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# 1. BACKGROUND

The success of the Interreg NEXT VI Black Sea Basin Programme (Interreg NEXT BSB Programme) is to a large extent related to the ability of the management structures and beneficiaries to develop, collect and report consistent, relevant and reliable indicators.

Thus, a comprehensive document providing the programme structures and relevant programme partners with the necessary framework for understanding the methodology for defining, quantifying and measuring indicators, including clear definitions of the selected programme output and result indicators, setting milestones and targets which could timely reflect progress in implementation, is essential.

The Performance Framework Methodology may also provide guidance to potential beneficiaries for a coherent approach in the identification of appropriate project indicators able to contribute to Interreg NEXT BSB Programme results and may support beneficiaries during implementation in measuring progress on achieving the proposed targets.

In this context, the Performance Framework Methodology of the Interreg NEXT BSB Programme has been developed taking into account the provisions of *Regulation (EU) 2021/1058 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 June 2021 on the European Regional Development Fund and on the Cohesion Fund and the* *Regulation (EU) 2021/1060 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund Plus, the Cohesion Fund, the Just Transition Fund and the European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund and financial rules for those and for the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund, the Internal Security Fund and the Instrument for Financial Support for Border Management and Visa Policy* (Common Provisions Regulation - CPR), respectively articles 16 and 17. It consists of the following elements:

* Output and result indicators linked to programme specific objectives;
* Final targets to be achieved by the end of the year 2029 for output and result indicators.

The document also presents definitions, the criteria applied to select indicators, the data or evidence used, data quality assurance and the calculation method as well as a description on how the factors that may influence or influenced the achievement of the milestones and targets were taken into account.

# 2. DEFINITIONS

**Output indicator** *means an indicator to measure the specific deliverables of the intervention, which* are the main products, goods, services, obtained following the implementation of project activities with the project funds and that are further used by relevant target groups or final beneficiaries. This indicator is in the control of the project. Indicative examples: tools, small-scale investments, pilot projects/actions, solutions, events, educational products such as training programmes or methods, curricula etc.

**Result indicator** *means an indicator to measure the effects of the interventions supported,* with particular reference to the direct addressees, population targeted or users of deliverables. It describes the advantage of carrying out the project. Result(s) are derived from the outputs achieved by the project. Indicative examples: organizations cooperating in the concerned area after project completion, pilot joint actions up-scaled, joint solutions applied,etc.

**Target means** *the pre-agreed value to be achieved at the end of the programme eligibility period in relation to an indicator included under the specific objective.*

**Milestone** *means an intermediate value to be achieved at a given point in time during the programme eligibility period in relation to an output indicator included under a specific objective.*

# **3. LESSONS LEARNT**

The proposed performance framework builds on the lessons learnt from the 2014-2020 and 2007-2013 Black Sea Basin programmes, having in mind that the objectives of the future programme generally focus on similar fields. It also takes into consideration the relevant aspects presented in the Programme annual implementation reports, the mid-term EC review, the EC ROM Report for ENI CBC Black Sea Basin Programme 2014-2020 and in the special report on Cross-border cooperation programmes of the European Court of Auditors.

The analysis revealed that the main lessons learnt and recommendations are:

1. Need for the Programme documents to clearly explain the scope of each indicator, the time of measurement and how to set the targets;
2. Need for increased support for potential beneficiaries prior and during the call for proposals for a better understanding of the definition and scope of indicators;

In some cases, the outputs and/or their target values were defined, estimated and subsequently reported by beneficiaries only partially in accordance with the requirements explained in Guidelines for Applicants or during training courses. This approach led to:

* project outputs which could not be directly linked to one of the programme common or specific output indicator (COI or PSOI) in terms of definition or scope;
* project outputs having different measurement unit to the ones measuring the COI or PSOI linked with;
* deliverables defined as outputs;
* over-estimated target values of project outputs included in the initial Application form.

All these required further analysis and revisions during the assessment or implementation stages in order to ensure more coherence between the indicators and the objectives, results, deliverables and activities, both at programme and project level.

1. Need for providing continuous support to beneficiaries during project implementation and reporting stage in order to ensure that the reported intermediate or final values of the indicators are actually achieved and could be counted as contributing to the programme indicator;
2. The duration of the contracting process may be affected by factors beyond the control of the management structures to a larger extent than anticipated. For example, the duration for contracting a project was of minimum 5 months while the maxim was of 22 months. These periods were calculated starting with the date following the JMC approval of the recommended project list, until the signature of the grant contract by the beneficiary;
3. According to the statistical data related to ENI CBC BSB Programme 2014-2020, the average budget of the largest number of projects (72%) submitted by the potential beneficiaries was of 750,000 EUR;
4. The delivery of outputs tends to be reported in the second half of the project implementation;
5. The higher final values achieved and reported by some beneficiaries, compared to the targets initially estimated indicate a rather safe approach on their side when designing the projects;
6. The need to ensure mitigation measures in case the milestones and targets are not achieved because of unforeseen events such as the COVID 19 pandemics or any other potential crisis situation arising in the future;
7. Making the type of activities specific enough to select the best projects that contribute to the programme objectives, in order to be able to assess a real change brought by the projects in the eligible area;
8. To select those result and output indicators which are most relevant for the type of actions envisaged by the programmes thus to better measure the results and effects of cross border projects[[1]](#footnote-1).

In this context, the proposed indicators identified taking into consideration the above mentioned are those that could be used to best monitor the achievement of programme objectives, the target values and milestones.

This document was made available prior to the launch of the calls for proposals, thus allowing sufficient time to potential beneficiaries to properly understand the link which has to be ensured between project and programme results, to translate this into smart indicators able to capture the transnational cooperation dimension and to measure the achievement of programme specific objectives.

As the implementation has advanced, several lessons learnt have been added following the calls for proposals launched:

- The level of interest expressed by the applicants under Priority 1 can be considered appropriate, given that the Programme did not previously financed projects related to research and innovation. However, a substantial interest directed toward regular projects was observed, whereas small-scale projects generated relatively limited engagement.

-Environmental protection and adaptations to the climate changes remain key priorities for the stakeholders in the region, therefore the interest of potential beneficiaries for the Priority 2 was very high, proven by the large number of applications submitted and the amounts requested, exceeding 6 times the allocation available.

The newly introduced priority focusing on better cooperation governance (Priority 3) may have not been fully aligned with the needs for addressing crucial topics or bridging essential gaps in terms of type and size of the projects, as the demand during the call for proposals was moderate and the projects submitted proved a different understanding of aims, objectives, and desired outcomes for the respective Priority.

In this context, the target values needed adaptation to the Programme’s dynamics and measures adopted to maximize the use of Interreg funds.

# 4. GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF INDICATORS

When selecting the indicators, several principles were considered, as described below:

1. **Correlation with the territorial needs and the Programme specific objectives**

Result indicators were set in direct correlation with the specific objectives of the programme. Thus, the result indicators measure short term effects of the interventions with reference to the organisations participating in projects, direct addressees, i.e., target groups.

