EVALUATION PLAN OF THE ITALY-CROATIA CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION PROGRAMME 2014-2020

CCI 2014TC16RFCB042

Version N. 3 of 27/05/2021

List of acronyms

AIR	Annual Implementation Report
CBC	Cross-border cooperation
CP	Cooperation Programme
CPR	Common Provision Regulation - Regulation (EU) No1303/2013
CSF	Common Strategic Framework
EC	European Commission
ERDF	European Regional Development Fund
ERDF Regulation	Regulation (EU) No 1301/2013
ESF	European Social Fund
ESI	European Structural and Investment Funds
ETC	European Territorial Cooperation
ETC Regulation	Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013
EU	European Union
EUSAIR	European Union Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region
EUSALP	European Union Strategy for the Alpine Region
EUSDR	European Union Strategy for the Danube Region
FLC	First Level Control
IP	Investment Priority
JS	Joint Secretariat
MA	Managing Authority
MC	Monitoring Committee
NA	National Authority
NC	National Committee
PA	Priority Axis
SO	Specific Objective
TO	Thematic Objective

SECTION I: GENERAL CONTEXT

1. Programme context

INTERREG V A Cross-border Cooperation Programme Italy – Croatia 2014-2020, hereinafter referred to as the "Programme" is designed in the framework of the European strategy for a smart, inclusive and sustainable growth and the relevant national and regional strategic documents (Europe 2020 Strategy).

The overall aim of the Programme is **to increase the prosperity and the blue growth potential of the area by stimulating cross-border partnerships able to achieve tangible changes**.

a) Eligible area

The Programme area includes the following administrative units at the NUTS III level:

ITALY	Provinces	Teramo, Pescara, Chieti (Abruzzo), Campobasso (Molise), Brindisi, Lecce, Foggia, Bari, Barletta-Andria-Trani (Puglia), Venezia, Padova, Rovigo (Veneto), Pordenone, Udine, Gorizia, Trieste (Friuli Venezia Giulia), Ferrara, Ravenna, Forlì-Cesena, Rimini (Emilia Romagna), Pesaro e Urbino, Ancona, Macerata, Ascoli Piceno, Fermo (Marche).
CROATIA	Counties (županija)	Primorsko-goranska, Ličko-senjska, Zadarska, Šibensko-kninska, Splitsko-dalmatinska, Istarska, Dubrovačko-neretvanska (Adriatic Croatia region), Karlovačka (Continental Croatia region).

The Programme cooperation area covers over 85.562 km2 and, according to the last census (2011), the population is 12.465.861 inhabitants.

b) Programme budget (EUR)

The Programme is co-funded:

- 85% by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) for Italian and Croatian partners with a budget of 201.357.220,00 EUR
- 15% by National co-financing (ruled by respective Member State).

The Programme total budget is 236.890.849,00 EUR:

Priority Axis	ERDF (85%) €	Co-financing (15%) €	Total €
1 Blue Innovation	24.162.867	4.264.036	28.426.903
2 Safety and resilience	51.346.091	9.061.075	60.407.166
3 Environment and cultural heritage	70.475.027	12.436.770	81.911.797
4 Maritime transport	43.291.802	7.639.730	50.931.532
5 Technical assistance	12.081.433	2.132.018	14.213.451
Total €	201.357.220	35.533.629	236.890.849

c) Thematic Objectives, Priority Axes, Investment Priorities and Specific Objectives

Priority Axis	ERDF support	Thematic objective (TO)	Investment Priority (IP)	Specific Objective (SO)
PA 1 - Blue Economy	24.162.867,00	01- Strengthening research, technological development and innovation	1b - Promoting business investment in R&I, developing links and synergies between enterprises, research and development centres and the higher education sector, in particular promoting investment in product and service development, technology transfer, social innovation, eco-innovation, public service applications,	1.1 - Enhance the framework conditions for innovation in the relevant sectors of the blue economy within the cooperation area

			demand stimulation, networking, clusters and open innovation through smart specialisation, and supporting technological and applied research, pilot lines, early product validation actions, advanced manufacturing capabilities and first production, in particular in key enabling technologies and diffusion of general purpose technologies.	
PA 2 – Safety and resilience	51.346.091,00	05 - Promoting climate change adaptation, risk prevention and management	5a - Supporting investment for adaptation to climate change, including ecosystem-based approaches.	2.1 - Improve the climate change monitoring and planning of adaptation measures tackling specific effects, in the cooperation area
			5b - Promoting investment to address specific risks, ensuring disaster resilience and developing disaster	2.2 - Increase the safety of the Programme area from natural and man-made disaster.

			management systems.	
PA 3 – Environmental and cultural heritage	70.475.027,00	06 - Preserving and protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency	6c - Conserving, protecting, promoting and developing natural and cultural heritage.	3.1 - Make natural and cultural heritage a leverage for sustainable and more balanced territorial development.
			6d - Protecting and restoring biodiversity and soil and promoting ecosystem services, including through Natura 2000, and green infrastructure.	3.2 - Contribute to protect and restore biodiversity.
			6f - Promoting innovative technologies to improve environmental protection and resource efficiency in the waste sector, water sector and with regard to soil, or to reduce air pollution.	3.3 - Improve the environmental quality conditions of the sea and coastal area by use of sustainable and innovative technologies and approaches.
PA 4 – Maritime transport	43.291.802,00	07 - Promoting sustainable transport and removing bottlenecks in key network infrastructures	7c - Developing and improving environmentally-friendly (including low noise) and low carbon transport systems, including	4.1 - Improve the quality, safety and environmental sustainability of marine and coastal transport

			inland waterways and maritime transport, ports, multimodal links and airport infrastructure, in order to promote sustainable regional and local mobility.	services and nodes by promoting multimodality in the Programme area.

2. Regulatory context

The evaluation plan of the Interreg Italy-Croatia CBC Programme has been prepared in compliance with the following regulatory framework:

- CPR: art. 54 (General Provisions), art. 56 (Evaluation during the programming period), art. 110 (Functions of the monitoring committee) and art. 114 (Evaluation);
- ETC Regulation: recital 26 and art. 14 (implementation reports);
- COMMISSION DELEGATED REGULATION (EU) No 240/2014 of 7 January 2014 on the European code of conduct on partnership in the framework of the European Structural and Investment Funds: art 16 (Involvement of partners in the evaluation of programmes);
- Interreg V-A Italy-Croatia Cooperation Programme as approved by European Commission with decision C(2015)9342 of 15 December 2015;

In addition, the evaluation plan builds on the following relevant European Commission (EC) guidance documents:

- *Guidance document on monitoring and evaluation* - March 2014;
- *Guidance document on evaluation plans*. Terms of References for Impact Evaluations. Guidance on Quality Management of External Evaluations - February 2015.

The Programme has been subject to an independent ex-ante evaluation with the aim to improve Programme quality and to optimize the allocation of budget resources. The recommendations of this Ex-ante evaluation (see Chapter 2, par. 2.2 b. "Findings") have been taken into account in the drafting phase of the Cooperation Programme.

All evaluations, recommendations and follow-up actions will be examined and approved by the MC. In line with art. 114 of CPR, by 31 December 2022, the MA will submit to the Commission a report summarizing the findings of evaluations carried out during the programming period, including an assessment of the main outputs and results of the Programme.

In compliance with Article 57 of the of CPR, the ex-post evaluation lies in the responsibility of the European Commission.

SECTION II: OBJECTIVES, COVERAGE AND COORDINATION

1. Role and objectives of the evaluation plan

In accordance with the principles set out in Article 54 of CPR the present evaluation plan is carried out so as to improve the quality of the implementation of the Programme as well as to assess its effectiveness, efficiency and impact and to provide crucial information for decision-makers, Programme implementation bodies and for reporting.

The evaluation plan is a strategic Programme document setting out how and which evaluations will be organized under the Programme during the whole programming period; its objective is to support the result orientation and the evaluation of Programme effectiveness and impact. In coherence with the EC *Guidance document on evaluation plans*, it represents a management tool for the implementation of the Programme by supporting quality evaluations to be used effectively by the MA to contribute to the implementation of an evidence-based, result-oriented Programme.

The evaluation plan covers both impact and efficiency aiming at, on one side, capturing the effects of the intervention and, on the other side, looking at how the Programme is being implemented and managed, in order to increase the knowledge of what works and what does not work and thus allow decision makers to make timely adjustments to ensure an adequate Programme performance.

The main objectives of the evaluation plan are:
- to provide a strategic framework to plan impact and operational evaluations;
- to improve through proper methodologies and tools planning at high quality of evaluations carried out during the whole programming period;
- to facilitate informed Programme management and policy decisions also on the basis of evaluation findings;
- to ensure that evaluations provide inputs for relevant annual implementation reports and, in accordance with Article 114(2) CPR, to the report to be submitted by the MA to the EC in 2022, that summarises the findings of the evaluations carried out, the main outputs and results of the programme, including also comments on the reported information;
- to ensure that resources for funding the evaluations are appropriate and proportionate to the Programme financial size;
- to provide a framework to ensure effective follow-up of the evaluations and the adequate communication about main findings and results.

2. Coverage of the evaluation plan

This evaluation plan covers the INTERREG CBC Programme Italy – Croatia 2014 – 2020, co-financed by the ERDF and from National co-financing of both the two Member States involved. The area covered by this evaluation plan is the whole Programme area as described in Section I above. Time-wise, the coverage of the evaluation plan spans up until the end of 2023 when the last annual implementation report of the Programme to the European Commission is due.

