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase transnational activity of innovative clusters and networks of key sectors of the eligible area.</td>
<td>HIGH – Territorial cooperation seems to approximately of level four (Table 2.2), coordination of actions in the innovation sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening cross-border institutional cooperation in the central regions of the program area.</td>
<td>HIGH – Territorial cooperation seems to approximately of level six (Table 2.2), synergies in the present state of the organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information is rather precise in the other two examples in Table 2.3. In the first one (third row), territorial cooperation seems to correspond to the “coordination of action” category reported in Table 2.3, since the objective is to promote transnational activity of innovative clusters and key sectors. The other example reported in Table 2.3, on the other hand, concerns the strengthening of cross-border institutional cooperation, a kind of action close to the “synergies in the present state of the organization” defined in Table 2.2.

2.2.3 Definitional issues emerging from assessment of programme-specific results indicators

Once the objective of the policy is correctly defined, the logical chain enters the phase of the implementation of the public actions, leading to the results through the choice of tools and the generation of outputs. The definitional issues are therefore those potential problems arising in the phase of definition of the result indicators. These problems may occur in different phases of the conceptual framework reported in Figure 2.3.

The first kind of definitional issue refers to the coherence of the result indicator. Coherence is defined by the consistency of the result indicator with the objectives of the policy. Any mismatch between these two elements would undermine the possibility of measuring the results generated by the Programme, since the indicator would not properly capture them.
Table 2.4 reports some examples of current result indicators characterized by low and high levels of coherence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific objective</th>
<th>Result indicator</th>
<th>Coherence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in product and process innovations in the field of CO₂ reduction and sustainable energy.</td>
<td>Share of SMEs implementing product or process innovations (Percentage).</td>
<td>LOW – This specific objective concerns innovation in a narrow field (the environment and CO₂ emissions), while the result indicator captures a more general propensity to innovate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and cultural resources developed into sustainable tourist attractions.</td>
<td>More sustainable joint natural and cultural heritage based tourist attractions (number of attractions).</td>
<td>LOW – The number of attractions does not capture neither the sustainable management of cultural/natural resources nor their attractiveness for tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the framework conditions for innovation within the cooperation area.</td>
<td>Number of EPO applications (Number).</td>
<td>HIGH – Patents’ applications are directly related to the framework conditions for innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in the product and process innovations in sectors relevant for the border region.</td>
<td>Share of SMEs implementing product or process innovations (Percentage).</td>
<td>HIGH – The implementation of product or process innovation is fully consistent with the Programme’s objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first example concerns a policy aimed at increasing both product and process innovation in a specific field, i.e. CO₂ reduction and sustainable energy. The result indicator, however, is more broadly defined, measuring the overall share of SMEs implementing product and process innovation, irrespective to their field of action. The coherence in this case is rather low, because the result indicator is not fully capturing the progress towards the specific objective targeted by the policy. Notice that coherence would be high if the result indicator was restricted to the field of intervention of the Programme, i.e. CO₂ emissions and sustainable energy.

The second example of low coherence refers to a Programme aimed at the development of natural and cultural resources as sustainable tourist attractions. In this case, the proposed result indicator is the number of attractions available in the eligible area. Again, the level of coherence is low because the pure number of attractions does not capture neither the sustainable management of these resources nor their attractiveness for tourism purposes. Therefore, the adoption of a result indicator of this kind would imply a distorted measurement of the way in which the policy action contributes to solving the societal problem.

Considering the best practices reported in Table 2.4, both examples are focused again on the enhancement of innovation within the eligible area, without any restriction either to a particular sector of the economy or to a specific type of innovation. The result indicators proposed by the Programmes are both highly coherent with the specific objectives. In the first example, the number of EPO applications is coherent because this indicator is directly associated to the framework conditions for innovation. In the second case, the result indicator is analogous to the one discussed among the low-coherence example, but here its use is appropriate since the area of intervention of the policy is not limited to a narrow field of the economy.
The second potential definitional issue is the relevance of the result indicator. It is particularly important for the result indicators to capture a result of the project, rather than an output. Outputs are the products generated by the policy in order to achieve certain results. Hence, the output is not the final goal of the policy, but rather the tool through which the policy objective is pursued. The results, on the other hand, represent the extent to which the objective of a policy has been achieved. Consider for instance a policy aimed at increasing innovation through the financing of research projects involving firms, universities and research centres. The number of project activated and financed by the Programme is an output indicator, i.e. it measures the extent to which the Programme was able to provide the tool to achieve the desired result. The latter, however, is represented by the increase in the innovation capabilities of the local actors, and must be measured by another indicator, such as for instance the number of patents and trademarks applications.5