Output indicators cover all the fields of action of the programme, ensuring the causal link between the output and result indicator as well as between the identified needs and the chosen fields of intervention.

The needs identified in the territorial analysis were translated into fields of actions for each specific objective. The selection of indicators took into consideration the indicative types of action included in the Programme for each specific objective and the available resources. Consequently, the indicators were selected so as to cover most of the possible types of actions: investments, joint actions and solutions, trainings, capacity building and raising awareness events, depending on the thematic field of intervention and its specific aims, allowing a proper measurement of the effects, while keeping the number as reduced as possible, for concentration purpose.

Interreg common indicators were mainly used, as they cover a wider range of types of actions, while best capturing the cooperation dimension. Furthermore, following the allocation of additional funds by the European Commission to the programme, the indicators’ system was enriched with one common output indicator (RCO).

1. **Clear distinction between indicators**

In order to maintain a clear distinction between what is covered by one indicator and what is covered by another, detailed explanations were provided for each indicator in order to reduce the overlapping to the minimum.

1. **Correspondence with the intervention fields**

When designing the indicators system, the correlation with the intervention fields was also checked, in order to ensure that the data at specific objective level is well-structured.

Having in mind the specificity of the Interreg NEXT BSB Programme, the wide eligible area, the large number of participating countries, the purpose, type and dimension of the projects, it is assumed that the outputs and results obtained in small scale projects under PO1/SO1, PO2/SO4, PO2/SO7 will contribute to Intervention field no. 171 *Enhancing cooperation with partners both within and outside the Member State[[2]](#footnote-2)*.

In addition, taking into account the specificity of the proposed fields of action for each specific objective, it is assumed that the outputs and results obtained in regular projects under PO1/SO1, PO2/SO4, PO2/SO7 will contribute to other intervention fields, as follows:

* PO1/SO1 - Intervention field no. 012 - Research and innovation activities in public research centres, higher education and centres of competence including networking (industrial research, experimental development, feasibility studies);
* PO1/SO1- Intervention field no. 029 - Research and innovation processes, technology transfer and cooperation between enterprises, research centres and universities, focusing on the low carbon economy, resilience and adaptation to climate change
* PO2/SO4 - Intervention field no. 058 - Adaptation to climate change measures and prevention and management of climate related risks: floods and landslides (including awareness raising, civil protection and disaster management systems, infrastructures and ecosystem based approaches);
* PO2/SO4 - Intervention field no. 060 - Adaptation to climate change measures and prevention and management of climate related risks: others, e.g. storms and drought (including awareness raising, civil protection and disaster management systems, infrastructures and ecosystem based approaches);
* PO2/SO4 - Intervention field no. 061 - Risk prevention and management of non-climate related natural risks (for example earthquakes) and risks linked to human activities (for example technological accidents), including awareness raising, civil protection and disaster management systems, infrastructures and ecosystem based approaches;
* PO2/SO4 - Intervention field no. 064 - Water management and water resource conservation (including river basin management, specific climate change adaptation measures, reuse, leakage reduction);
* PO2/SO7 - Intervention field no. 079 - Nature and biodiversity protection, natural heritage and resources, green and blue infrastructure.

Taking into consideration the specificities of the small-scale projects that will be financed ISO1/SO3, it is assumed that the outputs and results will contribute to Intervention field no. 173 Enhancing *institutional capacity of public authorities and stakeholders to implement territorial cooperation projects and initiatives in a cross-border, transnational, maritime and inter-regional context.*

This approach also ensured the link between input (budget allocated to each specific objective), output (what kind of and how many outputs the beneficiaries are expected to deliver), result (how will the outputs translate into change at the level of the final beneficiaries/target group) and specific objective (what need of the population is targeted through this intervention).

The correspondence between the specific objectives, intervention fields and output indicators is described in Annex 1.

1. **Measuring and recording achievement for indicators**

The lead partner bears the responsibility for reporting and monitoring the output and result indicators, meaning that the lead partner is the one who should collect and/or collate relevant data received from project partners and report on the output and result indicators relevant to the project.

A key aspect under the responsibility of the lead partner and essential for the monitoring and reporting stage is the setting up of realistic and achievable target values for the indicators since the project design, in close consultation with all project partners.

Appropriate measures in order to avoid multiple counting shall be put in place (eg. clear explanations for the applicants in Guidelines for Grant Applicants and other implementation documents, regarding the counting method for the indicators). Also, for the result indicators that require measurement within a certain period after project/output completion, the lead partner will be requested to take all the necessary measures for that measurement to be done in time and accurately and that the results are reported to the programme authorities.

Each project will contribute to at least one programme output indicator and to at least one result indicator.

Based on these principles, the following **Selection Criteria for the proposed Indicators** were considered:

* **Relevance to transnational cooperation** – able to capture and reflect the added value of transnational cooperation
* **Relevance to programme specific objectives** – able to reflect the programme contribution to the selected priorities
* **Partnership and integrated approach** – able to reflect the achievements through the partners joint participation
* **Thematic concentration** – reflect the use of resources for the most important outcome in the concerned field of intervention
* **Applicability and availability** – able to collect consistent data which are easily available across various countries.

# 5. THE INTERREG NEXT BSB PROGRAMME STRATEGY AND INTERVENTION LOGIC

Interreg NEXT BSB Programme supports transnational cooperation actions throughout three priorities corresponding to Policy Objective 1, 2 and Interreg Specific Objective 1 and related four Specific objectives.

*Figure 1*

Priority 1 **BLUE AND SMART REGION** (Policy Objective no.1-A smarter Europe and its neighbourhood )

Priority 2 **CLEAN AND GREEN REGION** (Policy Objective no.2-A greener, low-carbon Europe and its neighbourhood)

Priority 3 **COMPETENT AND RESILIENT REGION** (Interreg Specific Objective 1 – “Better cooperation governance”)

*Developing and enhancing research and innovation capacities and the uptake of advanced technologies (SO1.1)*

*Promoting climate change adaptation and disaster risk prevention, and resilience, taking into account eco-system based approaches (SO2.4)*

*Enhancing protection and preservation of nature, biodiversity and green infrastructure, including in urban areas, and reducing all forms of pollution (SO2.7)*

*Build up mutual trust, in particular by encouraging people-to-people actions (ISO1/SO3)*

The challenges and needs of the Interreg NEXT BSB Programme area have been identified through a territorial analysis (TA) and they are taken into consideration by the intervention logic for each programme specific objective.

While the two first priorities (Priority 1 and Priority 2) were considered when the Programme was initially approved by the EC on the 13th of December 2022, Priority 3 was added at a later stage, following the additional allocation of funds from the EC in 2023.

In order to “contribute to measuring the overall performance of the funds”[[3]](#footnote-3), the overall set of indicators should cover a large majority of the actions and budget allocated to the programme.