3. Analysis of available evidence

Being a brand new Programme, in the case of the Italy-Croatia Programme, the evaluators cannot base their analysis on the lessons learnt during the previous programming period in a specific cross-border Programme. Indeed, the Programme decided to start its implementation by funding a set of projects capitalising lessons learnt from previous programming period in ETC Programmes involving Italian and Croatian partners. This initial capitalisation process was aimed at helping the identification of a common ground useful for both implementation and evaluation. Moreover, it might be useful to consider potential evidence available from evaluations conducted by other ERDF Programmes funding operations in the same territories as the Italy-Croatia Programme, in order allow common strategic elements where to focus the evaluation analysis.

In full compliance with the Ex-ante recommendations, the present document has considered the following approach:

- it is necessary to design standardized procedures for monitoring result indicators and for the impact evaluation in order to reduce the burden for stakeholders and to capitalize the activities already carried out for setting the baseline;
- the evaluation plan should clearly tackle the new challenges of the result-oriented approach;
- the evaluation plan should confirm this approach and ensure the involvement of key stakeholders whenever appropriate in surveys, workshops, other tools;
- in order to improve the setting up of the monitoring and evaluation system, it would be important and useful to:
  - promote an increased focus on the project level, which will allow building a coherent monitoring system from project to Programme level and will provide useful information for the evaluation;
  - identify effective procedure in order to promptly provide early warnings and amendments in case of possible failures;
  - clearly define the roles and logically link the bodies, steps and mechanisms of the monitoring and evaluation system. This will allow building systems of information

capable of feeding monitoring, performance and evaluation and "correlating" the strategy of the Programme with the indicators' system;

▪ take into consideration the possibility to organize part of the evaluation at project level, combining both a top-down and bottom-up approach.

Additionally, the present document has been drafted adapting to the specific context of the Italy-Croatia Programme the general lessons emerged at European level regarding the implementation of monitoring and evaluation activities in the ETC context. Main source of information at this regards are the data on the 2007-2013 ETC AIRs collected in the context of the DG Regio 2007-2013 ex-post evaluation on data collection, the various analyses produced by Interact (e.g. "Capturing the impact of territorial cooperation" and "Typology of Interreg projects: measuring main project achievements across Interreg Programmes"), as well as the general experience of the evaluators regarding the implementation of the 2007-2013 Programmes.

Moreover, the level of consistency and complementarity of the Programme objectives to the relevant macro-regional, national and regional strategies has been taken into consideration. In order to analyse the external coherence at a cross-border level, the following strategies were also taken into consideration:

● The European Union Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region (**EUSAIR**) which covers all the Italian and Croatian Regions involved in the CP;

● the European Union Strategy for the Alpine Region (**EUSALP**) which covers the Italian regions of Veneto and Friuli Venezia Giulia;

● the European Union Strategy for the Danube Region (**EUSDR**) involving Croatia.

4. Coordination of evaluations

According to the *Guidance document on evaluation plans* of the EC DG Regional and Urban Policy a coordination mechanism is set up to ensure that the complementarity principle is met at the stage of Programme management, monitoring, evaluation and control.

The present evaluation plan takes into consideration those instruments allowing the MC to assess if during the implementation of the Italy-Croatia Programme the coordination with other ESI Funds as well as with relevant funding instruments under the umbrella of the Common Strategic Framework (CSF) and also with macro-regional strategies has been sought and put into practice.

At Programme level the MC, which is involved in all evaluation activities, encompasses a range of institutions involved in the implementation of national initiatives and national and regional as well as ETC Programmes co-financed by the ESI funds that allows for proper coordination of

evaluations and a good follow-up of the evaluation conclusions and recommendations. In addition, exchanges with other Managing Authorities of Programmes covering the same countries and regions or policy fields and sharing of information with other Interreg Programmes through the evaluation network facilitated by Interact has been foreseen.

In addition, the complete overlap of the geographical area where EUSAIR operates as well as the presence of other ETC Programmes suggest the setting in place of further mechanisms of coordination:

- With ADRION and MED programme, in relation to the transferring of selected outcomes to the transnational dimension of cooperation;
- With the other CBC programmes especially involving Italian and Croatian beneficiaries, in relation to implementation of operations and common supported Thematic Objectives;
- With EUSAIR actors involved in its Governance, with regard to the possible Programme contributions to the Strategy implementation.

SECTION III: EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

1. Evaluation process and responsible bodies

The main responsibilities and functions for the Programme evaluation process rest with the MA and the MC, in line with art. 56, 110 and 114 of CPR.

The MA, supported by the JS, has the responsibility for designing and delivering the evaluation plan and presenting it to the MC for approval. The EC can advise the MC at all stages of the evaluation process. The status of the evaluation plan will be discussed at least once a year by the MC. The review of the evaluation plan could be combined with the approval of the annual implementation report in which progress made in implementing the evaluation plan will be reported. Any follow-up measures of evaluation findings will also be reported to the MC. After MC approval of each version of the evaluation plan, the MA shall submit the plan to the EC for information through the SFC 2014 System. Information on the evaluation plan will be published on the Programme website. Information about the implementation of the evaluation plan is also presented in each Programme annual implementation reports which are made available to all interested stakeholders and Programme bodies.

The MA is responsible for the tendering of external experts. Special attention will be put on the preparation of the terms of reference (ToR) as a key step for assuring good quality evaluation. For that reason a permanent Evaluation Working Group (EWG), composed by representatives of the two national delegations was set up in November 2019. The EWG shall be included in the whole evaluation process and shall be consulted, by ensuring a sufficient and proper lead time to send comments, for the drafting of the ToR, for the definition of the inception report and on the reports drafted by the evaluators.

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluations shall be drafted with the support of the JS. For the definition of the ToR, Commission guidance shall be used as well as previous MA or other Regional offices' experience on public procurements and evaluations. The MA/JS will ensure an impartial and transparent selection process, in full compliance with the applicable public procurement rules. Lessons learnt from INTERACT group on evaluation shall also be taken into due account as they provide a solid ground and know-how for drawing-up the ToR by building on other Programmes' experiences.

2. Involvement of partners in the evaluation

In accordance with the multi-level governance approach and in compliance to the principle of partnership, the European code of conduct on partnership in the framework of the European Structural and Investment Funds and the CP, the Programme promotes the engagement of its

stakeholders in the design and implementation of the evaluation plan whenever possible. In particular, relevant partners, main stakeholders and target groups (e.g. national, regional and local public authorities, economic and social partners, bodies representing the civil society, including environmental partners, non-governmental organizations, higher education and research institutions, bodies responsible for promoting social inclusion, gender equality and non-discrimination), beyond their involvement as evaluation stakeholders in the National Committees and as non-voting members of the MC, shall be involved also in the evaluation of the Programme. Their participation to the Programme evaluation phase could be attained also thanks to the work of National Committees having the role to support MC members not only in the execution of MC tasks but also in the monitoring, provision of data for the measurement of Programme indicators as well as Programme evaluation. As already mentioned, besides the involvement of the relevant national partners, also a broad range of other stakeholders' categories will be consulted, through surveys and interviews, in the collection of data which will serve as an input for the operational and impact evaluation.

3. Evaluation expertise

The evaluations will be carried out by an external evaluation team meeting the functional independence of contracted experts from the authorities responsible for Programme implementation (Article 54 (3) of CPR).

(Update to 30ᵗʰ April 2021)

On 21ˢᵗ December 2020 the entrustment procedure of the external evaluation service (for the performance of the operation, impact and additional evaluations) was completed. The external evaluator (a temporary grouping of undertakings between Lattanzio KIBS S.p.A. and IRIS s.r.l.) signed the contract and started its work in 2021 (final commitment: € 235.307,50).

The MA/JS can count on relevant internal evaluation expertise as well as on a thorough knowledge of the CP and will coordinate the evaluation-related activities of the Programme. In particular, staff members of the JS "Evaluation and Monitoring Unit" and MA members of the "Overall Coordination Unit" have a good understanding of evaluation methods and will support the on-going evaluation activities of the Programme.

The evaluators will be selected according to the applicable public procurement rules. The respective expertise of the MA/JS will be crucial for preparing the ToR with the necessary specifications of the tasks to be delivered, timing and requested outputs. In the process of selection of the evaluation team, the quality of the proposed expert pool and methodological approach will be given the highest possible weight compared to the offered price of the service. The evaluators will be provided with monitoring data taken from the SIU system as well as internal data collation feeding the AIRs, Programme documents and any other relevant information that might be needed for executing the evaluation tasks.

A continuous and possibly fruitful exchange between the evaluation team and the MA/JS is foreseen in order to provide the evaluators with up-to-date information and practical insights into Programme implementation as well as to build a common understanding of the Programme and a common terminology and to avoid misunderstandings.

4. Planned training activities related to the evaluation process

Training activities that can support the evaluation process and increase evaluation capacities in the MA and JS will be carried out. The MA/JS will actively contribute to the exchange and sharing of information with other programmes through the participation in the evaluation network which is facilitated by INTERACT. Furthermore MA/JS will closely follow the guidance and trainings on evaluation provided by the EC and INTERACT. MA/JS members have already

participated in various seminars organised by INTERACT on programme evaluation, evaluation plan and impact evaluation.

