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# 1. BACKGROUND

The success of the Interreg NEXT 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;
* Milestones to be achieved by the end of the year 2024 for output indicators;
* 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 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.

It is envisaged that this document will be 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.

# 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.

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 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 will contribute to other intervention fields, as follows:

* PO1/SO 1- 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);
* PO1SO1- 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;
* -PO2SO4/064 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.

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 two priorities corresponding to Policy Objective 1 and 2 and related three Specific objectives:

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.

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:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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 |

# 6. FACTORS INFLUENCING THE 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;
* Delays during contracting process due to: lack of availability of documents required during contracting, changes in the partnership structure, other revisions requiring Monitoring Committee approval.

The managing structures shall 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.

# 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;

- Elaborate check list to be used by the beneficiaries prior to project submission, which shall contain questions dedicated to checking the relevance of proposed indicators to programme 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 MILESTONES AND TARGETS

As required by the CPR, the performance framework of the Interreg NEXT BSB Programme includes milestones to be achieved by the end of the year 2024 for the selected output indicators (not required for result indicators).

In addition, 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 milestones and 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;
* Allocation of funds as foreseen in the Financing plan of the Programme for each priority and SO;
* Expected size and number of projects to be supported under each SO, as explained in Section 9 System of Indicators ;
* The envisaged date for launching the calls and the expected deadline for contracting the projects and starting their implementation;
* Capacity of potential beneficiaries to define outputs linked to programme objectives and to timely report progress in implementation.

It is envisaged that two calls for proposals will be launched, first call in the first half of 2023 and second call in the first half of 2024.The first call will be dedicated to small scale projects and regular projects and the second one only to regular projects. The amount available for small scale projects (10% of the total project allocation) will be launched during the first call. The amount allocated for regular projects will be split in equal shares between the two calls for proposals. Both call for proposals will be dedicated to all priorities, with a period of submission of 3 months. The evaluation and selection process is expected to last 6 months. Taken into consideration the minimum period for contracting of 5 months, the implementation of the first projects is expected to start at the earliest by first half of 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.

Having in mind the above, the milestones set up for 2024 are set only for the indicator RCO 115 *Public events across borders jointly organized*, as previous experience shows that the main achievements of the projects rather tend to be reported in the second half of the project implementation. The main assumption for setting the milestones is that half of the projects will organize an event in the first year of implementation.

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

The Interreg Next BSB Programme will finance 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.

# 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 assumptions:

* Programme budget allocated to P1/SO1: 19,711,401 EUR Interreg Funds (30% of total programme budget);
* Allocation for limited financial value projects (small scale projects): up to 10% of the allocation for PO1/SO1 respectively 1,971,140 EUR Interreg Funds;
* Small scale projects have been financed under the Joint Operational Programme Black Sea Basin 2007-2013 under Objective 3 *Promoting local, people-to-people type actions,* having a minimum budget of 50,000 EUR and a maximum budget of 300,000 EUR.12 projects have been financed under the respective objective with a total allocated budget of 3,000,000 EUR, meaning that the average budget per project was 250,000 EUR, representing 83% of the maximum permitted budget (300,000 EUR);
* Applying the same rationale, it is estimated that 5 small scale projects could be financed under P1/SO1 of the Interreg NEXT BSB Programme (83% out of 500,000 EUR, the average budget project is approximately 400,000 EUR, meaning 5 small scale projects);
* Allocation for regular projects: 17,740,261 EUR Interreg Funds;
* The size of the ENI grants within the 2014-2020 BSB Programme was between 300,000 EUR –and 1,500,000 EUR
* Average regular projects budget in 2014-2020 - 750,000 EUR; based on this rationale, it is estimated to finance 23 regular projects (17,740,261 /750,000=23 projects);
* 28 projects to be supported under Priority 1/SO1 (5 small scale and 23 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 | 46 | **Assumption:**  Research organisations will participate mainly in 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 projects  23 projects\*2 research organisations=46 research organisations |
| RCO116 | Jointly developed solutions | Solutions | 0 | 11 | **Assumption:**  50% of the regular projects will implement jointly developed solutions  **Target 2029:**  Target = number of projects \* average number of solutions developed  23 projects/2\*1 solution=11 solutions |
| RCO115 | Public events across borders jointly organised | Events | 14 | 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 events  **28 projects\*2 events/project=56 events**  **Milestones:**  Half of the projects will organise an event in the first year of implementation.  **28 projects/50%=14 events** |
| RCO84 | Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | Pilot actions | 0 | 11 | **Assumption:**  In average half of the regular projects will implement 1 pilot action for strengthening innovation capacities developed per project  **Target 2029:**  Target = number of projects \* average number of pilot actions  23 projects/2\*1 pilot action=11 pilot actions |
| RCO87 | Organisations cooperating across borders | Organisations | 0 | 69 | **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 5 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:**  28\*5\*70%= 140\*70%=98 organisations \* 70% = 69 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.