The ERDF/CF Regulation (Annex I, Table 2) listed the dedicated Interreg common output and result indicators. Based on experience in 2014-2020, the list is expected to better capture the outputs and results of cooperation actions. Interreg common indicators should be used in dedicated specific objectives by cooperation programmes under the European territorial cooperation goal (Interreg), the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance (IPA) and the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument (NDICI), but also across all other specific objectives used in such programmes falling under policy objectives 1-5. The ERDF common indicators listed for policy objectives 1-5 (Annex I, Table 1) can be used to complement the Interreg common indicators where there is a direct investment leading to such outputs and results (for instance, through joint or pilot actions).

Having in mind these recommendations and the thematic concentration principle, which was taken into consideration during the programming process, the Interreg NEXT BSB Programme will use for each specific objective a limited number of common output and result indicators as defined in the ERDF/CF Regulation, in particular, Interreg- specific common indicators. No programme specific indicators shall be used.

The progress and achievement of the indicators is collected at project level during reporting, based on the data provided by Beneficiaries and monitored by the MA/JS. The data reporting and collection for all output and results indicators will be done through/from the Joint Electronic Monitoring System (Jems).

The predominant use of Interreg specific common indicators and of the harmonized definitions[[4]](#footnote-4) will facilitate the aggregation of indicator data at the level of the Interreg community.

The Interreg NEXT BSB Programme indicator system is presented below:

*Figure 2*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority/Specific Objective** | **Common output indicator** | **Common Result Indicator** |
| PO1/SO1 | RCO07 Research organizations participating in joint research projects | RCR84 Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion |
| RCO87 Organisations cooperating across borders |
| RCO115 Public events across borders jointly organised |
| RCO84 Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | RCR104 Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations |
| RCO116 Jointly developed solutions |
| PO2/SO4 | RCO87 Organisations cooperating across borders  | RCR84 Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion |
| RCO115 Public events across borders jointly organised |
| RCO84 Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects  | RCR104 Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations |
| RCO116 Jointly developed solutions |
| PO2/SO7 | RCO87 Organisations cooperating across borders  | RCR84 Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion |
| RCO115 Public events across borders jointly organised  |
| RCO84 Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | RCR104 Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations |
| RCO116 Jointly developed solutions |
| ISO 1/SO3 |

|  |
| --- |
| RCO81 Participations in joint actions across borders  |

 | RCR84 Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion |
| RCO87 Organisations cooperating across borders |
| RCO116 Jointly developed solutions | RCR104 Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations |

# 6. FACTORS INFLUENCING THE achievements MILESTONES AND TARGETS

There are various external factors that can influence the achievements of the targets as follows:

* The unpredictable development of the COVID 19 pandemics or other unforeseen situation(s) might affect the overall project progress and lead to a slow-down in the project implementation and delay in the achievement of outputs;
* A consequence of the COVID19 pandemics is related to the limited economic recoveries and hence, financial difficulties that some of the potential beneficiaries or beneficiaries might have in providing the co-financing which might lead to a reduced number of applications or reduced number of beneficiaries;
* Political context - changes in participating countries which may lead to lack of commitment to implement the projects, to delays in decision making process concerning both public and private sector architecture and funding;
* Amendment of the participating countries legislation with impact on projects and programme implementation;
* The insufficient quality of the submitted projects may result in bottlenecks during the evaluation and selection process, which could in turn lead to delays in the implementation timeline;
* Delays during contracting process due to: lack of availability of documents required during contracting, changes in the partnership structure, other revisions requiring Monitoring Committee’s approval;

The managing structures duly consider the factors on a case by case basis and timely intervene with the appropriate measures in order to mitigate the impact on the implementation of projects and risk of target values of the indicators being affected.

It was the case when the Monitoring Committee, considering the results of the calls for proposals, authorized the Managing Authority to initiate the modification request at the European Commission so that the Interreg NEXT BSB Programme could be adjusted in order to ensure the most efficient use of the funds and the achievement of the Programme output and result indicators.

# 7. QUALITY ASSURANCE

In order to ensure the collection and reporting of quality data at programme level at the set date, and that reporting will focus on results, the following aspects will be considered by the Managing Authority/Joint Secretariat throughout the various stages of Programme implementation, as follows:

**Programming** – develop Performance Framework Methodology, containing definition and detailed information on the selected programme output and result indicators, information to be made available to the potential beneficiaries prior to launching the calls for proposals, and also during project preparation and implementation. When drafting the methodological document, it was ensured that the data underpinning the indicator baselines, milestones, and targets were taken from a reliable source (e.g. the monitoring system or official statistics). Whenever this was not the case, the necessary steps were taken to ensure the quality of the data.

**Calls for proposals**

**–** Provide information to ensure potential beneficiaries are well informed as concerns the programme indicators system.In addition to the information and explanations provided in the Guidelines for Applicants, during training sessions envisaged to be organized, clarifications will be provided to potential applicants including on project indicators definition, quantification and their correlation with the programme indicators. Information shall also be posted on the programme website for wide use;

- The Lead Beneficiary will be made aware on its coordination role of the other project partners in the definition and quantification of realistic target values for project indicators;

**Project evaluation –** the assessors participating in the Quality assessment will have to be fully aware of the programme indicators, specific objectives and to ensure that the defined indicators and their estimated figures contained in the application are realistic and in line with programme requirements;

**Implementation –** continuous support will be provided to beneficiaries through monitoring and training as concerns collecting, measuring and reporting of the achieved progress, ensuring that the reported figures are correctly counted, realistic and according to the set deadlines.

# 8. CALCULATION METHOD FOR TARGETS

Final targets to be achieved by the end of the year 2029 are set for output and result indicators of all SOs. The quantified targets are taking into account the budget allocated until 2027.

The quantification of programme targets is based on the following:

* Lessons learnt from the implementation of the ENI CBC Joint Operational Programme Black Sea Basin 2014-2020 and of the ENPI CBC Joint Operational Programme Black Sea Basin 2007-2013 as presented in section 3, and the perspectives for the Interreg NEXT BSB Programme following the results of the calls launched;
* Current allocation of funds, as reflected in the Financing plan of the Programme for each priority and SO;
* Size and number of projects to be supported under each SO, as explained in Section 9 System of Indicators;
* The expected deadline for contracting the projects and starting their implementation;
* Capacity of potential beneficiaries to define outputs linked to programme objectives;
* Capacity of the beneficiaries to ensure that the projects’ outputs and results contribute to the selected indicators and to timely report progress in implementation.

The calculation of the targets was done taking into account only the Interreg funds, based on the experience from 2014-2020 programming period and the results of the calls launched under Interreg NEXT BSB Programme. The target values are representative for the total investment effort of the programme, even if the calculations are made using only the Interreg funds, excluding the national co-financing.

Four calls for proposals were launched, first calls in the first half of 2023 and second calls in the first half of 2024, dedicated to small scale projects and regular projects. The implementation of the first projects started in the first half of 2024 and by the end of the year 2025 all projects are expected to be under implementation. The time measurement for the achievement of the indicators chosen by Interreg NEXT BSB Programme will be upon project finalization. However, intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementations.