In addition, exchange with other Interreg Programmes on the evaluation approaches and process will be initiated.

5. Use and communication of evaluations

The MA will illustrate the evaluation reports and discuss with MC the findings and recommendations made by the evaluators in order to reach the approval by MC of each evaluation report and an agreement on the necessary follow-up actions to be under-taken at Programme level.

Once approved, the evaluation reports will be made available to the public on the Programme website and their content used in Programme communication to target groups and main stakeholders, where considered appropriate.

In addition, the Programme will actively promote the findings of evaluations through different communication and dissemination activities (e.g. through thematic workshops for beneficiaries, policy makers and other stakeholders; the use of social media and community development, whenever relevant) as they are foreseen in the communication strategy, also in order to strengthen the evaluation capacity within the relevant stakeholders.

6. Evaluation budget

The necessary resources for carrying out this evaluation plan (Article 54(2) CPR), covering all the costs of evaluations, data collection, training, etc., comes from the Technical Assistance budget.

The total amount of financial resources available for the evaluation (consultant fees, travels, allowances, etc.) planned is **EUR 300.000,00** where the operational evaluation accounts for EUR 80.000,00 and impact evaluation accounts for EUR 130.000,00 as better described at the following Section V. Furthermore, EUR 90.000,00 are planned for additional evaluations (thematic, linked to revision of CP or Performance Framework) which might be needed during Programme implementation.

7. Quality management strategy for the evaluation process

The MA is responsible for the coordination and steering of the Programme evaluation and will safeguard that it is conducted in a professional and ethical manner in compliance with the principles of impartiality and independence of evaluators. In line with annex 2 of the Guidance

document on evaluation plans and in order to ensure high quality of Programme evaluations, the Programme will set up a quality management strategy for the evaluation process.

Firstly, significant effort will be devoted to the procurement of evaluations. The drafting of the Terms of Reference (ToR) and Selection of the tenderer will benefit from the competences within the MA on public procurement procedures in line with Community thresholds. The ToR will define, among others, the objectives of the evaluations, the role and responsibilities of the evaluators, the description of the evaluation assignment and work flow, the duration of the contract and the resources to be allocated. Welcoming EC recommendations, the ToR will include the specification of evaluation questions and the estimation of data requirements. As per the impact evaluation, the ToR will be developed in line with Annex 1 to the *Guidance document on evaluation plans*. The draft ToR will be presented to the MC.

Regarding the selection of the best offer, a selection committee in charge for the evaluation of the bids will be appointed. Clear award criteria and quality requirements will be defined in the ToR: they will relate in particular to professional and technical capacity in evaluation, previous experience in similar activities and methodological approach proposed. Evaluators will be required to use a sound methodology in the performance of their tasks. In the selection process, the quality of the proposed expert pool and methodological approach will be given the highest possible weight compared to the requested price of the service.

Secondly, during the execution of the evaluation exercise the support to evaluators and monitoring of progress will be coordinated by one or two managers identified as main reference within MA/JS. The Head of JS, the other JS Managers and MA Managers, depending on the scope of the evaluations, will actively contribute to the evaluation exercise. The coordinator within MA/JS will act as main interface with the appointed evaluation team which, in turn, will be required to set up a clear responsibility structure on their side. Continuous dialogue between the evaluators and the MA/JS will be ensured as this is directly linked to the quality and usefulness of evaluation outcomes. Regular meetings (physical or virtual) between the evaluators and the MA/JS will take place.

A kick-off meeting with the evaluators will be organised in order to discuss and agree on the evaluation process and work flow of each evaluation exercise, including identification of data sources and the setting of intermediate steps, deliverables and deadlines for reporting.

The overall expected outputs produced by the evaluators for each type of evaluation to be carried out consist of the following:
- **Inception report**: which will lay out the detailed methodology for carrying out the evaluation tasks as defined in the ToR and the typology of data and sources of

information. It will include also a schedule for intermediate reports and the final report to be delivered.

- **Intermediate reports**: which will provide an overview of the evaluation work carried out, intermediate results achieved and/or results of some specific evaluation tasks in accordance with the due dates as laid down in the ToR and/or the inception report.
- **Final evaluation report**: which will provide a comprehensive picture of the evaluation including its context and objectives, evaluation methods and information sources. In addition, it will present the results, conclusions and recommendations on all evaluation questions as defined in the ToR and further detailed in the inception report. It will also include an executive summary.

The MA/JS will closely follow the work of the evaluators and will carry out the necessary quality checks and provide feedback to the evaluators. Among others, it will check whether the analysis has been carried out in an appropriate way and will verify the evidence for supporting the presented findings and recommendations. In case of insufficient quality, it will intervene accordingly and, if the case, apply the clause regulating the early termination of the contract conditional on the quality of the work provided. In addition, the JS will coordinate the exchange with the relevant Programme Authorities and partners such as MC members, national contact points, programme beneficiaries, etc.

Finally, to further enhance quality control, all evaluation reports will be made available to the MC. If considered necessary, evaluators will present and discuss evaluation results within MC meetings. Any report submitted by the evaluators will undergo the quality management procedures set in place in order to be accepted by the MA, as contracting body.

SECTION IV: PLANNED EVALUATIONS

1. Timing of relevant Programme implementation phases

The following timetable concerning the timing of main Programme implementation phases (i.e. launch of Calls for Proposals and contracting of projects) is duly taken into account while setting the timing of evaluations:

Call for proposals	Call budget (ERDF)	Estimated launching	Estimated contracting time	Max. duration of projects	Estimated end date of projects
1st Call for Proposals ("Standard+" projects)	18.571.411,05 EUR	Q1 2017	Q1 2018	18 months	Q2 2019
1st Call for Proposals ("Standard" projects)	101.084.179,44 EUR	Q2 2017	Q2 2019	36 months[1]	Q4 2021 – Q2 2022
2nd Call for Proposals (Strategic projects)		Q42019	Q2 2020	36 months	Q42022
3rd Call for Proposals ("Standard" capitalization projects)		Q1 2021	Q4 2021	12 months	Q42022

2. Type and timing of evaluations during the programming period

The timing of evaluations during the programming period has to be balanced. As a general rule, it should be scheduled as late as possible to enable the availability of results but also as early as possible to allow a feedback and adjustment mechanisms of the findings of evaluation in the overall Programme implementation process.

---

[1] Due to the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic emergency and the containment measures adopted by governments, that have produced serious impacts on the implementation of projects, most of the Standard projects have requested and are obtaining the extension of the original duration beyond the envisaged 30 months

The timing for evaluations will thus need to be shaped according to the different Programme implementation phases (see table above).

Three types of evaluation are envisaged, in line with art. 54 of CPR:

a) **Operational evaluation,** aiming at appraising Programme efficiency and effectiveness, will be carried out at an earlier stage so that the findings of evaluations can still be taken on board and be used to improve or readdress where necessary the Programme approach, methods and practices;

b) **Impact evaluation,** aiming at providing a qualitative assessment of the impact of the Programme on its area and beneficiaries, will be carried out at a time when a critical mass of approved projects has realised first results;

c) **Additional evaluations** may be carried out in case of emerging urgent needs, e.g. where monitoring reveals a significant gap from the goals initially set or where proposals are made for the revision of the CP or Performance Framework; these evaluations may also be carried out in order to feed preparation for Post 2020 especially if carried out in coordination with other Programmes (e.g. ADRION). These evaluations can either address issues regarding the entire Programme or one or several priority axes or specific objectives. These evaluations cannot be anticipated at this stage and will be carried out by external experts that are functionally independent from the authorities responsible for Programme implementation.

(*Update to 30th April 2021*)

While drawing the external evaluation service Rules of Procedures, EWG and WG 21- 27 (operating in the run-up to the activation of the TF 21-27), decided to identify in the technical specifications one of the additional assessments to be carried out: territorial and socio-economic analysis and report on the 2021-27 strategic territorial and thematic scenarios. Then, based on the winner's bid, two additional evaluation domains have been identified, to support the new 2021-27 Italy-Croatia Interreg Programme drafting: 1) Projects of limited financial volume/Small project funds; 2) Simplified Cost Options (SCOs).

The scope and subject, evaluation questions, tasks and expected results of additional evaluations will be defined separately upon need.

Having considered the size and scope of the Programme, the illustrated timing of main Programme implementation phases and the delay accumulated by the Programme at the beginning of the programming period, as well as the necessary time needed to procure the evaluation services, no evaluations are planned before the beginning of 2019.

Moreover, taking into consideration the estimated duration of the evaluations (see the table above), one single tender for operational and impact evaluation shall be envisaged in order to have a unique contract with an evaluation team to be performed in a coherent and continuous manner. Detailed information and description on the evaluations planned for the Programme can be found in Section V of the evaluation plan.

(*Update to 30th April 2021*)

As a result of the time required for the completion of the entrustment of the independent evaluation service and the effective start of the activity, below the updated time schedule of the evaluations:

Type of evaluation	2020	2021				2022				2023	
	Q1-Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2
Operational evaluation			▮			▮				▮	
Impact evaluation							▮				▮
Additional evaluations											
Territorial and socio economic analysis & strategic territorial and thematic scenarios			▮								
SPFs/Projects of limited financial volume			▮								
Simplified cost options				▮							

SECTION V: DESCRIPTION OF PLANNED EVALUATIONS

1. Operational (process) evaluation

Scope and subject

The main goal of the planned operational evaluation is to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Programme management and implementation. It further aims at assessing the relevance of the Programme and the progress of implementation of the communication strategy.