Table 2.5 shows some examples of result indicators with low and high relevance. In the two cases characterized by a low level of relevance the result indicators are capturing an output of the Programme instead of a result. Consider the first example, focused on a policy aimed at an increase and better utilization of human capital in the eligible area. This objective is pursued through the provision of education and qualification activities. The proposed result indicator is defined by the number of these education and qualification activities supplied to the stakeholders. The relevance of this indicator is low because the number of activities provided is not the capturing the result of the policy, but rather the tool used by the policy in order to achieve the desired result. In other words, this result indicator captures an output, and not a result. As a consequence, an appropriate result indicator should measure the direct change in the job market generated by the provision of the abovementioned educational activities. For instance, if we assume that these courses are mainly aimed at improving the skills of the participants so to facilitate their reintegration in the job market, a result indicator with high relevance could be represented by the unemployment rate in the eligible area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific objective</th>
<th>Result indicator</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extension of common supply of education and qualification activities in order to utilize human resources potential in cross-border region.</td>
<td>Joint education activities and qualification supply (Number).</td>
<td>LOW – The result indicator is capturing an output rather than a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote investment in R&amp;I by strengthening cross-border cooperation between companies and research institutions.</td>
<td>Number of companies participating in cross-border networks and innovation clusters.</td>
<td>LOW – The result indicator is measuring an outcome rather than a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering the involvement of enterprises (primarily SMEs) in the innovation system.</td>
<td>R&amp;I expenditure in the business sector in % of GDP (%).</td>
<td>HIGH – The number of enterprises involved in the projects is the outcome, while their expenditure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Notice that this discussion does not imply that the measurement of a Programme’s outcomes is useless for the assessment of policies. Rather, it can be useful for understanding whether the number and typology of policy actions activated were consistent with those expected before their implementation. Nevertheless, this exercise is conceptually different from the assessment of the Programme’s results.
The second example of indicators with low relevance applies again to policies in the field of innovation. This time the Programme is aimed at fostering investments in R&I by promoting the participation of companies and research institutions in cross-border projects. The result indicator proposed is defined by the number of companies participating in cross-border networks and innovation clusters. As in the previous case, this indicator is capturing an output of the Programme rather than a result. In fact, the participation of local actors in cross-border projects is the tool through which the policy makers want to stimulate the increase in investments for innovation activities. A result indicator characterized by a high level of relevance should therefore focus on this aspect, measuring for instance the share of budget devoted to R&I by local firms or their innovative output (trademarks, patents).

An example of how a result indicator for a policy in the innovation field could be appropriately defined is represented by the first case included among the best practices in Table 2.5. In this case, a policy aimed at fostering the innovation capacity of firms is characterized by a result indicator defined by the R&I expenditure in the business sector. This indicator correctly captures a result instead of an output. A similar reasoning applies to the last example in Table 2.5, where the objective of the policy is to foster the adoption of new technologies (the result) by mean of dissemination activities (the output). The result indicator is in this case correctly focused on the new technologies already and potentially adopted by the relevant stakeholders operating within the eligible area.

The last potential issue in the definition of appropriate result indicator is the level of unbiasedness. This criterion concerns the relationship between the policy results and its impact. The policy impact is represented by the long-term effects on specific dimension of well-being and living standards of the population targeted by the policy. These long-term effects depend on a variety of different factors, most of them not under the control of the policy maker. The policy results, on the other hand, are short or medium-term effects, directly resulting from the outputs generated by the policy. It is therefore extremely important, for the result indicators, to capture the net effect of the policy actions on the defined targets, obtained when the result is free from, and unbiased with respect to, other on-going actions and processes.

Table 2.6 reports some examples of result indicators with low and high levels of unbiasedness. The first row shows the case of a policy aimed at increasing the number of researchers employed in the eligible area. The result indicator proposed is defined by the number of employees working in R&D activities. This indicator is fully coherent with the goal of the policy. Nevertheless, the decision of firms to invest in innovation (and therefore to hire workers for...
their R&D activities) does not depend solely on the policy actions undertaken by the policy makers. For instance, this decision may also be based on exogenous shocks in the economy, like a change in technology or an increase in demand, but also on other elements, as the presence of human capital and research centres in the regions eligible for funding. If these elements are not taken into account, the result indicator would not capture the net effect of the policy, but rather the overall variation of the result indicator, generated by the policy and any other relevant factor.

Another example of result indicator potentially biased is reported in the second row of Table 2.6. It refers to a policy aimed at promoting the internationalization of SMEs in the eligible area. The proposed result indicator is defined by the amount of foreign investments of local firms, expressed as a share of the overall value added they produce. As in the previous case, this indicator is likely to be biased by other factors influencing the internationalization strategies of firms. These factors include, for instance, the institutional characteristics of the foreign markets, the exchange rates and the conditions in the internal and external job markets.

As a general rule, it is therefore clear that when a result indicator is defined, a particular attention must be devoted to the identification of all those factors outside the control of the policy makers that might alter the results of the Programme activities. It is worth noting that the presence of factors of potential influence on the result indicator does not prevent from the use of that particular indicator. In this case, however, it is necessary to empirically measure the factors of potential influence and isolate, through appropriate statistical techniques, their effect on the result indicator. Full details about these methodologies will be provided in the next phases of the TEVI project and included in the guidelines for policy makers produced by the present project.

Table 2.6: Low and high unbiasedness: examples from current INTERREG Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific objective</th>
<th>Result indicator</th>
<th>Unbiasedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of researchers active cross border/internationally, cooperating with the industry and working in the area</td>
<td>Researchers in R&amp;D (Number of people)</td>
<td>LOW – Firms’ investments in innovation could be influenced by other factors (exogenous economic shocks, level of human capital, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement and increasing of the possibilities for the internationalisation of SMEs</td>
<td>Foreign investments of local firms, expressed as a share of the overall value added they produce</td>
<td>LOW – Several exogenous factors have an impact on the propensity of firms to internationalise (institutional factors, exchange rates, conditions in the job market)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to protect and restore biodiversity</td>
<td>Excellent conservation status of habitat types and species of Natura 2000 sites in the programme area (Number)</td>
<td>HIGH – The conservation status is not expected to be affected by exogenous factors in the short run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved transport flows of people and goods</td>
<td>Travel time of passengers (% of reduction of travel time)</td>
<td>HIGH – Travel time on a given transport network is not affected, in the short period, by exogenous factors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.6 presents a couple of examples in which this statistical procedure is not necessary, since the proposed result indicators can be assumed to be unbiased, i.e. not influenced by
any other factor apart from the policy action considered. The first example concerns a project whose objective is to protect and restore biodiversity. The proposed result indicator in this case is represented by the number of habitat sites and species included by Natura 2000 among those in an excellent status of conservation. In the short run, i.e. in the period of implementation of the policy, this result indicator is not expected to be influenced by other elements (like climate change, for instance) apart from the policy actions undertaken within the Programme. As a consequence, it can be considered as unbiased from any external confounding factor. The second example refers to a Programme aimed at improving transport flows of people and goods. The result indicator proposed is defined by the travel time needed to cover a given portion of the transport network. Also in this case, the result indicator can be considered as unbiased, because the time needed for a trip is not affected, in the short term, by any other factor (like new technologies applied to transportation vehicles, for instance) apart from the improvements generated by the policy.