The baselines for the other output indicators and for the result indicators have been defined as “zero”.

The Interreg Next BSB Programme finances projects of limited financial value (small scale projects) between 250,000 and 500,000 EUR Interreg Funds and regular projects between 500,000 and 1,500,000 EUR Interreg Funds.

The duration period of the regular projects is expected to be up to 30 months and of the small-scale projects is expected to be up to 18 months. Based on the previous experience, the beneficiaries tend to set up the project implementation period at the maximum allowed.

# 9. SYSTEM OF INDICATORS

**PRIORITY 1 – BLUE AND SMART REGION**

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE (SO1):** **DEVELOPING AND ENHANCING RESEARCH AND INNOVATION CAPACITIES AND THE UPTAKE OF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGIES**

The performance framework for Priority 1/SO1 as presented below is based on the following data and assumptions:

* Programme budget allocated to P1/SO1: 19,651,154 EUR Interreg Funds;
* Allocation for limited financial value projects (small scale projects): 1,395,761EUR Interreg Funds,
* 3 small scale projects contracted;
* Allocation for regular projects: 18,255,393 EUR Interreg Funds;
* 9 regular projects contracted under the first call and 9 projects selected under the second call;
* 21 projects to be supported under Priority 1/SO1 (3 small scale and 18 regular projects).

**Output indicators**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SO  | ID  | **Indicator**  | **Measurement unit**  | **Mile stone 2024**  | **Final target 2029**  | **Explanation**  |
| SO 1.1  | RCO07 | Research organisations participating in joint research projects | Research institutions | 0 | 36 | **Assumption:**Research organisations will participate in all regular projects. 100% of the regular projects will involve an average of 2 research organisations per project**Target 2029:**Target = number of projects \* average number of research organisations per projects18 projects\*2 research organisations = 36 research organisations |
| RCO116 | Jointly developed solutions | Solutions | 0 | 18 | **Assumption:**All regular projects will implement a jointly developed solution.**Target 2029:**Target = number of projects \* average number of solutions developed18 projects\*1 solution = 18 solutions |
| RCO115 | Public events across borders jointly organised | Events | 0 | 42 | **Assumption:** Due to specificities of the activities, it is assumed that the events will target a specialized target group, therefore an average of 2 events per project are envisaged.**Target 2029:**Target = number of projects \* average number of events21 projects\*2 events/project= 42 events |
| RCO84 | Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | Pilot actions | 0 | 11 | **Assumption:** In average half of the both regular and small scale projects will implement 1 pilot action for strengthening innovation capacities developed per project.**Target 2029:**Target = number of projects \* average number of pilot actions21 projects/2\*1 pilot action = 11 pilot actions |
| RCO87 | Organisations cooperating across borders | Organisations | 0 | 41 | **Assumption:** The total number of beneficiaries and of the unique (distinct) entities in the 2014-2020 programming period is 270, respectively 195. The unique entities represented 70% of all beneficiaries. The average number of partners per project was 5. From the average estimated number of partners in the 21 projects financed under this SO, having on average 4 partners (different limits of partners per type of projects), 70% will be unique organisations. However, there will be overlapping between partners in specific objectives, therefore it is anticipated that 70% of total partners at programme level will be actually unique beneficiaries.Therefore, the percentage is applied once again for total number of partners per each SO.**Target 2029:**21 projects \* 4 partners \* 70%= 59 organisations \* 70% = 41 organisations  |

**Research organizations participating in joint research projects (RCO 07)**

*Measurement unit*: research organisations

*Definition/comments*: This indicator counts the number of supported research organisations that cooperate in joint research projects. A joint research project includes at least one research organisation and another partner. Cooperation in research and innovation activities may be new or existing, and it should last at least for the duration of the project supported.

The indicator covers active participations in joint research projects, and it excludes contractual arrangements with no active cooperation in the supported project (i.e. exclude cases where partners in a framework contract do not all participate in specific joint research cooperation).

Research organizations are bodies with a primary goal to conduct independently fundamental research, industrial research and experimental development and to disseminate the results of such activities by way of teaching, publication or knowledge transfer.

*Examples:* include universities or research institutes, technology transfer agencies, research-oriented or virtual collaborative entities, and they can be public or private.

Multiple counting will be removed at the level of the specific objective. A research organisation is considered once regardless how many times it receives support from operations in the same specific objective.

This indicator will complement RCO87, although the same organization may be counted both under RCO07 and RCO87. The aim of RCO07 is to capture the number of research institutions supported while RCO87 reveals the cooperation dimension.

*Time measurement*: Values achieved shall be measured upon completion of the supported cooperation activity. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Jointly developed solutions (RCO116)**

The indicator counts the number of jointly developed solutions from joint actions (including as a result of pilot actions) implemented by supported projects. In order to be counted in the indicator, an identified solution should include clear indications of the actions needed for it to be taken up or to be upscaled.

A solution is an action or a process of solving a problem.

A jointly developed solution implies the involvement of organizations from at least two participating countries in the drafting and design process of the solution.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be upon project finalization. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Public events across borders jointly organized (RCO115)**

The indicator counts the number of events across borders which were jointly organized by the partners in supported projects, and not the number of participations in public events.

A public event across borders is understood as a joint action which has been advertised through relevant means, to the general public of the area covered by the programme and is not dedicated to the partner institutions only.

A joint action is considered as the action organized with the involvement of organizations from at least two participating countries, and involves stakeholders from outside the project consortium. A public event across borders should have participants from at least two countries of the programme eligible area.

On line events will also be taken into consideration, if justified.

The participation of the project staff in public events is not sufficient for ensuring the condition of participants from at least two countries of the programme eligible area.

*Examples* of public events include: launching/final Conference of the projects, trainings, workshops and seminars organized in the framework of the project, etc.

Internal working meetings, steering committees of the project staff are not considered as public events.

It is compulsory to advertise to the general public the organization of the public event, through website, social media, and/or local/national newspapers.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be upon project finalization. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects (RCO 84)**

The indicator counts the pilot actions developed jointly and implemented by supported projects. The scope of a jointly developed pilot action could be to test procedures, new instruments, tools, experimentation or the transfer of practices. In order to be counted by this indicator:

- the pilot action needs not only to be developed, but also implemented within the project

and

- the implementation of the pilot action should be finalized by the end of the project.

Jointly developed pilot action implies the involvement of organizations from at least two participating countries in its implementation.

A pilot action is to be understood as a practical implementation of newly developed solutions (e.g. services, tools, methods or approaches, even a small scale investment). A pilot action has an experimental nature which aims at testing, evaluating and/or demonstrating the feasibility and effectiveness of a solution. Therefore, it covers either the testing of innovative solutions or demonstrating the application of existing solutions to a certain territory/ sector.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be upon project finalization. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Organisations cooperating across borders (RCO87)**

The indicator counts the organisations cooperating formally in supported projects. The organisations counted in this indicator are the legal entities (project partners), as mentioned in the application form. Organisations cooperating formally in small scale projects are also counted.