Main criteria will thus be:

- Effectiveness – whether the Programme is on good track to achieve its objectives and expected results
- Efficiency – comparison between the actual outputs and the inputs – the resources mobilized
- Relevance – whether the Programme objectives are relevant to the current needs.

Based on the above-mentioned criteria, the scope of the operational evaluation will cover the following main aspects:

Effectiveness and efficiency of the Programme management system

- ▢ Programme management structures
- ▢ Decision making processes
- ▢ Project application and selection processes
- ▢ Project implementation and monitoring processes

Effectiveness and efficiency of Programme implementation

- ▢ Progress in terms of achievement of Programme objectives and expected results
- ▢ Progress in relation to performance framework milestones and targets
- ▢ Respect of horizontal principles
- ▢ Contribution to EU2020 strategy and macro-regional strategies
- ▢ Contribution to cross-cutting issues defined in the CP

Relevance, consistency and complementarity of the Programme objectives

- ▢ Programme strategy, set milestones and targets

Effectiveness and efficiency of the Communication strategy

- ▢ Programme communication
- ▢ Involvement of beneficiaries and target groups

European Regional Development Fund   **www.italy-croatia.eu**

The operational evaluation will allow appraising potential gaps to be considered for the forthcoming Calls for Proposals, if needed. Furthermore, it will allow integrating findings on Programme management settings and communication activities in view of immediate response and respective follow up measures to any identified weaknesses.

Indicative list of methods to be used and data to be made available to evaluators

The Terms of Reference (ToR) will specify the indicative methods and tools to be applied for the operational evaluation; they will then be further specified in the inception report to be delivered by the contracted evaluation team. An indicative list of tools and data to be made available by the Programme to the evaluation team is:

Evaluation type	Subject	Methods and tools	Available data
Operational evaluation	Effectiveness and efficiency of the Programme management system	Methods: The methodology for carrying out the operational evaluation tasks as defined in the ToR will be specified in the inception report to be delivered by the contracted evaluation team Indicative list of tools: Desk research Data analysis Surveys Interviews with Programme bodies, beneficiaries, target groups Case studies	Programme management structures; Decision making processes; Project application and selection processes; Project implementation and monitoring processes; Data collection from SIU system.
	Effectiveness and efficiency of Programme implementation		Progress in terms of achievement of Programme objectives and expected results; Progress in relation to performance framework milestones and targets; Respect of horizontal principles; Contribution to EU2020 strategy and macro-regional strategies.
	Relevance, consistency and complementarity of the Programme objectives		Programme documents Annual Implementation Reports Financial data Project outputs.
	Effectiveness and efficiency of the Communication Strategy		Communication strategy; Annual communication plans; Annual Implementation reports; follow up of specific indicators of the communication strategy.

Indicative list of evaluation questions

The following indicative evaluation questions could be further adapted and specified when defining the ToR as well as during the finalization of the inception report, in accordance with the evaluation team contracted[2].

Regarding the effectiveness and efficiency of the Programme management system

- Is the overall management and control system effective? What can be improved?
- How are the interactions between the programme bodies (MC, MA, CA, JS, AA, NAs, NCs, FLCs), are their functions and responsibilities clearly established?
- Are decision making processes at Programme level clear and transparent?
- How efficient and effective are the project generation, selection and contracting processes?
- How effective is the Programme monitoring system?
- How effective are the project implementation rules? Did the use of simplified cost options prove to be efficient?
- What are the major difficulties faced by the beneficiaries? What measures could be taken to overcome them?
- Are there any specific factors hindering the effective use of Technical Assistance funds? Are there any steps in the use of Technical Assistance funds that could be made more efficient?

Regarding the assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of Programme implementation
- What is the progress towards the overall Programme goal, specific objectives and expected results? How is the progress in relation to the means and resources mobilised?
- What is the actual level of achievement of Programme result and output indicators? Which are the internal and external factors affecting the achievement of the set targets?
- Are there any risks/problems (including de-commitment risks) hindering the smooth Programme implementation? What specific actions should be taken in order to minimize the risks?
- Are the relevant target groups of the Programme successfully involved? How is the participation in terms of beneficiaries' type as well as in relation to the geographical coverage of the Programme area?
- To what extent are horizontal principles integrated in the Programme management arrangements and in the activities of funded projects?

---

[2] In Annex 1 the list of the updated evaluation questions.

- To what degree is the Programme implementation contributing to the EU2020 strategy and to relevant macro-regional strategies like the EUSAIR/EUSDR/EUSALP), national and regional strategies?
- Have synergies been created with other instruments and funds? How effective is the coordination with other Interreg Programmes?

Regarding the relevance, consistency and complementarity of the Programme objectives
- Are the Programme objectives still relevant, consistent and complementary in the policy context?
- Is the Programme properly addressing the current development needs in the Programme area?
- Are there any stringent uncovered needs that could be tackled under this or future cross-border Programme?

Regarding the assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of the Communication strategy
- Do the communication activities carried out by the Programme lead to the achievement of the general and specific objectives set out in the Communication Strategy? If not which changes are needed?
- Has the Programme raised awareness about its activities and achievements?
- Which communication tools were the most effective in terms of increasing awareness on the Programme?
- Does the communication strategy need to be updated for the remaining Programme period based on the evaluation findings?
- Have Programme bodies been efficient in ensuring a well-functioning communication flow in the Programme area?
- Have the Programme communication measures reached the relevant target groups efficiently?
- Has the Programme contributed to increase the capacity of projects to communicate their own achievements?

Duration, timing and deliverables

The operational evaluation is planned to start during the first half of 2021 and is supposed to be finalised within june 2023. The evaluation is estimated to take around 27 months. Indeed at the beginning it will be possible to appraise Programme implementation with reference to the setting up of the management and control system, the communication activities, the use of the TA budget, the effectiveness of the Programme governance and the achievement of the Performance Framework targets. It will also be possible to evaluate the entire project cycle, considering that it is expected that several projects will end between June and December 2019.

Some findings shall feed the AIR due since May 2021 while the evaluation conclusions and recommendations will be included in the AIR 2023.

Three Operational Evaluation Reports are expected to be delivered in the years 2021, 2022 and 2023.

The recommendations related to Programme relevance could also be useful for the preparation of the next programming period which will start in 2020.

Budget

A budget of EUR 80.000 within the external expertise heading will be dedicated to the operational evaluation.

2. Impact evaluation

Scope, subject and rationale

The main goal of the planned impact evaluation is to assess the effects of the Programme implementation to the cross-border regional development and to analyse the mechanisms producing the impact. The challenges of the impact evaluation clearly lie in distinguishing the effects of Programme implementation from the contribution of other external factors (such as other EU co-financed Programmes, socio-economic developments, political changes, etc.).

In line with art. 56(3) of CPR which requires that "at least once during the programming period, an evaluation shall assess how support from the ESI Funds has contributed to the objectives for each priority axis" the impact evaluation shall cover the Programme thematic priorities 1 to 4 and their specific objectives.

As further specified in the *Guidance document on evaluation plans*, "in the 2014-2020 programming period, both result orientation and thematic concentration make it necessary to design programmes focussing their resources on a few objectives in order to maximise their impact; their expected results shall be measured with result indicators and the programme effects assessed with impact evaluations". Consequently, the impact evaluation envisaged during the programming period will concentrate on the identification of changes linked to the Programme funding, on estimating the impact of these changes as well as on proposing some lessons learnt on what was more effective and efficient towards the attainment of set objectives.

Indicative list of methods to be used and data to be made available to evaluators

The impact evaluation will be carried out following a theory-based approach (in line with the *Guidance document on evaluation plans)*, which follows the steps of the Programme intervention logic identifying causal links and mechanisms of change. Its main goal is to explain why a given change has occurred and how an intervention has caused that change. It will also analyse the assumptions which were made when establishing the intervention logic.

This approach mainly produces a qualitative estimate of the impacts.

The monitoring of the progress of the result indicators at different stages of Programme implementation (2018, 2020, 2022, 2023) and the comparison with the baseline situation (2014-2015) will provide an important input for the impact evaluation since it will give evidence of changes, both in quantitative and qualitative terms. This will allow getting a clear and impartial perception on progress made and on results achieved by the Programme compared to the initial situation as described in the baseline. The information gathered for the needs of result indicators monitoring will also contribute to a more in-depth understanding of the changes achieved and will serve as a valuable basis for the impact evaluation.

Relevant data for the impact evaluation are also available from the monitoring of the funded projects which will be available on the SIU system. The system also includes all deliverables and outputs from the project implementation as well as reported indicators which constitute a very comprehensive information source for analysing the thematic project achievements.

The Terms of Reference (ToR) will specify the indicative methods and tools to be applied for the impact evaluation; they will then be further specified in the inception report to be delivered by the contracted evaluation team. An indicative list of these methods and data to be made available by the Programme to the evaluation team are:

Evaluation type	Subject	Methods and tools	Available data
Impact evaluation	Thematic and territorial impacts of Programme implementation Contribution to EU 2020 targets	Method: Theory-based impact evaluation Indicative list of tools: desk research data analysis surveys focus group case studies interviews	Programme document (programming and implementation phase) Financial data at Programme level Annual Implementation Reports Results of the Implementation Evaluation List of projects funded and project description up to the cut-off date Monitoring data from SIU system

Evaluation questions

Evaluation questions will be further adapted and specified when defining the ToR as well as during the finalization of the inception report, in accordance with the evaluation team contracted[3].