2.2.4 Measurability issues emerging from assessment of programme-specific results indicators

Moving from the general definition of a result indicator to its empirical measurement implies some critical issues. These issues are generally defined under the label of measurability in the logical framework of Figure 2.3, as they refer to several criteria on which the selection for the best measurement of a certain result indicator should be based. The criteria have to reflect specific characteristics that results indicators should have. Results indicators should in fact be:

- **objective**: results have to be measured in an objective way. They have therefore to be as insensitive as possible to different methodologies and approaches for their collection, and have to provide a straightforward interpretation of the change occurred. In this sense, quantitative indicators are preferable to qualitative ones;
- **consistent over time**: since result indicators should monitor the gradual approach towards the specific targets set by the policy maker, it is important for their empirical measurement to be regularly available over time, without long time lags.
- **comparable**: to the broadest extent possible, indicators should allow a comparison with other policy contexts, so to understand whether the change occurred is more or less relevant.
- **available at affordable prices**: since the collection of indicators is a costly procedure, especially for qualitative data such as surveys and focus groups, the budget devoted to the measurement phase has to be carefully planned. Whenever possible, without decreasing the quality of indicators, existing data sources should be used for this purpose.

These measurability issues must be taken into consideration in the phase of definition of the Programme’s result indicator, since poorly measurable indicators might undermine the assessment of the policy actions.

As for the previous criteria, Table 2.7 presents some examples of result indicators with low and high measurability. The first example is the case of a Programme aimed at raising the capacity for better management of energy in public buildings. The proposed result indicator is defined by the share of regional, sub-regional and local energy efficiency plans including
adapted measures for public building stock. The measurability of this indicator is low because different administrative definitions and modes of provision of energy efficiency plans in public buildings are likely to prevent a clear comparison within the Programme area. Moreover, these data are not available from official statistical sources, and therefore the cost associated to their collection (including for instance the translation of administrative documents in different languages) is expected to be high.

The second example refers to a policy whose specific objective is to improve sustainable linkages among actors of the innovation systems for strengthening regional innovation capacity in the eligible area. The result indicator is a qualitative measurement, obtained by means of a survey study and focus groups investigating the stakeholders’ perceptions of the innovation system and its cross-border dimension. As discussed above, indicators of this kind present several issues. In the first place issues arise as values can be hardly replicated due to their high cost. Second, since they do not allow for a comparison with other areas, indications cannot be drawn whether the eligible region is performing significantly better or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific objective</th>
<th>Result indicator</th>
<th>Measurability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To raise capacity for better management of energy in public buildings at transnational level.</td>
<td>Share of regional, sub-regional and local energy efficiency plans including adapted measures for public building stock.</td>
<td>LOW – Different administrative definitions across countries could prevent any comparison also within the Programme area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve sustainable linkages among actors of the innovation systems for strengthening innovation capacity in the eligible area.</td>
<td>Status of linkages among actors of the innovation systems achieved through transnational cooperation in the region on data from survey and focus groups.</td>
<td>LOW – Survey studies and focus groups are difficult to be replicated (high costs), not comparable with other areas (lack of data).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valorising the region’s cultural and natural heritage in a sustainable way.</td>
<td>Overnight stays in the region (Number).</td>
<td>HIGH – Data on tourists’ presences are available from official statistical sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the innovation base for companies in the program area.</td>
<td>R&amp;D expenditure in the business sector in% of GDP (per cent).</td>
<td>HIGH – Official statistics provide data on R&amp;D expenditure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.7 also includes two examples of best practices, i.e. result indicators characterized by high measurability. The first one concerns a policy focused on the sustainable valorisation of the regional cultural and natural heritage. The proposed result indicator is represented by the number of tourists’ presences. Even if this indicator might suffer from other definitional issues (coherence and unbiasedness, for instance) its measurability is high, because data on overnight stays are available from official statistical sources. The second example refers to a Programme whose goal is to improve the innovation base for firms operating in the eligible area. The proposed result indicator is the expenditure (as a share of GDP) for R&D activities in the nosiness sector. Again, this result indicator is probably not unbiased from the influence of external factors. Nevertheless, it has a high level of measurability, given the availability of official statistics at the regional level on this theme.
2.2.5 Conclusions and future steps

The assessment of the result indicators currently proposed by the 12 Programmes participating to the Territorial Evidence project pointed out some general indications. First, rationale issues are rather few, especially as far as rationality is concerned. The link between the social problem and the objective of the policy is in most cases clear. Second, definitional issues are more frequent, especially in the dimensions of relevance and unbiasedness. Overcoming this issue requires further reflection on the expected results and impacts of the programs. Third, measurability is, in some cases, limited by the exclusive use of survey and other qualitative instruments. Often, however, poor data availability is a serious limitation and constraint for the definition of appropriate result indicators.

As far as the frequency of problematic issues across different kinds of actions, the analysis pointed out the higher difficulty for INTERREG Programmes of type B, those focused on transnational cooperation. The high number of regions involved, often characterised by different needs and territorial conditions, represent a further element of difficulty for the definition of appropriate result indicators.