At programme level, double counting should be avoided at the level of project partners.

All projects will have to contribute to this indicator.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be upon project finalization. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Result indicators**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SO**  | **ID**  | **Indicator**  | **Measurement unit**  | **Base line**  | **Ref. year**  | **Final target 2029**  | **Explanation**  |
| SO1.1 | RCR 84 | Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion | Organizations | 0 | 2021 | **29** | **Assumption:** The total number of beneficiaries and of the unique (distinct) entities in the 2014-2020 programming period is 270, respectively 195. The unique entities represented 70% of all beneficiaries. The average number of partners per project was 5. It is estimated for 2021-2027 that 2 out of 4 partners (different limits of partners per type of projects) will sign cooperation agreements and continue cooperation after project completion. From the average estimated number of partners in projects 2021-2027 70% will be unique organisations.**Target 2029:**Target = number of projects\* estimated number of organisations per project \*average percentage of durable cooperation organisations21 projects \* 2 partners \* 70% = 29 organisations |
| RCR 104 | Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | Solutions | 0 | 2021 | **12** | **Assumption:**In average 40% of developed solutions and of the pilot actions are taken up or up-scaled by organisations **Target 2029:** Target = number of solutions and of the pilot actions \*average percentage of uptake or up-scale by organisationsSolutions(18 solutions +11 pilot actions) \* 40% = 12 solutions |

**Organizations cooperating across borders after project completion (RCR84)**

The indicator counts the organizations cooperating across borders after the completion of the supported projects. The organizations are legal entities involved in project implementation. The cooperation concept should be interpreted as having a statement that the entities have a formal agreement to continue cooperation, after the end of the supported project. The sustained cooperation does not have to cover the same topic as addressed by the completed project.

The evidence on the commitment of the partner organizations to cooperate after the project ends its implementation period will be a cooperation agreement signed during the contracting stage.

Measures will be put in practice in order to monitor the cooperation activities after the project ends (sustainability reports).

Multiple counting will be removed at the level of the specific objective. An organisation is considered once regardless how many times it receives support from operations in the same specific objective.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be during project implementation or up to one year after project completion. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organizations (RCR104)**

The indicator counts the number of solutions and/or pilot actions, other than legal or administrative solutions, that are developed by supported projects and are taken up or upscaled during the implementation of the project or within one year after project completion. The organization adopting the solutions developed by the project may or may not be a participant in the project. The uptake / up-scaling should be documented by the adopting organizations in, for instance, strategies, action plans etc.

In terms of links with common output indicator, RCR104 is used together with RCO116 and RCO84.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be during project implementation or up to one year after project completion. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**PRIORITY 2 – GREEN AND CLEAN REGION**

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE (SO4): PROMOTING CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION, AND DISASTER RISK PREVENTION, RESILIENCE, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT ECOSYSTEM-BASED APPROACHES**

The performance framework for Priority 2/SO4 as presented below is based on the following data and assumptions:

* Programme budget allocated to P2/SO4: 25,914,107 EUR Interreg Funds;
* Allocation for limited financial value projects (small scale projects): 4,465,963 EUR Interreg Funds;
* 3 small scale projects contracted under the first call and 6 small scale projects selected under the second call;
* Allocation for regular projects: 21 448 144 EUR Interreg Funds;
* 9 regular projects contracted under the first call and 10 regular projects selected under the second call;
* 28 projects to be supported under Priority 2/SO4 (9 small scale and 19 regular projects).

**Output indicators**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SO  | ID  | **Indicator**  | **Measurement unit**  | **Mile stone 2024**  | **Final target 2029**  | **Explanation**  |
| SO2.4 | RCO 84 | Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | Pilot actions  | 0 | **14** | **Assumption:** In average half of all projects will implement 1 pilot action for strengthening innovation capacities developed per project **Target 2029:**Target = number of projects \* average number of pilot actions28 projects/2\*1 pilot action=14 pilot actions |
| RCO 116 | Jointly developed solutions | Solutions | 0 | **19** | **Assumption:**All regular projects will implement jointly developed solutions**Target 2029:**Target = number of projects \* average number of solutions developed19 projects \* 1 solution=19 solutions |
| RCO115 | Public events across borders jointly organised | Events | 0 | 56 | **Assumption:** Due to specificities of the activities, it is assumed that the events will target a specialized target group, therefore an average of 2 events per project are envisaged.**Target 2029:**Target = number of projects \* average number of events28 projects \* 2 events/project = 56 events |
| RCO87 | Organisations cooperating across borders | Organisations | 0 | 55 | **Assumption:** The total number of beneficiaries and of the unique (distinct) entities in the 2014-2020 programming period is 270, respectively 195. The unique entities represented 70% of all beneficiaries. The average number of partners per project was 5. From the average estimated number of partners in the 28 projects financed under this SO, having on average 4 partners (different limits of partners per type of projects), 70% will be unique organisations. However, there will be overlapping between partners in specific objectives, therefore it is anticipated that 70% of total partners at programme level will be actually unique beneficiaries.Therefore, the percentage is applied once again for total number of partners per each SO.**Target 2029:**28 projects \*4 partners \*70%= =78.4 organisations\*70%=55 organisations |

**Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects (RCO 84)**

The indicator counts the pilot actions developed jointly and implemented by supported projects. The scope of a jointly developed pilot action could be to test procedures, new instruments, tools, experimentation or the transfer of practices. In order to be counted by this indicator:

- the pilot action needs not only to be developed, but also implemented within the project

and

- the implementation of the pilot action should be finalized by the end of the project.

Jointly developed pilot action implies the involvement of organizations from at least two participating countries in its implementation.

A pilot action is to be understood as a practical implementation of newly developed solutions (e.g. services, tools, methods or approaches, even a small scale investment). A pilot action has an experimental nature which aims at testing, evaluating and/or demonstrating the feasibility and effectiveness of a solution. Therefore, it covers either the testing of innovative solutions or demonstrating the application of existing solutions to a certain territory/ sector.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be upon project finalization. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Jointly developed solutions (RCO116)**

The indicator counts the number of jointly developed solutions from joint pilot actions (including as a result of pilot actions) implemented by supported projects. In order to be counted in the indicator, an identified solution should include indications of the actions needed for it to be taken up or to be up scaled.

A jointly developed solution implies the involvement of organizations from at least two participating countries in the drafting and design process of the solution.

A solution is an action or a process of solving a problem.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be upon project finalization. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Public events across borders jointly organized (RCO115)**

The indicator counts the number of events across borders which were jointly organized by the partners in supported projects and not the number of participations in public events.

A public event across borders is understood as a joint action which has been advertised through relevant means, to the general public of the area covered by the programme and is not dedicated to the partner institutions only.

A joint action is considered as the action organized with the involvement of organizations from at least two participating countries, and involves stakeholders from outside the project consortium.