For each Priority axis and Specific Objectives the following indicative evaluation questions shall be addressed:

- What change can be observed in relation to the objectives of the Programme?
- To what extent can observed changes be attributed to the intervention?
- Are there unintended impacts?
- What mechanisms delivered the impact? What are key contextual features for these mechanisms?
- Does the impact vary by subgroup within the main target group?
- Will short-run effects of the intervention differ from those in the long run?

Moreover, in particular for Specific Objectives 1.1, 3.1 and 4.1, evaluators will be asked to identify additional result indicators to be monitored during the evaluation exercise in order to capture a broader range of changes which might occur in the innovation, culture and tourism, transport domains.

Duration, timing and deliverables

The impact evaluation is planned to start at the end of 2020 when first information on project achievements is expected to be available (at this time the implementation of projects approved under the 1st Set of Calls for Proposals will be almost finalised). The impact evaluation is estimated to last at least 24 months as it will include an update before the end of 2022 in order to feed the report requested by art. 114 of CPR with the findings of evaluations carried out. Two Impact Evaluation Reports are expected to be delivered in the years 2022 and 2023.

The conclusions and recommendations will be integrated in the AIR to be submitted by 31 May 2023 as well as in the final implementation report to be submitted in 2024.

Indicative budget

An indicative budget of EUR 130.000,00 within the external expertise heading will be dedicated to the impact evaluation.

---

[3] In Annex 1 the list of the updated evaluation questions.

3. Additional evaluations

Scope, subject and rationale

Additional evaluations will be planned and carried out during Programme implementation in order to satisfy emerging needs such as reprogramming and CP modifications, joint evaluations with other funds or Programmes, thematic evaluations also related to Post 2020 perspectives.

Duration and timing

Duration and timing of additional evaluations will depend on the scope and focus of the evaluations as well as on the needs to be fulfilled by the evaluation activities.

Indicative budget

EUR 90.000,00 are planned for additional evaluations which might be needed during Programme implementation.

(*Update to 30th April 2021*)

The WG 21- 27 (operating in the run-up to the activation of the TF 21-27) decided to identify one of the additional assessments to be carried out: territorial and socio-economic analysis and report on the 2021-27 strategic territorial and thematic scenarios. Then two additional evaluation domains have been identified, to support the new 21-27 Italy-Croatia Interreg Programme drafting: A) Projects of limited financial volume/Small project funds; B) Standard Cost Options (SCOs).

A. Support to "Projects of limited financial volume", "Small projects funds" and, as per Art. 24 and 25 of the Consolidated Interreg Regulation, related aspects of programme implementation in the 2014-2020 period and perspectives for 2021-2027.

Scope, subject and rationale
Assessment of how effectively projects of limited financial volume have been managed in the current period (Creation of Small projects funs, dedicated or regular calls, active civil society involvement procedures, simplification procedures adopted, …) in other Interreg V-A programmes, but especially a tool providing a comprehensive knowledge basis to consider the possibility to adopt specific instruments for a wider and structured approach to Small Projects in the next programme (ex. Adoption of small projects funds, ad hoc call, resources to be allocated, monitoring rules and requirements to beneficiaries, targeted beneficiaries, etc.).

Duration and timing

In order to provide profitable inputs to the new Interreg Programme 2021-2027, a draft report shall be delivered by May 2021 and the final report by the end of June 2021.

B. Feasibility Evaluation for a more extensive adoption of Standard Cost Options (SCOs) in programme implementation, taking into account the new provisions of the 2021-2027 regulatory framework

Scope, subject and rationale

An additional and specific evaluation to estimate the possible impact of the adoption of SCOs on a wider scale, taking into account the new range of SCOs foreseen for the Interreg programmes of the next programming period6 , as optional or compulsory, according to the current drafts of the new CPR and ETC Regulations.

Duration and timing

In order to provide profitable inputs to the new Interreg Programme 2021-2027, a draft report shall be delivered by July 2021 and the final report by the end of September 2021.

Annex 1 - Update list of the evaluation questions

INTERREG V A Italy Croatia CBC Programme
2014-2020

EVALUATION QUESTIONS – MAIN ELEMENTS

MAY 2021

Table of contents

This document purpose

In line with the evaluation framework set in the Programme Evaluation Plan (Section V: Description of planned evaluations) and based on evaluation specific objectives and tasks detailed in the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluation of the Italy-Croatia CBC Programme, the Evaluation Questions (EQs) are organized into the following themes:

- **Effectiveness and efficiency of the Programme management system;**
- **Focus on the indicators system;**
- **Effectiveness and efficiency of the Programme implementation;**
- **Relevance, consistency and complementarity of the Programme objectives;**
- **Cross-border cooperation added value and networking;**
- **Effectiveness and efficiency of the communication strategy;**
- **Thematic and territorial impacts of Programme implementation as well as contribution to macro-regional strategies and EU 2020 targets**.

Responses to EQs will be given in the framework of the following planned evaluations:

- **Operational (process) evaluation** aimed at appraising the efficiency and effectiveness of Programme management and implementation;
- **Impact evaluation** with the objective to assess the Programme (medium term) effects in the cooperation area;
- **Additional thematic evaluations:** 1) Projects of limited financial volume/Small project funds; 2) Standard Cost Options (SCOs).

For each EQ, the following tables show:

- ➤ the **main topics** tackled by the EQ and the type of planned evaluation (operational and/or impact) in the framework of which the EQ will be given response;
- ➤ **non binding examples** of indicative methods/tools and of related sources of data that may be used to develop evaluation activities.

Subjects of additional evaluations will be agreed between the Programme bodies and the evaluator, following the Programme upcoming needs.

Methods/tools and data sources presented in this document are only examples aimed at giving hints on possible evaluation activities. In their technical offers, bidders are invited to make their own proposals according to the evaluation objectives and foreseen resources.

4

List of proposed Evaluation Questions per subject

A - Effectiveness and efficiency of the Programme management system

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
A.1	Is the overall management and control system effective? What can be improved? How efficient and effective are the Programme management bodies (MA, CA, JS, MC, FLC) in the implementation of their functions? What can be improved?	• Efficacy and efficiency of Programme management bodies (MA, CA, JS, MC, first-level control).	• Operational	• Analysis of Programme documents and relating implementing tools • Interviews with Programme bodies/ beneficiaries • Survey to beneficiaries/ target groups	• Programme documents • Project application utilities • Project implementation documents • SIU system • Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
A.2	How efficient are the interactions between the programme bodies (MC, MA, CA, JS, AA, NAs, NCs, FLCs)? Are Programme bodies functions and responsibilities (division of tasks and workloads) clearly established and efficiently implemented?	• Efficiency of the Programme shared management	• Operational	• Analysis of Programme documents • Interviews/ survey with Programme bodies	• Programme documents • Interview/survey with Programme bodies • Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
A.3	How efficient are Programme bodies internal procedures, tools and communication	• Efficiency of the Programme shared management	• Operational	• Analysis of Programme documents • Interviews/ survey with Programme bodies	• Programme documents • Interview/survey with Programme bodies • Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator

5

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
	modalities adopted to guarantee the proper shared management, coordination and supervision of the Italy-Croatia CBC Programme implementation? Was it necessary any fine tuning or training for the Programme staff?				
A.4	What are the main strengths and weaknesses of the Programme shared management tools and procedures? What can be improved in the next programming period?	• Efficiency of the Programme shared management	• Operational	• Analysis of Programme documents • Interviews/survey with Programme bodies	• Programme documents • Interview/survey with Programme bodies • Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
A.5	Are decision making processes at Programme level clear and transparent?	• Clearness and transparency of decision-making procedures and mechanisms	• Operational	• Analysis of Programme documents • Interviews/survey with Programme bodies	• Programme documents • Interview/survey • Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
A.6	How efficient are the project generation, selection and contracting processes with specific reference to each typology of call (capitalization, standard and	• Efficiency and effectiveness of project selection and contracting processes	• Operational	• Analysis of Programme documents and relating implementing tools • Surveys to beneficiaries/Target groups • Interviews with Programme bodies	• Programme documents • Project application utilities • Project implementation documents • SIU system • Quantitative/ Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator

6

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
	strategic)?				
A.7	**How effective are project selection and contracting procedures per typology of call (capitalization, standard and strategic)?**	• Effectiveness of project selection and contracting procedures	• Operational	• Analysis of Programme documents and relating implementing tools • Surveys to beneficiaries/Target groups • Interviews with Programme bodies	• Programme documents • Project application utilities • Project implementation documents • SIU system • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
A.8	**How effective are application procedures and tools (access to the SIU online application system, SIU users manual and application package: factsheets, glossary, templates, online tools and utilities)?** **Do they guarantee clear and complete information on the application process and do they succeed in limiting administrative burdens on applicants?**	• Effectiveness of application procedures and tools (SIU system and application packages)	• Operational	• Analysis of Programme documents and relating implementing tools • Surveys to applicants/beneficiaries/ Target groups • Interviews with Programme bodies	• Programme documents • Project application utilities • Project implementation documents • SIU system • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
A.9	**How efficient and relevant are projects selection criteria for both standard and**	• Efficiency and relevance of project selection criteria	• Operational	• Logical framework analysis • Overview of Programme documents	• Programme documents • Interviews • Quantitative/ Qualitative analysis/tools proposed