The present section of the Inception report documented the typical issues occurred in the definition of the result indicators currently in use. The next step of the study consists in the provision of guidelines that will enable policy makers to define appropriate result indicators for INTERREG Programmes. These guidelines will directly stem from the framework previously discussed. For each of the criteria summarized in Figure 2.3, detailed indications will be provided on how to overcome the problematic issues arising in the different phases. Wherever possible, new result indicators, alternative to those included in the 12 Programmes participating to the Territorial Evidence project will be proposed.

2.3 Development of Key Territorial Indicators

As discussed above, the full methodology for the definition of appropriate development indicators will be provided in the next phase of the Territorial Evidence project. A detailed explanation of the techniques and methodologies able to overcome the issues presented in section 2.2 will lead to the definition of result indicators alternative to those currently suggested by the 12 INTERREG Programmes involved.

Part of the second round of workshop was devoted to the introduction of these methods, and to the presentation of some examples of indicators able to overcome the weaknesses presented in the previous section. More in detail, the main issue discussed in the workshops involved the coherence of result indicators, i.e. the consistency between the result indicator and the objective specified by the Programme.

From this perspective, an appropriate result indicator should feature two characteristics:

(1) measure how much the policy action allows moving towards the desired objective;
(2) take into account all the results generated by the policy action, and their potential trade-offs.

Concerning the first point, it is important for the result indicator (once the objective is correctly stated, consistently with the societal problem addressed) to capture the change generated by the policy towards this goal. Therefore, since the result is a change induced by the policy action, it is fundamental to compare the same indicator before the policy and after its implementation. Also for this reason, survey studies and focus groups are often not the most appropriate instrument to capture the result of a policy action. Instead, official statistical offices are often providing time series of regional data on several domains, allowing for a measurement of the change occurred in the variables of interest for the policy makers.

The second point is more complex. It acknowledges that policies are usually generating several results, and sometimes a trade-off among them may arise. Consider for instance policies aimed at the valorisation and preservation of the cultural and natural capital of regions. The previous section showed that some of the currently proposed indicators are not appropriate because they capture a specific result of the policy, without taking into account also other effects. A result indicator represented by the number of overnight stays in the region, for example, is a good proxy for the change in the attractiveness of the cultural and natural assets of the area, but it does not measure neither the sustainable use of these resources, nor the change in environmental quality caused by the policy action. Similarly, the use as a result indicator of a variable such as the number of Natura 2000 sites (a rather common choice in INTERREG Programmes) has the drawback to carefully measure the effect on environmental quality generated by the project, at the expenses of providing no evidence on attractiveness and sustainability.

In other words, moving towards the Programme’s objective concerns the simultaneous achievement of different results. These results (and therefore the indicators measuring them) are capturing the different kinds of values generated by the policy. For instance, the valorisation of cultural and natural heritage is likely to increase the attractiveness of the area involved, which can be correctly measured by the change in tourists’ presences. At the same time, the policy will probably raise the environmental quality of the region which can be empirically captured by the change in the number of Natura 200 sites. Finally, investments in the cultural and natural field may promote a more sustainable use of these resources, which could be measured, for instance, by an indicator on the seasonality of tourism.

In this example, the implementation of the project is therefore generating three kinds of values, since they will affect the attractiveness of the region, its environmental quality and the sustainable use of its cultural and natural assets. Hence, the use of a single indicator for the assessment of the results would not appropriate, since it would miss considering some of the results produced by the policy.

Whenever a policy action is likely to generate results in different domains, it is necessary to define composite synthetic indicators represented by a combination of several single indica-
tors. Recalling the abovementioned example, an appropriate result indicator of a policy on the valorisation and preservation of the cultural and natural capital of regions could be represented by a combination of the three indicators discussed before: overnight stays in the region, seasonality of tourism and the number of Natura 2000 sites. Each indicator captures a specific result generated by the policy, and considering them all together would provide an overall assessment of the direct effects of such actions.

The aggregation of the single indicators, however, introduces a further element of complexity. Consider for instance the simplest way of aggregating these variables, represented by the calculation of their arithmetic mean. This implies that the relative importance of one variable over the other is exactly the same. Nevertheless, in several cases policy makers may be more interested in reaching a certain result over the others. If we consider again our example, policy makers might be primarily interested in improving the attractiveness of the area, rather than achieving one of the other two results, on environmental quality and sustainability. If it is the case, then, the arithmetic means would not be an appropriate method for the aggregation of the three indicators. Rather, a weighted mean should be calculated, where the system of weight mirroring the priorities of the public intervention.

An example of this is reported in Table 2.8. The single result indicators are reported in the column on the left, each of them representing a criterion of choice, i.e. a way in which the implementation of the policy is expected to generate value of a certain kind. Overnight stays measure the extent to which the policy is increasing attractiveness, the seasonality in tourism captures the effect on sustainability and the number of Natura 2000 sites proxies the change in environmental quality produced. The value of these indicators is therefore measured as their change over time (remind point 1 above), between the moment of implementation of the policy and the period at which results are expected to arise. In the example below this value is abstractly defined by “a”, “b” and “c”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Weight (no priority among the different objectives)</th>
<th>Weight (priority for increasing attractiveness)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overnight stays in the region</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonality in tourism</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Natura 2000 sites</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic indicator</td>
<td></td>
<td>(a<em>0.33)+(b</em>0.33)+(c*0.33)</td>
<td>(a<em>0.50)+(b</em>0.25)+(c*0.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed above, the aggregation of these values needs to take the objectives and priorities of the public intervention into consideration. If there is no priority among the three objectives of the policy, then the arithmetic mean can be used as a strategy for the combination of the indicators. This case is represented in the third column of Table 2.8, where all the criteria (i.e. result indicators) have the same weight. Nevertheless, in case a ranking of priorities exists, so for instance that the increase of attractiveness is a priority compared with the other two objectives, this has to be mirrored in the set of weights used for the aggregation of the
single variables. The example reported in Table 2.8 (last column on the right) shows the case in which the relative importance of increasing attractiveness (i.e. the indicator of total overnight stays) is twice the one of the other two objectives. The aggregation rule consists therefore in the weighted mean of the three values, as shown in the last row.