A public event across borders should have participants from at least two countries of the programme eligible area.

On line events will also be taken into consideration, if justified.

The participation of the project staff in public events is not sufficient for ensuring the condition of participants from at least two countries of the programme eligible area.

Examples of public events include: launching/final Conference of the projects, trainings, workshops and seminars organized in the framework of the project, etc.

Internal working meetings, steering committees of the project staff are not considered as public events.

It is compulsory to advertise to the general public the organization of the public event, through website, social media, and/or local/national newspapers.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be upon project finalization. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Organisations cooperating across borders (RCO87)**

The indicator counts the organisations cooperating formally in supported projects. The organisations counted in this indicator are the legal entities (project partners), as mentioned in the application form. Organisations cooperating formally in small scale projects are also counted.

At programme level, double counting should be avoided at the level of project partners.

All projects will have to contribute to this indicator.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be upon project finalization. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Result indicators**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SO**  | **ID**  | **Indicator**  | **Measurement unit**  | **Base line**  | **Ref. year**  | **Final target 2029**  | **Explanation**  |
| SO 2.4 | RCR 84 | Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion | Organizations | 0 | 2021 | 39 | **Assumption:** The total number of beneficiaries and of the unique (distinct) entities in the 2014-2020 programming period is 270, respectively 195. The unique entities represented 70% of all beneficiaries. The average number of partners per project was 5. It is estimated for 2021-2027 that 2 out of 4 partners (different limits of partners per type of projects) will sign cooperation agreements and continue cooperation after project completion. From the average estimated number of partners in projects 2021-2027, 70% will be unique organisations.**Target 2029:**Target = number of projects\* estimated number of organisations per project \*average percentage of durable cooperationorganisations28 projects \* 2 partners \* 70%=39 organisations |
| RCR 104 | Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | Solutions | 0 | 2021 | 13 | **Assumption:**In average 40% of developed solutions and of the pilot actions are taken up or up-scaled by organisations **Target 2029:** Target = number of solutions and of pilot actions\*average percentage of uptake or up-scale by organisationsSolutions(19 solutions +14 pilot actions) \* 40%= 13 solutions |

**Organizations cooperating across borders after project completion (RCR84)**

The indicator counts the organizations cooperating across borders after the completion of the supported projects. The cooperation concept should be interpreted as having a statement that the entities have a formal agreement to continue cooperation, after the end of the supported project. The sustained cooperation does not have to cover the same topic as addressed by the completed project.

The evidence on the commitment of the partner organizations to cooperate after the project ends its implementation period will be a cooperation agreement signed during the contracting stage.

Multiple counting will be removed at the level of the specific objective. An organization is considered once regardless how many times it receives support from operations in the same specific objective.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be during project implementation or up to one year after project completion. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organizations (RCR104)**

The indicator counts the number of solutions and/or pilot actions, other than legal or administrative solutions, that are developed by supported projects and are taken up or up scaled during the implementation of the project or within one year after project completion. The organization adopting the solutions developed by the project may or may not be a participant in the project. The uptake / up-scaling should be documented by the adopting organizations in, for instance, strategies, action plans etc.

In terms of links with common output indicator, RCR104 is used together with RCO116 and RCO84.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be during project implementation or up to one year after project completion. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE (SO7): ENHANCING PROTECTION AND PRESERVATION OF NATURE, BIODIVERSITY AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE, INCLUDING IN URBAN AREAS, AND REDUCING ALL FORMS OF POLLUTION**

The performance framework for Priority 2/SO7 as presented below is based on the following data and assumptions:

* Programme budget allocated to P2/SO7: 25,853,861 EUR Interreg Funds;
* Allocation for limited financial value projects (small scale projects): up to 4,465,963 EUR Interreg Funds;
* 6 small scale projects contracted under the first call and 5 small scale projects selected under the second call;
* Allocation for regular projects: 21,387,898 EUR Interreg Funds;
* 7 regular projects contracted under the first call and 9 regular projects selected under the second call;
* 27 projects to be supported under Priority 2/SO7 (11 small scale and 16 regular projects).

**Output indicators**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SO  | ID  | **Indicator**  | **Measurement unit**  | **Mile stone 2024**  | **Final target 2029**  | **Explanation**  |
| SO7/PO2 | RCO 84 | Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | Pilot actions  | 0 | 14 | **Assumption:** In average half of the all projects will implement 1 pilot action for strengthening innovation capacities developed per project **Target 2029:**27 projects/2 \*1 pilot action=14 pilot actions |
| RCO 115 | Public events across borders jointly organised | Events | 0 | 81 | **Assumption:** In average each project will organise 3 events for this SO**Target 2029:**Target = number of projects \* number of events per project27 projects \* 3 events=81 events |
| RCO116 | Jointly developed solutions | Solutions | 0 | 16 | **Assumption:**All regular projects will implement jointly developed solutions**Target 2029:**Target = number of projects \* average number of solutions developed16 projects \* 1 solution=16 solutions |
|  | RCO 87 | Organisations cooperating across borders | Organisations | 0 | 53 | **Assumption:** The total number of beneficiaries and of the unique (distinct) entities in the 2014-2020 programming period is 270, respectively 195. The unique entities represented 70% of all beneficiaries. The average number of partners per project was 5. From the average estimated number of partners in the 27 projects financed under this SO, having on average 4 partners (different limits of partners per type of projects), 70% will be unique organisations.However, there will be overlapping between partners in specific objectives, therefore it is anticipated that 70% of total partners at programme level will be actually unique beneficiaries.Therefore, the percentage is applied once again for total number of partners per each SO.**Target 2029:**27 projects \* 4 partners \* 70% = 75.6 organisations\*70%= 53 organisations |

**Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects (RCO 84)**

The indicator counts the pilot actions developed jointly and implemented by supported projects. The scope of a jointly developed pilot action could be to test procedures, new instruments, tools, experimentation or the transfer of practices. In order to be counted by this indicator:

- the pilot action needs not only to be developed, but also implemented within the project

and

- the implementation of the pilot action should be finalized by the end of the project.

Jointly developed pilot action implies the involvement of organizations from at least two participating countries in its implementation.

A pilot action is to be understood as a practical implementation of newly developed solutions (e.g. services, tools, methods or approaches, even a small scale investment). A pilot action has an experimental nature which aims at testing, evaluating and/or demonstrating the feasibility and effectiveness of a solution. Therefore, it covers either the testing of innovative solutions or demonstrating the application of existing solutions to a certain territory/ sector.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be upon project finalization. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Public events across borders jointly organized (RCO115)**

The indicator counts the number of events across borders which were jointly organized by the partners in supported projects and not the number of participations in public events.

A public event across borders is understood as a joint action which has been advertised through relevant means, to the general public of the area covered by the programme and is not dedicated to the partner institutions only.

A public event across borders should have participants from at least two countries of the programme eligible area and involve stakeholders from outside the project consortium.

On line events will also be taken into consideration, if justified.

The participation of the project staff in public events is not sufficient for ensuring the condition of participants from at least two countries of the programme eligible area.