7

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
	strategic projects? **Are they consistent with the Programme overall strategy and cross-border nature?**	keeping in mind differences between standard and strategic projects		• Interviews with Programme bodies	by the evaluator
A.10	**How effective is the Programme monitoring system?** **What can be improved?**	• Effectiveness of the monitoring system	• Operational	• Analysis of Programme documents and relating implementing tools • Surveys to beneficiaries/ target groups • Interviews with Programme bodies	• Programme documents • Project application utilities • Project implementation documents • SIU system • Quantitative/ Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
A.11	**How effective are the project implementation rules?**	• Overall effectiveness of project implementation rules	• Operational	• Analysis of Programme documents and relating implementing tools • Survey to beneficiaries/target groups • Interviews with Programme bodies	• Programme documents • Project application utilities • Project implementation documents • SIU system • Quantitative/ Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
A.12	**How effective are the project implementation tools (manuals, factsheets, templates, online tools and utilities)?** **Do they guarantee clear and complete information on the implementation process and do**	• Effectiveness of project implementation tools (SIU manuals and other project implementation tools)	• Operational	• Analysis of Programme documents and relating implementing tools • Survey to beneficiaries/ target groups • Interviews with Programme bodies	• Programme documents • Project application utilities • Project implementation documents • SIU system • Quantitative/ Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
	they succeed in limiting administrative burdens on beneficiaries?				
A.13	Did the use of simplified cost options prove to be efficient?	• Effectiveness of project implementation rules with particular reference to the use of simplified cost options	• Operational	• Analysis of Programme documents and relating implementing tools • Survey to beneficiaries/ target groups • Interviews with Programme bodies	• Programme documents • Project application utilities • Project implementation documents • SIU system • Quantitative/ Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
A.14	What are the major difficulties faced by the beneficiaries? What measures could be taken to overcome them?	• Administrative burdens on beneficiaries and related corrective measures	• Operational	• Analysis of Programme documents and relating implementing tools • Survey to beneficiaries/ target groups • Interviews with Programme bodies	• Programme documents • Project application utilities • Project implementation documents • SIU system • Quantitative/ Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
A.15	Are there any specific factors hindering the effective use of Technical Assistance funds? Are there any steps in the use of Technical Assistance funds that could be made more efficient?	• Effectiveness in the use of Technical Assistance funds	• Operational	• Analysis of Programme documents • Interviews to Programme bodies	• Programme documents • SIU system • Quantitative/ Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator

B -Focus on the indicators system

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
B.1	**Has the selection of the overall set of common and Programme specific indicators turned out to be suitable and exhaustive for monitoring and evaluation purposes?**	• Effectiveness of the overall set of common and Programme specific indicators	• Operational	• Logical framework analysis • Interviews/ survey with Programme bodies	• Programme documents • Interview/survey
B.2	**Are baseline, milestones and target values realistic and clearly defined?**	• Adequacy of baseline, milestones and target values to describe Programme achievements	• Operational	• Analysis of programme documents • Overview of monitoring data • Overview of other available statistical data • Benchmarking with similar ETC programmes • Interviews with Programme bodies	• Programme documents • SIU system • Statistical data • Other ETC programmes documents • Interviews with managing bodies • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
B.3	**Is the set of indicators clearly described and measurable?**	• Effectiveness of adopted indicators to measure both quantitative and qualitative Programme results	• Operational	• Logical framework analysis • Overview of monitoring data	• Programme documents • SIU system • Quantitative/ Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
B.4	**Is information needed to quantify indicators available at a**	• Availability of quantitative and	• Operational	• Overview of monitoring data • Interviews with Programme bodies/	• Programme documents • SIU system • Interviews • Surveys

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
	reasonable cost?	qualitative data needed to valorize indicators at a reasonable cost		• stakeholders • Survey to stakeholders/beneficiaries	• Quantitative/ Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
B.5	Are indicators adopted at project level consistent with the Programme indicators system? To what extent is it possible to scale-up findings from project to Programme level?	• Coherence of indicators used at project level with the Programme indicators system	• Operational	• Logical framework analysis • Overview of monitoring data • Survey to managing bodies/ stakeholders/ target groups	• Programme and project documents • SIU system • Surveys • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
B.6	At this stage of the programming period, is the system of indicators still relevant according the Programme strategy and in line with Programme bodies and stakeholders needs? How can it be improved in view of the next programming period?	• Relevance, efficacy and actuality of the current set of indicators	• Operational	• Logical framework analysis • Overview of monitoring data • Interviews with Programme bodies/ stakeholders • Survey to managing bodies/stakeholders/ target groups • Comparison with indicator sets adopted by other Programmes	• Programme documents • SIU system • Interviews • Surveys • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator

C - Effectiveness and efficiency of the Programme implementation

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
C.1	**What is the progress towards the overall Programme goal, specific objectives and expected results? How is the progress in relation to the means and resources mobilized?**	• Progress towards Programme specific objectives and expected results	• Operational • Impact	• Analysis of monitoring data at Programme and projects levels • Interviews with Programme bodies	• Programme documents • SIU System • Projects progress reports • Interviews • Quantitative/Qualitative methods/tools proposed by the evaluator
C.2	**To what extent has the Programme achieved its general and specific objectives? Were there any internal or external factors hindering the achievement of the Italy Croatia CBC Programme goals?**	• Achievement of Programme general and specific objectives with evidence of internal and external factors affecting it.	• Impact	• Analysis of monitoring data at Programme and projects levels • Interviews with Programme bodies	• Programme documents • SIU System • Projects progress reports • Interviews • Quantitative/Qualitative methods/tools proposed by the evaluator
C.3	**Are there any risks/problems (including de-commitment risks) hindering the smooth Programme implementation? What specific actions should be taken in order to minimize the risks?**	• Possible risks affecting the Programme implementation and relating corrective measures	• Operational	• Analysis of monitoring data at Programme and projects levels • Interviews with Programme bodies	• SIU System • Projects progress reports • Interviews • Quantitative/Qualitative methods/tools proposed by the evaluator
C.4	**To what extent did the**	• Achievement of the	• Operational	• Analysis of monitoring data at	• SIU System

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
	Programme achieve the expected results linked to the Performance Framework? **How efficient were the corrective measures adopted?**	Performance Framework and corrective measures adopted to overcome possible negative financial performances		Programme and projects levels • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey to beneficiaries/ target groups	• Projects progress reports • Interviews • Quantitative/Qualitative methods/tools proposed by the evaluator
C.5	**Considering the overall expenditure management process (from the reporting by the partners up to the Declaration of the expenditure to the European Commission), what are the performing elements that maximize and speed up the process and what are the main bottlenecks ?** **If corrective measures were taken, were they effective in speeding up and improving the overall expenditure management process?**	• Possible risks affecting the expenditure management process and relating corrective measures	• Operational	• Analysis of monitoring data at Programme and projects levels • Interviews with Programme bodies	• SIU System • Projects progress reports • Interviews • Quantitative/ Qualitative methods/tools proposed by the evaluator
C.6	**To what extent has the**	• Achievement of Specific	• Impact	• Analysis of Programme	• Programme documents • SIU System

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
	Programme contributed to enhancing the framework conditions for innovation in the relevant sectors of the blue economy within the cooperation area? **Have performances in the field of blue innovation improved?**	Objective 1.1 (Priority Axis 1 "Blue innovation")		documents • Analysis of monitoring data • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries • Case studies	• Projects progress reports • Surveys • Case studies • Quantitative/Qualitative methods/tools proposed by the evaluator
C.7	**To what extent has the Programme contributed to improving the climate change monitoring and planning of adaptation measures tackling specific effects in the cooperation area?**	• Achievement of Specific Objective 2.1 (Priority Axis 2 "Safety and resilience")	• Impact	• Analysis of Programme documents • Analysis of monitoring data • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries • Case studies	• Programme documents • SIU System • Projects progress reports • Surveys • Case studies • Quantitative/ Qualitative methods/tools proposed by the evaluator
C.8	**To what extent has the Programme contributed to increase the safety of the cooperation area from natural and man-made disaster?**	• Achievement of Specific Objective 2.2 (Priority Axis 2 "Safety and resilience")	• Impact	• Analysis of Programme documents • Analysis of monitoring data • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries • Case studies	• Programme documents • SIU System • Projects progress reports • Surveys • Case studies • Quantitative/Qualitative methods/tools proposed by the evaluator
C.9	**To what extent has the Programme contributed to make natural and cultural heritage**	• Achievement of Specific Objective 3.1 (Priority Axis 3 "Environme	• Impact	• Analysis of Programme documents • Analysis of monitoring data	• Programme documents • SIU System • Projects progress reports • Statistical data

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
	a leverage for sustainable and more balanced territorial development in the cooperation area?	nt and cultural heritage")		• Analysis of statistical data concerning tourism • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries • Case studies	concerning tourism • Surveys • Case studies • Quantitative/ Qualitative methods/tools proposed by the evaluator
C.10	To what extent has the Programme contributed to protecting and restoring the biodiversity in the cooperation area? Has the Programme succeeded in strengthening the shared management and protection of cross-border ecosystems also for developing economic and employment opportunities?	• Achievement of Specific Objective 3.2 (Priority Axis 3 "Environment and cultural heritage")	• Impact	• Analysis of Programme documents • Analysis of monitoring data • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries • Case studies	• Programme documents • SIU System • Projects progress reports • Surveys • Case studies • Quantitative/ Qualitative methods/tools proposed by the evaluator
C.11	To what extent has the Programme contributed to improving the environmental quality conditions of the sea and coastal area by use of sustainable and innovative technologies and approaches? Did the Programme	• Achievement of Specific Objective 3.3 (Priority Axis 3 "Environment and cultural heritage")	• Impact	• Analysis of Programme documents • Analysis of monitoring data • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries • Case studies	• Programme documents • SIU System • Projects progress reports • Surveys • Case studies • Quantitative/ Qualitative methods/tools proposed by the evaluator