Notice that the weighting of the different criteria is a delicate phase of the definition on result indicators for two reasons. First, as said above, because it requires a clear idea of all the objectives and results generated by the policy actions, and of their relative importance. Second, because trade-offs may arise among different objectives. If we recall again our example on the policy aimed at valorisation and preservation of cultural and natural heritage, it is evident that trade-offs could occur between, for instance, increasing attractiveness and environmental quality. An excessive number of tourists could lead to undesired congestion effects and pollution, threatening the environmental preservation of the cultural and natural resources. The same applies if we confront attractiveness and sustainability. The definition of the system of weight needed for the aggregation of single indicators must consider these potential effects.

This approach was applied, in this phase of the project, for the identification of new result indicators in some cases where the current ones were considered as not appropriate.

Table 2.9 provides a list of result indicators using the multicriteria approach discussed above. The first column of the table shows the specific goal of the policy, while the second one reports the proposed result indicator. The latter has to be intended as the aggregation of the empirical measurements of the change in the single indicators listed. The first row of the table is therefore fully correspondent to the example described in the present section. The change in the number of tourists, the variation of seasonality and the change in the number of sites in good conditions have to be aggregated in one single indicator, according to the policy priorities.

The second and third rows provide other two examples, for which an empirical measurement has been provided and mapped. In the first case (second row) the specific objective consists in increasing employment and self-employment in microenterprises. The expected results of these actions can be identified in both an increase of entrepreneurship in the area and a positive change of the employment in microenterprises. Therefore, a result indicator for this policy could be represented by the combination of the number of new firms and the change in employment in enterprises with 1-9 employees. Notice that, in this case, trade-offs between the achievements of the two different objectives are not likely to occur. The weights associated to each of these two indicators depend on the priorities of the policy, and whether they are more oriented towards either the creation of job places or the entrepreneurship promotion.

---

6 The measurement and mapping exercise is purely demonstrative. The period over which the change of the single indicators has been measured is 2008-2013. The source of the data employed in the analysis is EUROSTAT. Some regions are missing because no evidence was available for them. The aggregation rule applied for the empirical examples is the calculation of the arithmetic mean of the indicators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific objective</th>
<th>Proposed result indicator (as a change in the listed variables)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To improve capacities for the sustainable use of cultural heritage and resources</td>
<td>Tourism presences + tourism seasonality + natural sites in good conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting an increased employment in self-employed businesses, micro enterprises and start-ups</td>
<td>Number of new firms (1-9 employees) + number of employees in enterprises with 1-9 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering the innovative potential of the region</td>
<td>Patent application in the relevant sectors + trade-mark applications in the relevant sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the applied research and innovation oriented activity in the area</td>
<td>Share of R&amp;D expenditure in % of the regional GDP + number of trademark application + number of patent applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To facilitate the implementation of low-carbon, energy and climate protection strategies to reduce GHG emissions</td>
<td>CO₂ emissions + N₂O emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More exports by the companies of the area to new markets</td>
<td>Increase in export + share of export towards non EU/EFTA markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved services of existing small ports to improve local and regional mobility and contribute to tourism development</td>
<td>Number of tourists + index of concentration of tourists per port of arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More people benefiting from stronger communities in the area</td>
<td>Composite indicator of indexes of social inclusion (people under poverty threshold, long-term unemployment rate, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the development of social innovation applications in order to make more efficient and effective local services to address the key societal challenges in the area</td>
<td>Number of IP + households with access to internet + households with access to broadband connection + households who use internet for interactions with the PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the quality, safety and environmental sustainability of marine and coastal transport services and nodes by promoting multimodality in the area</td>
<td>Goods transported by sea + average age of the ships + number of accidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make natural and cultural heritage a leverage for sustainable and more balanced territorial development</td>
<td>Number of tourists + seasonality in tourism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third row of Table 2.9 reports an example of a policy aimed at fostering the innovative potential of the region. In this case, the objective consists in the creation of knowledge and innovation in the Programme area. Since innovative products may take different forms, a single indicator would probably be biased, taking into account only one of them. For this reason, the proposed result indicator is represented by the combination of the variation in both patent and trademark applications. Again, the way in which these two indicators are aggregated depends on the priorities of the Programme, and on the focus of the policy action.

The rest of the table presents other cases in which a similar approach for the definition of result indicators was applied. The methodological guidelines developed in the rest of the project will discuss these issues more in details, and in combination with the other tools able to overcome the issues discussed in section 2.2.
3 Stakeholder Outreach