For SO1/PO1, it is compulsory to link RCO116 with RCR 84 (not exclusively).

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, trainnings, 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 | 59 | **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 3 out of 5 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  organisations  28\*3\*70%=59 organisations |
| RCR 104 | Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | Solutions | 0 | 2021 | 7 | **Assumption:**  In average 30% 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 organisations  Solutions  (11+11)\*30%= 7 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 assumptions:

* Programme budget allocated to P2/SO4: 19,711,401EUR Interreg Funds (30% of total programme budget);
* Allocation for limited financial value projects (small scale projects): up to 10% of the allocation for P2/SO4, respectively 1,971,140 EUR Interreg Funds;
* Small scale projects have been financed under the Joint Operational Programme Black Sea Basin 2007-2013 under Objective 3 *Promoting local, people-to-people type actions*, having a minimum budget of 50,000 EUR and a maximum budget of 300,000 EUR.12 projects have been financed under the respective objective with a total allocated budget of 3,000,000 EUR, meaning that the average budget per project was 250,000 EUR, representing 83% of the maximum permitted budget (300,000 EUR);
* Applying the same rationale, it is estimated that 5 small scale projects could be financed under P2/SO4 of the Interreg NEXT BSB Programme (83% out of 500,000 EUR, the average budget project is approximately 400,000 EUR, meaning 5 small scale projects);
* Allocation for regular projects: 17,740,261 EUR Interreg Funds;
* The size of the ENI grants within the 2014-2020 BSB Programme was between 300,000 EUR –and 1,500,000 EUR
* Average regular projects budget in 2014-2020 - 750,000 EUR; based on this rationale, it is estimated to finance 23 regular projects (17,740,261 /750,000=23 projects);
* 28 projects to be supported under Priority 2/SO4 (5 small scale and 23 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 | 11 | **Assumption:**  In average half of the regular projects will implement 1 pilot action for strengthening innovation capacities developed per project  **Target 2029:**  Target = number of projects \* average number of pilot actions  23 projects/2\*1 pilot action=11 pilot actions |
| RCO 116 | Jointly developed solutions | Solutions | 0 | 11 | **Assumption:**  50% of the regular projects will implement jointly developed solutions  **Target 2029:**  Target = number of projects \* average number of solutions developed  23 projects/2\*1 solution=11 solutions |
|  | RCO115 | Public events across borders jointly organised | Events | 14 | 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 events  28 projects\*2 events/project=56 events  **Milestones:**  Half of the projects will organise an event in the first year of implementation.  28 projects/50%=14 events |
|  | RCO87 | Organisations cooperating across borders | Organisations | 0 | 69 | **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 5 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:**  28\*5\*70%= 140\*70%=98 organisations\*70%=69 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, trainnings, 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 | 59 | **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 3 out of 5 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  organisations  28\*3\*70%=59 organisations |
| RCR  104 | Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | Solutions | 0 | 2021 | 7 | **Assumption:**  In average 30% 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 organisations  Solutions  (11+11) \* 30%= 7 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 assumptions:

* Programme budget allocated to P2/SO7: 19,711,401EUR Interreg Funds (30% of total programme budget);
* Allocation for limited financial value projects (small scale projects): up to 10% of the allocation for P2/SO7, respectively 1,971,140 EUR Interreg Funds;
* Small scale projects have been financed under the Joint Operational Programme Black Sea Basin 2007-2013 under Objective 3 *Promoting local, people-to-people type actions*, having a minimum budget of 50,000 EUR and a maximum budget of 300,000 EUR.12 projects have been financed under the respective objective with a total allocated budget of 3,000,000 EUR, meaning that the average budget per project was 250,000 EUR, representing 83% of the maximum permitted budget (300,000 EUR);
* Applying the same rationale, it is estimated that 5 small scale projects could be financed under P2/SO7 of the Interreg NEXT BSB Programme (83% out of 500,000 EUR, the average budget project is approximately 400,000 EUR, meaning 5 small scale projects);
* Allocation for regular projects: 17,740,261 EUR Interreg Funds;
* The size of the ENI grants within the 2014-2020 BSB Programme was between 300,000 eur –and 1,500,000 eur;
* Average regular projects budget in 2014-2020 - 750,000 EUR; based on this rationale, it is estimated to finance 23 regular projects (17,740,261 /750,000=23 projects);
* 28 projects to be supported under Priority 2/SO7 (5 small scale and 23 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 | 11 | **Assumption:**  In average half of the regular projects will implement 1 pilot action for strengthening innovation capacities developed per project  **Target 2029:**  11 projects/2\*1 pilot action=11 pilot actions |
| RCO 115 | Public events across borders jointly organised | Events | 14 | 84 | **Assumption:**  In average each project will organise 3 events for this SO  **Target 2029:**  Target = number of projects \* number of events per project  28 projects\*3 events=84 events  **Milestones:**  Half of the projects will organise an event in the first year of implementation.  28 projects/50%=14 events |
| RCO116 | Jointly developed solutions | Solutions | 0 | 11 | **Assumption:**  50% of the regular projects will implement jointly developed solutions  **Target 2029:**  Target = number of projects \* average number of solutions developed  22 projects/2\* solution=11solutions |
|  | RCO 87 | Organisations cooperating across borders | Organisations | 0 | 69 | **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 5 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:**  28\*5\*70%= 140\*70%=98 organisations\*70%=69 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, trainnings, 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 2.7 | RCR 84 | Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion | Organizations | 0 | 2021 | 59 | **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 3 out of 5 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  organisations  28\*3\*70%=59 organisations |
| RCR 104 | Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | Solutions | 0 | 2021 | 7 | **Assumption:**  In average 30% of developed solutions and of the pilot actions are taken up or up-scaled by organisations  **Target 2029:**  Target = number of solutions \*average percentage of uptake or up-scale by organisations  Solutions  (11+11) \* 30%= 7 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.

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 | Result Indicator | M.U. | Baseline | Final target 2029 | Intervention field code | Budget |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 46 | RCR 84 Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion | Organisations | 0 | 59 |  |  |  |  | 171  012  029 | 1,971,140  8,870,131  8,870,130 |
| RCO87 Organisations cooperating across borders | 0rganisations | 0 | 69 |  |  |  |  |
| RCO115 Public events across borders jointly organised | Events | 14 | 56 |  |  |  |  |
| RCO116 Jointly developed solutions | Solutions | 0 | 11 |  |  |  |  | RCR 104 Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | Solutions | 0 | 7 |
| 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 | 14 | 56 | RCR 84 Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion | Organizations | 0 | 59 |  |  |  |  | 171  058  060 | 1,971,140  4,435,066  4,435,065 |
| RCO87 Organisations cooperating across borders | Organisations | 0 | 69 |  |  |  |  |
| RCO84 Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | Pilot actions | 0 | 11 |  |  |  |  | RCR 104 Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | Solutions | 0 | 7 |
| RCO116 Jointly developed solutions | Solutions | 0 | 11 |  |  |  |  | 061  064 | 4,435,065  4,435,065 |
| 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 | 14 | 86 | RCR 84 Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion | Organizations | 0 | 59 |  |  |  |  | 171  079 | 1,971,140  17,740,261 |
| RCO87 Organisations cooperating across borders | Organisations | 0 | 69 |  |  |  |  |
| RCO84 Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | Pilot actions | 0 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | RCO116 Jointly developed solutions | Solutions | 0 | 11 |  |  |  |  | RCR 104 Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | Solutions | 0 | 7 |

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)