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
	succeed in improving the quality of the sea and bathing waters?				
C.12	**To what extent has the Programme contributed to improve the quality, safety and environmental sustainability of marine and coastal transport services and nodes by promoting multimodality in the cooperation area?**	• Achievement of Specific Objective 4.1 (Priority Axis 4 "Maritime transport")	• Impact	• Analysis of Programme documents • Analysis of monitoring data • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries • Case studies	• Programme documents • SIU System • Projects progress reports • Surveys • Case studies • Quantitative/ Qualitative methods/tools proposed by the evaluator
C.13	**What is the actual level of achievement of Programme result and output indicators? Which are the internal and external factors affecting the achievement of the set targets?**	• Level of achievement of expected outputs and results along with possible internal and external factors that might jeopardize the achievement of planned targets	• Operational	• Analysis of monitoring data at Programme and projects levels • Interviews with Programme bodies • Surveys to beneficiaries	• Programme documents • SIU System • Projects progress reports • Interviews • Surveys • Quantitative/ Qualitative methods/tools proposed by the evaluator
C.14	**Are the relevant target groups of the Programme successfully involved?** **How is the**	• Type and geographical coverage of target groups successfully	• Operational	• Analysis of Programme/project documents • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey to target	• Programme documents • Project application utilities • Project implementation documents • SIU system

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
	participation in terms of beneficiaries' type as well as in relation to the geographical coverage of the Programme area?	involved in the Programme implementation		groups/beneficiaries	• Interview/survey • Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
C.15	**To what extent are horizontal principles integrated in the Programme management arrangements and in the activities of funded projects?**	• Integration of horizontal principles in Programme management arrangements and project activities	• Operational	• Analysis of Programme/project documents • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey to target groups/beneficiaries	• Programme documents • Project application utilities • Project implementation documents • SIU system • Interview/survey • Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
C.16	**To what extent horizontal principles (sustainable development, equal opportunities and non-discrimination, equality between men and women) were integrated in the project selection, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?**	• Success in promoting horizontal principles in project selection, implementation, monitoring and evaluation	• Operational	• Analysis of Programme/project documents • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey to target groups/beneficiaries	• Programme documents • Project application utilities • Project implementation documents • SIU system • Interview/survey • Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator

European Regional Development Fund

D - Relevance, consistency and complementarity of the Programme objectives

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
D.1	**Are the Programme objectives still relevant, consistent and complementary in the policy context?**	• Current relevance, consistency and complementarity of Programme objectives in the policy context	• Operational	• Intervention logic analysis • (Updated) SWOT analysis • Interviews with Programme bodies	• Programme documents • Interviews • Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
D.2	**Is the Programme properly addressing the current development needs in the Programme area? Are there any stringent needs that have not been covered by the Programme?**	• Programme capacity to properly address current development needs in the cross-border cooperation area	• Operational	• (Updated) SWOT analysis • Interviews with managing bodies • Survey to relevant stakeholders	• Programme documents • Interviews • Survey • Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
D.3	**Are there any stringent uncovered needs that could be tackled under this or future cross-border Programme?**	• Possible uncovered needs that may be tackled under the current or next cross-border Programme	• Impact	• (Updated) SWOT analysis • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey to relevant stakeholders • Focus group	• Programme documents • Interviews • Survey • Focus • Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
D.4	**Which are the main lessons learned relating the elaboration of Programme strategy during this programming period?** **What can be improved to better address development needs in the next future?**	• Lessons learnt and hints for the next programming period	• Impact	• Intervention logic analysis • (Updated) SWOT analysis • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey to relevant stakeholders • Focus group	• Programme documents • Interviews • Survey • Focus • Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator

E - Cross-border cooperation added value and networking

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
E.1	**Are created partnerships relevant and coherent with the Programme cross-border nature?** **Are all relevant stakeholders at cross-border level duly represented?**	• Cross-border relevance and representativeness of created partnerships	• Operational	• Programme/projects intervention logic analysis • Overview of Programme/project documents • Surveys • Case studies	• Programme/projects documents • Monitoring data • Survey • Case studies • Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
E.2	**Are created partnerships relevant according to Programme/projects objectives?**	• Relevance of created partnerships following Programme/projects objectives	• Operational	• Programme/projects intervention logic analysis • Overview of Programme/project documents • Surveys • Case studies	• Programme/projects documents • Monitoring data • Survey • Case studies • Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
E.3	**Are the partnerships, of the financed projects ,balanced in terms of number of partners, represented areas, roles and budget?**	• Relevance and quality of partnerships in terms of number of involved actors, represented cross-border areas, roles and budget	• Operational	• Overview of Programme/project documents • Surveys • Case studies	• Programme/projects documents • Monitoring data • Survey • Case studies • Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
E.4	**Are promoted partnerships based on previous experiences and how do they ensure their sustainability in time?**	• Strength and sustainability of partnerships	• Operational	• Overview of Programme/project documents • Surveys • Case studies	• Programme/projects documents • Monitoring data • Survey • Case studies • Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
E.5	**To what extent has the Programme contributed to improve partners' administrative competences/skills at Programme and project levels?** **Do involved partners efficiently contribute to achieving Programme/project expected results?**	• Administrative capacities of involved partners at Programme and project levels	• Impact	• Overview of Programme/project documents • Surveys • Case studies • Interviews to managing bodies, stakeholders, beneficiaries	• Programme/projects documents • Monitoring data • Survey • Case studies • Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator

F - Effectiveness and efficiency of the communication strategy

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
F.1	Do the communication activities carried out by the Programme lead to the achievement of the general and specific objectives set out in the Communication Strategy? If not which changes are needed?	• Effectiveness of the communication strategy	• Operational	• Analysis of communication strategy and relating indicators • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries	• Communication strategy • Annual communication plans • Annual Implementation reports • Follow up of specific indicators of the communication strategy • Interviews/survey • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
F.2	To what extent the communication strategy and relating activities have enhanced cooperation in involved public administrations and strengthened internal communication capacities? Are there any good practices that may be replied in the next programming period?	• Enhancement of cooperation in public administration and improvement of internal communication through communication strategy and relating activities	• Operational	• Analysis of communication strategy and relating indicators • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries	• Communication strategy • Annual communication plans • Annual Implementation reports • Follow up of specific indicators of the communication strategy • Interviews/survey • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator

European Regional Development Fund

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
F.3	**To what extent communication activities have succeeded in raising awareness on Programme objectives and in involving relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries to reach Programme objectives?**	• Involvement of relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries through effective communication activities	• Operational	• Analysis of communication strategy and relating indicators • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries	• Communication strategy • Annual communication plans • Annual Implementation reports • Follow up of specific indicators of the communication strategy • Interviews/survey • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
F.4	**Has the Programme raised awareness about its activities and achievements?**	• Programme capacity to raise awareness on its activities and results	• Impact	• Overview of documents relating to the communication strategy at project level • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries	• Communication strategy • Annual communication plans • Annual Implementation reports • Progress reports on communication strategy • Survey • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator

22

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
F.5	**To what extent the communication strategy has contributed to improve the knowledge on EU funds and the CBC Programme objectives and opportunities in the cooperation area?**	• Effectiveness of communication tools	• Impact	• Overview of documents relating to the communication strategy at project level • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries	• Communication strategy • Project Brand Manual • Annual communication plans • Annual Implementation reports • Progress reports on communication strategy • Survey • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
F.6	**Were communication tools effective in increasing awareness on Programme objectives and offered opportunities? Which tools were most successful?**	• Effectiveness of communication tools	• Operational • Impact	• Overview of documents relating to the communication strategy at Programme/project level • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries	• Communication strategy • Project Brand Manual • Annual communication plans • Annual Implementation reports • Progress reports on communication strategy • Survey • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator

23

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
F.7	**Does the communication strategy need to be updated for the remaining Programme period based on the evaluation findings?**	• Relevance of the communication strategy	• Operational	• Overview of Programme documents • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries	• Communication strategy • Project Brand Manual • Annual communication plans • Annual Implementation reports • Progress reports on communication strategy • Interview/survey • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
F.8	**Have Programme bodies been efficient in ensuring a well-functioning communication flow in the Programme area?**	• Effectiveness of communication flow in the Programme area	• Operational	• Overview of Programme documents • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries	• Communication strategy • Project Brand Manual • Annual communication plans • Annual Implementation reports • Progress reports on communication strategy • Interview/survey • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator

European Regional Development Fund

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
F.9	**Have the Programme communication measures reached the relevant target groups efficiently?**	• Programme ability to reach key target groups through communication activities	• Operational	• Analysis of the communication strategy and relating documents at Programme/project level • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries	• Communication strategy • Project Brand Manual • Annual communication plans • Annual Implementation reports • Progress reports on communication strategy • Survey • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
F.10	**Has the Programme contributed to increase the capacity of projects to communicate their own achievements?**	• Improvement of beneficiaries capacity to disseminate projects results	• Impact	• Analysis of the communication strategy and relating documents at Programme/project level • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries	• Communication strategy • Follow up of specific indicators of the communication strategy • Progress reports • Survey • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator

G - Thematic and territorial impacts of Programme implementation as well as contribution to macro-regional strategies and EU 2020 targets

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
G.1	What change can be observed in relation to the objectives of the Programme? How they are distributed at a territorial level?	• Programme achievements	• Impact	• Logical framework analysis • Overview and processing monitoring data • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries	• Programme document • Annual Implementation Reports • Monitoring data from SIU system • Interview/survey • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
G.2	To what extent can observed changes be directly attributed to the Programme? Are there unintended impacts?	• Programme added value	• Impact	• Logical framework analysis • Counterfactual analysis • Overview and processing monitoring data • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries	• Programme document • Annual Implementation Reports • Monitoring data from SIU system • Statistical data • Interview/survey • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
G.3	What mechanisms delivered the impact? What are key contextual features for these mechanisms?	• Programme effectiveness and impacts	• Impact	• Logical framework analysis • Counterfactual analysis • Benchmarking with other Interreg Programmes • Overview and processing monitoring data • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries	• Programme document • Annual Implementation Reports • Monitoring data from SIU system • Statistical data • Other Interreg Programmes documentation • Interview/survey • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
G.4	Does the impact vary by subgroup within the	• Programme	• Impact	• Logical framework analysis	• Programme document • Annual Implementation

26

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
	main target group?	impacts on different target groups		- Counterfactual analysis - Benchmarking with other Interreg Programmes - Overview and processing monitoring data - Interviews with Programme bodies - Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries	Reports - Monitoring data from SIU system - Statistical data - Other Interreg Programmes documentation - Interview/survey - Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
G.5	**Did the Programme succeed in achieving the expected impacts on the different target groups?**	Programme impacts on different target groups	Impact	- Logical framework analysis - Overview and processing monitoring data - Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries	- Programme document - Annual Implementation Reports - Monitoring data from SIU system - Survey - Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
G.6	**Will short-run effects of the intervention differ from those in the long run?**	Programme results and impacts on the long run	Impact	- Logical framework analysis - Overview and processing monitoring data - Interview with Programme bodies - Survey to relevant stakeholders/ beneficiaries	- Programme document - Annual Implementation Reports - Monitoring data from SIU system - Survey - Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
G.7	**To what extent has Italy-Croatia CBC Programme contributed to the EU 2020 Strategy for a smart, sustainable and inclusive growth?**	Programme contribution to the EU 2020 Strategy	Impact	- Overview of Programme document - Logical framework analysis - Analysis of monitoring data - Benchmarking with other Interreg	- Programme document - Annual Implementation Reports - Monitoring data from SIU system - Interview, survey, focus group - Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools

27

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
				Programmes • Interviews with Programme bodies • Focus Group with relevant stakeholders	proposed by the evaluator
G.8	**To what extent has Italy-Croatia CBC Programme contributed to EUSAIR macroregional strategy?** **The solutions adopted by the Programme in order to support the implementation of the EUSAIR through the projects have been effective?**	• Programme contribution to macro-regional strategies	• Impact	• Overview of Programme and macro-regional strategies document • Logical framework analysis • Benchmarking with other Interreg Programmes involving the Programme and macro-regional strategies areas • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey to relevant stakeholders	• Programme documents • Macro-regional strategies documents • Other Interreg Programmes documents • Interview/survey • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
G.9	**Has the Italy-Croatia CBC Programme contributed also to other macroregional strategies (EUSALP, EUSDR) involving the cooperation area?**	• Programme contribution to macro-regional strategies	• Impact	• Overview of Programme and macro-regional strategies document • Logical framework analysis • Benchmarking with other Interreg Programmes involving the Programme and macro-regional strategies areas • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey to relevant stakeholders	• Programme documents • Macro-regional strategies documents • Other Interreg Programmes documents • Interview/survey • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
G.10	**Which kind of**	• Synergies with	• Impact	• Overview of	• Programme documents

	Evaluation Question	Topic	Type of evaluation	Examples of methods/tools	Examples of data sources
	synergies with other Interreg and mainstream programmes involving the cooperation area have been activated? To what extent such synergies produce enhanced results in terms of integration and complementarities and what is the Italy-Croatia CBC Programme added value?	other Interreg and mainstream Programmes involving the same cooperation area		Programmes documents • Logical framework analysis • Benchmarking with other Interreg Programmes involving the same cooperation area • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey to relevant stakeholders	• Other Interreg Programmes documents • Interview/survey • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator
G.11	What are the main lessons learnt during the 2014/2020 period concerning both the programming and implementation phases? What can be replied or improved in the next CBC Programme?	• Lessons learnt during the 2014/2020 programming period and proposals for the upcoming CBC Programme	• Impact	• Analysis of Programme documents • Overview of operational and impact evaluations • Interviews with Programme bodies • Survey/focus group with relevant stakeholders	• Programme documents • Outcomes of operational and impact evaluations • Interviews, survey, focus group • Quantitative/Qualitative analysis/tools proposed by the evaluator

H - Projects of limited financial volume/Small projects funds

	Evaluation Question	Examples of methods/tools
H.1	How were Small Projects managed in a sample of significant Programme management practices dedicating specific instruments to small projects (for example chosen from the following Programmes: Interreg V-A Germany-Netherlands; Interreg V-A Slovakia-Hungary; Interreg V-A Germany (Mecklenburg-Vorpommern/Brandenburg)-Poland; Interreg V-A Poland-Slovakia; Interreg V-A	• Documental analysis; • Interviews; • Benchmarking; • Meta-evaluation; • Multicriteria analysis

29

	Evaluation Question	Examples of methods/tools
	France(Chanel-Manche)England; Interreg V-B Northern Periphery and Arctic; Interreg-IPA CBC Bulgaria-Serbia); Italy-Austria; Italy-Switzerland; IPA Italy-Albania-Montenegro; Interreg V-A Hungary-Croatia?	
H.2	What pros and cons can be identified for each different approach, in terms of efficiency and effectiveness of the project selection, assessment, monitoring and reimbursement procedures? (Particular focus shall be given to CBC Maritime Programmes and taken into account the different typologies of application of small projects, also considering the distinction among projects of limited financial volume directly funded by the OPs and small project funds).	• Documental analysis; • Interviews; • Benchmarking; • Meta-evaluation; • Multicriteria analysis
H.3	What are the possible improvements – in terms of simplification – of the approach to small projects in the ITA-CRO 2014-2020 programme?	• Documental analysis; • Interviews; • Benchmarking; • Meta-evaluation; • Multicriteria analysis
H.4	Which potential objectives, domains, type of interventions and the type of target recipients of the 2021-2027 Programme would benefit more from the use of specific instruments for small projects?	• Documental analysis; • Interviews; • Benchmarking; • Meta-evaluation; • Multicriteria analysis
H.5	Would the use of specific instruments for Small Projects in the next programming period be feasible from the point of view of the efficiency of the Programme Management system? What would be the type of additional resources to be put in place by Programme Bodies?	• Documental analysis; • Interviews; • Benchmarking; • Meta-evaluation; • Multicriteria analysis
H.6	What Kind of adaptations and modifications shall the Programme take?	• Documental analysis; • Interviews; • Benchmarking; • Meta-evaluation;

	Evaluation Question	Examples of methods/tools
		• Multicriteria analysis
H.7	**How could the adoption of Small Projects specific instruments improve the effectiveness of the Programme, both in reaching its targets and in the expenditure of its budget?**	• Documental analysis; • Interviews; • Benchmarking; • Meta-evaluation; • Multicriteria analysis
H.8	**What would be a reasonable initial financial allocation for instruments for Small Projects, considering the overall financial plan of the 2021-2027 Programme?**	• Documental analysis; • Interviews; • Benchmarking; • Meta-evaluation; • Multicriteria analysis

European Regional Development Fund

I - Standard Costs Options (SCOs)

	Evaluation Question	Examples of methods/tools
I.1	**What type of SCOs available in the 2014-2020 period could have been more extensively used? With which advantages and for which subjects?**	• Documental analysis; • Programme data analysis; • Interviews; • SWOT analysis.
I.2	**What would be the expectable impact on the Programme financial implementation of the adoption of each of the new /modified SCOs provision foreseen in the 2021-2027 regulatory framework?**	• Documental analysis; • Programme data analysis; • Interviews; • SWOT analysis.
I.3	**What would be the expected impact on the management of the Technical Assistance resources of the provisions of Art. 26 of the new ETC regulation (flat rate reporting of TA expenditures)**	• Documental analysis; • Programme data analysis; • Interviews; • SWOT analysis.
I.4	**Which kind of project/beneficiary and in which domain would benefit more from the adoption of each of the new/modified SCOs foreseen in the new Regulatory Framework?**	• Documental analysis; • Programme data analysis; • Interviews; • SWOT analysis.
I.5	**Which would be the expected impact of the adoption of each of the new/modified SCOs foreseen in the new Regulatory Framework on the management system of the Programme (accounting, reporting, monitoring, management verifications)?**	• Documental analysis; • Programme data analysis; • Interviews; • SWOT analysis.