*Examples* of public events include: launching/final Conference of the projects, trainings, workshops and seminars organized in the framework of the project, etc.

Internal working meetings, steering committees of the project staff are not considered as public events.

It is compulsory to advertise to the general public the organization of the public event, through website, social media, and/or local/national newspapers.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be upon project finalization. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Jointly developed solutions (RCO116)**

The indicator counts the number of jointly developed solutions from joint pilot actions (including as a result of pilot actions) implemented by supported projects. In order to be counted in the indicator, an identified solution should include indications of the actions needed for it to be taken up or to be up scaled.

A jointly developed solution implies the involvement of organizations from at least two participating countries in the drafting and design process of the solution.

A solution is an action or a process of solving a problem.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be upon project finalization. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Organisations cooperating across borders (RCO87)**

The indicator counts the organisations cooperating formally in supported projects. The organisations counted in this indicator are the legal entities (project partners), as mentioned in the application form. Organisations cooperating formally in small scale projects are also counted.

At programme level, double counting should be avoided at the level of project partners.

**All projects will have to contribute to this indicator.**

The **time measurement** for the achievement of this indicator will be upon project finalization. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Result indicators**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SO**  | **ID**  | **Indicator**  | **Measurement unit**  | **Base line**  | **Ref. year**  | **Final target 2029**  | **Explanation**  |
| SO 2.7 | RCR 84 | Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion | Organizations | 0 | 2021 | 38 | **Assumption:** The total number of beneficiaries and of the unique (distinct) entities in the 2014-2020 programming period is 270, respectively 195. The unique entities represented 70% of all beneficiaries. The average number of partners per project was 5. It is estimated for 2021-2027 that 2 out of 4 partners (different limits of partners per type of projects) will sign cooperation agreements and continue cooperation after project completion. From the average estimated number of partners in projects 2021-2027, 70% will be unique organisations**Target 2029:**Target = number of projects \* estimated number of organisations per project \* average percentage of durable cooperationorganisations27 projects \* 2 organisations \* 70% = 38 organisations |
| RCR 104 | Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | Solutions | 0 | 2021 | 12 | **Assumption:**In average 40% of developed solutions and of the pilot actions are taken up or up-scaled by organisations **Target 2029:** Target = number of solutions and pilot actions \* average percentage of uptake or up-scale by organisationsSolutions(16 solutions+14 pilot actions) \* 40%= 12 solutions |

**Organizations cooperating across borders after project completion (RCR84)**

The indicator counts the organizations cooperating across borders after the completion of the supported projects. The cooperation concept should be interpreted as having a statement that the entities have a formal agreement to continue cooperation, after the end of the supported project. The sustained cooperation does not have to cover the same topic as addressed by the completed project.

The evidence on the commitment of the partner organizations to cooperate after the project ends its implementation period will be a cooperation agreement signed during the contracting stage.

Measures will be put in practice in order to monitor the cooperation activities after the project ends (sustainability reports). Multiple counting will be removed at the level of the specific objective. An organization is considered once regardless how many times it receives support from operations in the same specific objective.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be during project implementation or up to one year after project completion. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organizations (RCR104)**

The indicator counts the number of solutions and/or pilot actions, other than legal or administrative solutions, that are developed by supported projects and are taken up or up scaled during the implementation of the project or within one year after project completion. The organization adopting the solutions developed by the project may or may not be a participant in the project. The uptake / up-scaling should be documented by the adopting organizations in, for instance, strategies, action plans etc.

In terms of links with common output indicator, RCR104 is used together with RCO116 and RCO84.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be during project implementation or up to one year after project completion. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**PRIORITY 3 - COMPETENT AND RESILIENT REGION**

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 3 (SO3): BUILD UP MUTUAL TRUST, IN PARTICULAR BY ENCOURAGING PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE ACTIONS**

The performance framework for P3/SO3 as presented below is based on the following data and assumptions:

* Programme budget allocated to P3: 5,863,202 EUR Interreg Funds;
* Allocation of the entire amount for limited financial value projects (small scale projects);
* 13 small scale projects selected;

**Output indicators**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SO  | ID  | **Indicator**  | **Measurement unit**  | **Mile stone 2024**  | **Final target 2029**  | **Explanation**  |
| SO 3 | RCO 81 | Participations in joint actions across borders | Participations | 0 | 650  | Assumption:In average 50 persons will be counted as participations in joint actions across borders per each project implemented under this ISO Target 2029:13 projects \* 50 persons = 650 participations |
| SO 3 | RCO 87 | Organisations cooperating across borders | Organisations | 0 | 19 | **Assumption:** The total number of beneficiaries and of the unique (distinct) entities in the 2014-2020 programming period is 270, respectively 195. The unique entities represented 70% of all beneficiaries. The average number of partners per project was 5. From the average estimated number of partners in the 13 projects financed under this SO, having on average 3 partners, 70% will be unique organisations.However, there will be overlapping between partners in specific objectives, therefore it is anticipated that 70% of total partners at programme level will be actually unique beneficiaries.Therefore, the percentage is applied once again for total number of partners per each SO.**Target 2029:**13 projects \* 3 \* 70% = 27.3 organisations \* 70% = 19 organisations |
| SO 3 | RCO116 | Jointly developed solutions | Solutions | 0 | 13 | **Assumption:**All the small scale projects under this priority will implement 1 jointly developed solutions.**Target 2029:**Target = number of projects \* average number of solutions developed13 projects \* 1 solution = 13 solutions |

**Participations in joint actions across borders (RCO81)**

The indicator counts the number of participations in joint actions across borders implemented in the supported projects. Joint actions across borders could include, for instance, exchange activities, trainings, capacity building events organized with partners across borders.

A joint action is considered as the action organised with the involvement of organizations from at least two participating countries.

By participations it should be understood for example: number of persons attending a joint action across borders - e.g. citizens, volunteers, students, pupils, public officials, etc.). They are counted for each joint action organised on the basis of attendance lists or other relevant means of quantification.

Participations at on line events will also be taken into consideration, if justified.

Participations in public events and/or participations in internal project meetings of the partners should not be counted in RCO81.The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be upon project finalization. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Organisations cooperating across borders (RCO87)**

The indicator counts the organisations cooperating formally in supported projects. The organisations counted in this indicator are the legal entities (project partners), as mentioned in the application form.

At programme level, double counting should be avoided at the level of project partners.

**All projects will have to contribute to this indicator.**

The **time measurement** for the achievement of this indicator will be upon project finalization. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Jointly developed solutions (RCO116)**

The indicator counts the number of jointly developed solutions from joint pilot actions (including as a result of pilot actions) implemented by supported projects. In order to be counted in the indicator, an identified solution should include indications of the actions needed for it to be taken up or to be up scaled.

A jointly developed solution implies the involvement of organizations from at least two participating countries in the drafting and design process of the solution.

A solution is an action or a process of solving a problem.