3.1 Overview of the stakeholder participatory process

Along the project a series of three stakeholder workshops is to be conducted by each programme group. The focus of these three workshops follows the needs of project progress and is aligned with each of the three tasks. Table 3.1 summarizes the main topics and expected outcomes of the workshops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop 1</th>
<th>Workshop 2</th>
<th>Workshop 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Draft Territorial Evidence Reports</td>
<td>Draft Territorial Evidence Report</td>
<td>Draft final best-practice user guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of existing Indicators</td>
<td>Developed synthetic indicators</td>
<td>Draft final keep.eu database interface tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft assessment of possible gaps and shortages of existing indicators</td>
<td>Prototype of the keep.eu database tool</td>
<td>Draft final Territorial Evidence Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First propositions for indicator development</td>
<td>technical analysis and plan for integration for the keep.eu database tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technical analysis and plan for integration for the keep.eu database tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of findings on territorial characterization</td>
<td>Ensure completeness of the Draft Territorial Evidence Reports</td>
<td>Ensure understandable &amp; comprehensive best-practice user guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinement of assessment of gaps and shortages of existing indicators</td>
<td>Help identify common and specific indicators</td>
<td>Ensure completeness of the Territorial Evidence Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of first propositions by experts for indicator development</td>
<td>Discussion of a shortlist of initial synthetic indicators produced by the experts, Fine-tuning and finalization</td>
<td>Testing the keep.eu database interface tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of first propositions by experts for indicator development</td>
<td>Ensure match with expectations for the keep.eu database tool</td>
<td>Reflection on the overall programme decision-making guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial inputs to the keep.eu database interface tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main outcomes</td>
<td>Stakeholder feedback on territorial characterization and assessment of current indicators, as well as results of benchmarking, Stakeholder inputs on the design of the keep.eu database interface tool.</td>
<td>Validation and inputs on the shortlist of indicators allowing experts to produce a final list, Feedback on the keep.eu database interface prototype</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The twelve participating ETC programmes are divided up into three programme groups, according to their geographical distribution. Programme groups consist of participating stakeholders that belong to each group, as well as two partners of the consortium who act as group supervisor and support.

The group leader is the partner with most relevant expertise as well as language skills and is, thus, responsible for establishing and maintaining communication with the stakeholders. The supporting partner can act as both organisational and content-related support to the group.
leader. The task allocation is mutually agreed upon between the group leader and support. The table below summarises the group distribution of participating ETC programmes as well as the partners assigned both the supervising and supporting roles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1: Southern Europe</th>
<th>Group 2: Central Europe</th>
<th>Group 3: Northern Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor:</strong> ÖIR</td>
<td><strong>Supervisor:</strong> TU Delft</td>
<td><strong>Supervisor:</strong> Nordregio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support:</strong> Polimi</td>
<td><strong>Support:</strong> ÖIR</td>
<td><strong>Support:</strong> EPRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean (INTERREG VB)</td>
<td>North West Europe (INTERREG VB)</td>
<td>South Baltic (INTERREG VA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-West Europe (INTERREG VB)</td>
<td>Deutschland-Nederland (INTERREG VA)</td>
<td>Central Baltic (INTERREG VA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy-Croatia (INTERREG VA)</td>
<td>Austria-Czech Republic (INTERREG VA)</td>
<td>Two Seas programme (INTERREG VA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy-Austria (INTERREG VA)</td>
<td>Central Europe (INTERREG VB)</td>
<td>Sweden-Denmark-Norway (INTERREG VA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 Workshop Outcomes

#### 3.2.1 Workshop Round 1

The first round of workshops was held in June 2018. In each of the programme groups, one workshop was organised at one of the Programme’s Joint Technical Secretariats. Programme group Southern Europe met on 15 June in Bozen/Bolzano in Italy, Programme group Central Europe met on 13 June in Vienna in Austria, and Programme group North met on 26 June in Gdansk, Poland. All programmes were able to participate in these workshops, with turnout of representatives between 9 and 12 per session.

The focus of the first round of the workshop was to introduce the participants to the project. In that regard, the preliminary outputs of the project, as well as the underlying methodology, were presented and discussed. The methodology used to assess the result indicators used by the programmes was presented. Further, this allowed the participants to discuss the specificities of capturing the links between interventions and results via indicators. Participants were presented with intervention logics for each of the identified ETC objectives in a world café setting. Finally, in a moderated feedback session, participants were able to provide the project team with information on their use of keep.eu as well as on potential uses of the platform.

The workshop round highlighted one major concern in regard to the developed intervention logics: while the intervention logics were generally deemed suitable by the CBC programmes, the larger transnational programmes often found the presented intervention logics not specific enough to their respective needs. On the other hand, the methodology supporting the development of new result indicators was well-received by the participants. However, even here some larger transnational programmes noted some scepticism in regards to the usability of the result indicators to be developed. There was also an expressed wish to concentrate relatively more on output indicators. The participants also expressed that the use of keep.eu is relatively limited by the programmes themselves, but is generally rather used by potential beneficiaries for “match-making”, as well as finding potential partners.
3.2.2 Workshop Round 2

The second round of workshops was held in late September/October 2018 in Santander, Spain (27 September – Programme Group South), Lille, France (1 October – Programme Group Central Europe), and Turku, Finland (3 October – Programme Group North). Participation was not as high in the second round of workshops due to scheduling difficulties, with fewer programmes than expected participating in workshop group Central Europe. In the two other workshops, turnout was good, with every programme represented.

The workshop was divided into three distinct sections: a presentation and discussion of the methodology used to develop the result indicators, as well as exemplary result indicators, a discussion of the developed indicators in connection with the intervention logics, as well as a presentation of mock-ups of the keep.eu database. The first section of the workshop allowed for a semi-interactive discussion of the underlying methodology, as well as example indicators. A purpose of this discussion was to illustrate the importance of designing methodologically sound indicators when attempting to measure results of a policy intervention. In a world café setting, the augmented intervention logics discussed in the first round were discussed in connection to the proposed result indicators. Among collecting stakeholder feedback in terms of usability of the indicators, this session also served to connect the developed result indicators with the revised intervention logics. Mock-ups of the proposed keep.eu interface tools were discussed with the participants regarding usability and additional developments they may require.