The **time measurement** for the achievement of this indicator will be upon project finalization. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Result indicators**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SO**  | **ID**  | **Indicator**  | **Measurement unit**  | **Base line**  | **Ref. year**  | **Final target 2029**  | **Explanation**  |
| SO 3 | RCR 84 | Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion | Organizations | 0 | 2021 | 18 | **Assumption:** The total number of beneficiaries and of the unique (distinct) entities in the 2014-2020 programming period is 270, respectively 195. The unique entities represented 70% of all beneficiaries. The average number of partners per small scale project 2021-2027 is 3. It is estimated that 2 out of 3 partners will sign cooperation agreements and continue cooperation after project completion. From the average estimated number of partners in projects 2021-2027, 70% will be unique organisations.**Target 2029:**Target = number of projects\* estimated number of organisations per project \*average percentage of durable cooperation organisations13 projects \* 2 partners \* 70% = 18 organisations |
| RCR 104 | Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | Solutions | 0 | 2021 | 5 | **Assumption:**In average 40% of developed solutions are taken up or up-scaled by organisations **Target 2029:** Target = number of solutions \*average percentage of uptake or up-scale by organisations13 solutions \* 40% = 5 solutions |

**Organizations cooperating across borders after project completion (RCR84)**

The indicator counts the organizations cooperating across borders after the completion of the supported projects. The cooperation concept should be interpreted as having a statement that the entities have a **formal agreement** to continue cooperation, after the end of the supported project. The sustained cooperation does not have to cover the same topic as addressed by the completed project.

The evidence on the commitment of the partner organizations to cooperate after the project ends its implementation period will be a cooperation agreement signed during the contracting stage.

Measures will be put in practice in order to monitor the cooperation activities after the project ends (sustainability reports). Multiple counting will be removed at the level of the specific objective. An organization is considered once regardless how many times it receives support from operations in the same specific objective.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be during project implementation or up to one year after project completion. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

**Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organizations (RCR104)**

The indicator counts the number of solutions and/or pilot actions (i.e ICT tools and/or digital solutions, etc), other than legal or administrative solutions, that are developed by supported projects and are taken up or up scaled during the implementation of the project or within one year after project completion. The organization adopting the solutions developed by the project may or may not be a participant in the project. The uptake / up-scaling should be documented by the adopting organizations in, for instance, local and regional strategies, action plans etc.

In terms of links with common output indicator, RCR104 is used together with RCO116.

The time measurement for the achievement of this indicator will be during project implementation or up to one year after project completion. Intermediate values can be collected for reporting purposes also during projects implementation.

Annex 1- Correspondence between Specific Objectives - Result Indicators - Output Indicators - Intervention fields

| **Priority** | **Specific Objective** | **Indicative Actions** | **Output Indicators** | **M.U.** | **Milestone 2024** | **Final target 2029** | **Result Indicator** | **M.U.** | **Baseline** | **Final target 2029** | **Intervention field code** | **Budget****Euro** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| BLUE AND SMART REGION | PO1/SO1-Developing and enhancing research and innovation capacities and the uptake of advanced technologies  | 1. Use of innovative technological developments, including enhancement and application of Artificial Intelligence technologies, in support of the blue economy;2.Development of research on integrated coastal and marine management including the interaction between land-based and sea-based activities and their impacts on coastal zones;3. Use of innovative technologies for sustainable fisheries and eco-friendly aquaculture. | RCO07 Research organizations participating in joint research projects  | Research institutions | 0 | 36 | RCR 84 Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion | Organisations | 0 | 29 | 171012029 | 1,395,761 9,127,6979,127,696 |
| RCO87 Organisations cooperating across borders | 0rganisations | 0 | 41 |
| RCO115 Public events across borders jointly organised | Events | 0 | 42 |
| RCO116 Jointly developed solutions | Solutions | 0 | 18 | RCR 104 Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | Solutions | 0 | 12 |
| RCO84 Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | Pilot actions | 0 | 11  |
| CLEAN AND GREEN REGION | PO2/SO4-Promoting climate change adaptation and disaster risk prevention, and resilience, taking into account eco-system based approaches | 1. Promotion of innovation for improved tools for smart observing, monitoring and accurate environmental forecasting;2.Measures to prevent and mitigate the impacts of climate change on the Black Sea region, including on water quality and quantity;3.Addressing environmental hazards: erosion, landslides, sea level rise, extreme events, flooding, and drought in connection with climate change;4.Development and improvement of mechanisms of monitoring and early warning for natural or/and man-made disasters;5. Development and implementation of green recovery actions, contributing to climate change effects adaptation in the Black Sea Basin area. | RCO115 Public events across borders jointly organised | Public events | 0 | 56 | RCR 84 Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion | Organizations | 0 | 39 | 171058060 | 4,465,963 5,362,0365,362,036 |
| RCO87 Organisations cooperating across borders | Organisations | 0 | 55 |
| RCO84 Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | Pilot actions | 0 | 14 | RCR 104 Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | Solutions | 0 | 13 |
| RCO116 Jointly developed solutions | Solutions | 0 | 19 | 061064 | 5,362,0365,362,036 |
| PO2/SO7- Enhancing protection and preservation of nature, biodiversity and green infrastructure, including in urban areas, and reducing all forms of pollution | 1. Protection and promotion of biodiversity and natural heritage;2.Actions on environment protection at all educational levels;3.Investing in green infrastructure to mitigate air, water, noise, soil pollution and degradation;4. Actions for pollutants reduction, as well as marine and river litter reduction, collecting and recycling. | RCO115 Public events across borders jointly organised | Events | 0 | 81 | RCR 84 Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion | Organizations | 0 | 38 | 171079 | 4,465,963 21,387,898  |
| RCO87 Organisations cooperating across borders | Organisations | 0 | 53 |
| RCO84 Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | Pilot actions | 0 | 14 | RCR 104 Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | Solutions | 0 | 12 |
| RCO116 Jointly developed solutions | Solutions | 0 | 16 |
| COMPETENT AND RESILIENT REGION | ISO1/SO3- Build up mutual trust, in particular by encouraging people-to-people actions | 1. Enhance the institutional capacity of public authorities across the programme area, to build mutual trust, and to enhance sustainable democracy and support civil society actors.
 | RCO 81Participations in joint actions across borders | Participations | 0 | 650 | RCR 84 Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion | Organizations | 0 | 18 | 173 | 5,863,202 |
| RCO87 Organisations cooperating across borders | Organisations | 0 | 19 |
| RCO116 Jointly developed solutions | Solutions | 0 | 13 | RCR 104 Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | Solutions | 0 | 5 |

1. European Court of Auditors special report on Cross-border cooperation programmes issued in 2021. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. According to ANNEX I Dimensions and codes for the types of intervention for the ERDF, the ESF+, the Cohesion Fund and the JTF - Article 22(5) of Regulation (Eu) 2021/1060 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 June 2021 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Article 16.1 CPR [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. According to the EC Staff Working Document: Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation of the ERDF/CF and JTF in 2021-2027 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)