As in the first round of workshops, a certain level of scepticism regarding the degree of usability of some of the indicators to the larger transnational programmes persisted. It was mentioned that a high degree of complexity in indicators can carry risks, in terms of understanding the methodology. However, the methodology behind the development processes of the indicators was deemed appropriate by the participants. The interactive discussions centred on the outcomes of the assessment of the indicators also provided learning-effects in regards to the designing of indicators which were reported across the three sessions. Some additional revisions were needed to tie the revised intervention logics together with the new indicators to the specificities of the programmes. A stated wish by some programmes was to be more actively involved in the project.

3.3 Challenges and resulting revisions to methodology

One of the challenges encountered during both workshop rounds was the matter of expectation management. In the first round of the workshop, a participant expressed wishes for an assessment of the performance of their programme, in terms of indicators (values and quality). The final Territorial Evidence Reports are foreseen (as is stated in the ToR) to include a benchmarking of the programme areas, which displays the state of the territory in a number of defined dimensions. As a consequence, in the second round of workshops the outputs of the
project were underlined again, especially that an assessment of a programme vis-à-vis other programmes is not an output of the project.

One of the outputs of the project is the development of result indicators which are to be both specific enough to be useful to the individual programme, but also general enough to be applied across the (participating) programmes. Due to some differences in terms of indicator requirements between cross-border and transnational cooperation programmes, muted scepticism in regards to their usability to transnational cooperation programmes was noted. This sentiment was captured in the first round of workshops. As a consequence, the second workshop also saw a discussion of the (revised/augmented) intervention logics, as they serve as an input to the development process.

3.4 Additional data requirements

No additional/unscheduled data requirements are noted.
4 The keep.eu interface

4.1 Keep.eu Database update and connection with ESPON Database

One of the requirements from the ToR is widen the keep.eu database to include the new indicators developed within the framework of this project, as well as data visualisation tools. Further, this includes a linking of the two databases. This linking of the ESPON Scientific Database and the keep.eu Database seeks to avoid database duplication, with any data called up from the ESPON Scientific Database not permanently stored in keep.eu.

In terms of the integration of the ESPON Scientific Database and the keep.eu database, two possibilities have been analysed. The main difference between the two alternatives concerns the matter of the integration of the newly developed indicators.

a) The Indicators Database is loaded into the keep.eu database. The information related to these indicators is imported from ESPON Database using the ESPON DB Webservices tool already created. This allows the user to call-up relevant data from the ESPON Scientific Database. On the other hand, the developed indicators are connected to the rest of keep.eu information (projects, programs, partners) using the keep.eu ADMIN Tool.

b) The database of developed indicators is created outside of the keep.eu database. The information related to these indicators is imported from the ESPON Database using the ESPON DB Webservices already created. On the other hand, the developed indicators are connected to the rest of keep.eu information (projects, programs, partners) using the keep.eu ADMIN Tool and a web service.
4.2 Admin Tool

An Admin Tool is proposed to manage the new indicators and its connection to keep.eu information (e.g. on projects, programmes, and partners). The admin tool would also allow for the management of information related to projects, programmes, and partners, including the uploading and updating of relevant information. The following sub-sections contain mock-ups of the work-in-progress admin tool.

The admin tool allows the user to access relevant indicators from the ESPON Scientific Database. Indicators are displayed in a list which can be filtered and searched, as displayed in the figure below. The tool includes a search function by name, as well as filter options via drop-down menus from a series of pre-defined criteria. These indicators are not stored in the keep.eu database, but rather called up when selected.

The admin tool also allows for the manual addition of indicators to the keep.eu database. Indicator values can be imported via external data sources (in .csv file format) or called up from the ESPON Scientific Database. Via several fillable fields the indicator characteristics can be entered.
Indicators can be called up from the ESPON Scientific Database via the same tool by selecting the appropriate option. A searchable list provides an overview of the indicators. Selecting the relevant indicator and choosing to “import” it, stores a copy of the indicator in the session of the user. The values of the indicator are not stored in the keep.eu database itself.

The values of the indicator per relevant geographical dimension are displayed in the following window in the tool. These values can be saved for further analysis and exported by the user. It is important to note that any saved values are tied to the session of the user, and thus will not be permanently stored.
The admin tool also proposes additional functionalities in regards to the management of and adding of programme-related information into keep.eu. Specifically an interface is proposed which allows for the entry of project-specific information, programme-specific information, and partner-specific information. These functionalities are presented in Annex 1.

### 4.3 Analysis Tool

The date called up by the user and stored throughout the user’s session can be outputted in the analysis tool. An Analysis Tool is proposed in the figure below. The tool is able to analyse and visualise the selected indicators. The user can choose specific periods, as well as mapping for specific programmes. The indicators are mapped on an ESPON space map at their specific NUTS level. Additional functionalities include the display of graphs, such as a time-series evolution of the indicator.

**Figure 4.7: Analysis Tool**
5 Organisational Aspects

5.1 Feedback Inception Report

The project team had several discussions with Interact on the topic of the integration of keep.eu and the ESPON Scientific Database. Overall, the approach carried forward in terms of data base integration is a side-by-side integration which maintains clear links between the databases, but refrains from permanently storing information in keep.eu after it is called up by the user. However, there were several conceptual questions remaining which need to be discussed together with the client, ESPON EGTC, and Interact in order for the project to move forward.

So far, the consortium has developed plans (and mock-ups) for an admin tool which can be used to upload indicators and related information. The question would be to which extent an admin tool is needed, or whether it suffices if information is uploaded by users manually (as it is done currently). In this regard, Interact would foresee only a tool which helps with the data feeding from the ESPON database, not a separate admin tool.

From the Consortium’s understanding, Interact’s position is that any tools (such as the proposed admin tool and data visualisation tool) are to be developed by the dedicated keep.eu service provider. Thus, we would have to restrict our involvement to the immediate task, which is the “linking” of the database and respective interface.

Additional feedback from the inception report includes the reporting of the first two rounds of the workshops. Section 3 discusses in-depth the outcomes, challenges and any resulting revisions to the methodology stemming from the first two rounds of workshops.
### 5.2 Workplan Delivery

*Figure 5.1: Workplan D3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial Characterisation and Reference Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Benchmarking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Territorial Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting and finalizing Territorial Evidence Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototyping of KEEP database interface tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of transferability of methods and indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best-Practice User Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone consultation of stakeholders on the guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting technical guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting practical guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of the guidelines and interface tool in the workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final KEEP database interface tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compilation of final guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project controlling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting deliveries and quality checks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings mit ESPON EGTC and 4 outreach events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project close-down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Next Steps Ahead

The project team recommends trilateral talks with ESPON EGTC and Interact on several conceptual issues as outlined in Section 5.1. The focus of the discussion is less on the technical side, but rather to which extent the responsibilities of creating the admin and data visualisation tool falls under the purview of the Consortium or the dedicated keep.eu service provider.

The project team would also like to recommend a discussion with ESPON EGTC on the matter of the proposed benchmarking and associated mapping. Specifically, the methodology of mapping (see Section 2.1.3) has to be agreed upon. An associated question concerns the choice of Mapkit for the Deliveries. The project team would like to use zoomed-in maps of the ESPON space as to better map the programme area, specifically the cross-border-cooperation programmes.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Name of Organisation</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Building tolerant solutions to climate change</td>
<td>Building Net</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Smart buildings</td>
<td>Eco-2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Energy efficiency and comfort</td>
<td>ENEIE</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2008</td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Solar energy solutions</td>
<td>Stirling NG</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Energy efficiency and comfort</td>
<td>ENEIE</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2008</td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A.6: New Partner

New Partner

- **Name:** Blue-Energy Robotics
- **Address:**
- **Country:** Denmark
- **Phone:** Yes
- **Email:** Yes
- **Description:** Energy efficiency and comfort
- **Involvement:** Contact details available for this partner
Annex 2: Augmented Intervention Logics

Figure A.7: Intervention logic “Support for SME access to cross-border or international markets”

- **Identified needs**: The sustainability of businesses operating in remote, rural and sparsely populated communities and those that are characterised by seasonality of traditional activities.
- **Intended Change**: Exploitation of the opportunities of the “green”, “silver” and “blue” economy. Creation and cooperation of new joint enterprises, especially on the basis of ICT and low-carbon solutions.
- **Indicators**: DD on the current result indicator accounting for other factors that could influence firms’ investments in innovation: level of human capital, economic sector, etc.

Figure A.8: Intervention logic “Promoting efficient use of energy through cooperation”

- **Identified needs**: Low and inefficient consumption of unsustainable energy, Insufficient use of renewable energy in the public sector, Insufficient use of renewable energy in the transport sector, Lack of recognition of potential renewable energy sources, Lack of exchange of knowledge, in particular via education.
- **Intended Change**: Enhanced implementation of renewable energy schemes, in particular in the realm of public infrastructure, Increasing awareness of climate change, the potential of renewable energy schemes.
- **Indicators**: Synthetic indicator composed of: CO2 emissions, PM10 emissions, private vehicles.
Figure A.9: Intervention logic “Joint action plans and labelling on natural and cultural heritage for territorial development”

Joint action plans and labelling on natural and cultural heritage for territorial development (e.g. tourism)

**Identified needs**
- Pollution of coastal areas and other areas affected by tourism
- Strong seasonality of tourism, leading to insecure employment in the region and strongly fluctuating tax revenues
- Need for available tools to enhance the development of sustainable and responsible tourism (alternatives)
- Lacking coordination in cross-border pollution stemming from economic activities based on cultural and natural heritage

**Intended change**
- Increase in the environmental sustainability, via cross-border coordination, of economic activities based on cultural and natural heritage in the region
- Reduction of negative demand-side shocks due to seasonality of tourism, via the development of sustainable tourism based on natural and cultural heritage
- Use of heritage sites for other purposes of demographic development (e.g. fighting demographic change)
- Development and boosting of economic activities (e.g. tourism) based on natural and cultural heritage

**Indicators**
- Synthetic indicator composed of: tourism presences, seasonality of tourism, natural sites in good conditions (Natura 2000)
- DD on an indicator of environmental quality (e.g. Natura 2000) accounting for other factors that could influence environmental quality: exposure to pollutants from other areas, economic activities, etc.

Figure A.10: Intervention logic “Facilitating cross-border labour exchange and using territorial cooperation potentials for better education and training”

Facilitating cross-border labour exchange and using territorial cooperation potentials for better education and training (capacity building)

**Identified needs**
- Increasing levels of outmigration caused by high levels of long term adult and youth unemployment.
- Need to reduce brain drain through cross-border initiatives and cooperation between businesses and higher education institutions aimed at matching education to employers’ needs.
- Social problems related to health, minorities, safety, gender, elderly, low involvement in entrepreneurship.
- Need to enhance the competitiveness of VET programmes and align them more closely with the needs of the labour market.

**Intended change**
- Better prepared labour force for work places in the blue and green growth sector
- Better prepared labour force for work places in the blue and green growth sector
- Strengthening social inclusion through joint educational and/or training activities through “people to people” projects
- Development and further integration of labour markets, decrease of social exclusion

**Indicators**
- Change in the reallocation rate of unemployed low-skilled workers
- Change in the unemployment rate of highly-skilled workers
The ESPON EGTC is the Single Beneficiary of the ESPON 2020 Cooperation Programme. The Single Operation within the programme is implemented by the ESPON EGTC and co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund, the EU Member States and the Partner States, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland.