

# The Baltic Sea Region INTERREG IIIB Neighbourhood Programme

Mid-term Evaluation - Update

Final Report

November 2005

Ramboll Management  
Olof Palmes Allé 20  
DK-8200 Århus N

[www.ramboll-management.com](http://www.ramboll-management.com)

## Table of contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Programme history	3
2.2	Programme priorities and measures	4
2.3	Programme evaluation	5
2.4	Table 1: BSR – projects selected for evaluation	6
<b>3.</b>	<b>Methodology and approach</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	The III B programme part	7
3.1.1	Effectiveness	7
3.1.2	Efficiency	7
3.1.3	Results and impact	7
3.2	The III A priorities and the Neighbourhood part	8
<b>4.</b>	<b>Findings and conclusions</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1	Project level	10
4.1.1	Effectiveness - project output	10
4.1.2	Effectiveness - project results	11
4.1.3	Effectiveness - project impact	14
4.1.4	Efficiency	16
4.2	Programme level	19
4.2.1	Impact of the programme and its priorities	19
4.3	Delivery system level	21
4.3.1	Effect of pro-active measures	21
4.3.2	Integration of the Neighbourhood programme	22
4.3.3	Integration of the INTERREG III A priorities	24
<b>5.</b>	<b>Lessons and recommendations</b>	<b>27</b>
5.1	Project level	27
5.1.1	Achievements of project output	27
5.1.2	Achievements of project results	27
5.1.3	Achievements of project impact	28
5.1.4	Project efficiency	29
5.2	Programme level	29
5.2.1	Impact of the programme and its priorities	29
5.2.2	Effectiveness of pro-active measures	30
5.2.3	Integration of the Neighbourhood programme and INTERREG III A	30
	<b>Annex 1: List of interviews and material used</b>	<b>31</b>
	<b>Annex 2: Overall project impact – quantification</b>	<b>32</b>
	<b>Annex 3: Evaluation problems caused be lack of indicators</b>	<b>37</b>
	<b>Annex 4: The questionnaire used for project survey</b>	<b>47</b>

## 1. Executive summary

According to the Terms of Reference, the Baltic Sea Region INTERREG III B mid-term evaluation update focuses on the following key issues:

- effectiveness and efficiency of outputs and results to date and the likely achievement of impacts of the main programme
- the inclusion of the new structures, III A Priorities and the Neighbourhood part, into the programme

The evaluation has assessed these issues based on different information sources: desk research, interviewing and survey of 27 finalised projects. On this basis the following findings and conclusions are drawn:

### *Effectiveness and efficiency*

The evaluator estimates that 22% of the projects will reach their *results* fully and 70% partly. The rest will only achieve the planned results in a limited way. One single important problem in achieving the expected results is the fact that major intended investments will be difficult to reach for about 25% of the projects that originally intended to lead to major investments. A special problem in assessing the project results in general – and the reason why the “partly” group of projects is as high as 70% - is the low quality of the indicators used in the project application form. This leads the evaluator to suggest that something radical needs to be done on the issue of indicators.

Efficiency, measured as *cost-effectiveness*, is middle to high for about 70% of the projects and low for about 30%. The single most important problem related to efficiency is delay in implementation, mainly because of lack of external funding and partner progress/commitment. In this respect the evaluator recommends to avoid projects with too huge/complex partnerships and to intensify the partnership commitments prior to implementation start.

The assessment of the expected *impact of the programme* is constructed on the basis of a combined evaluation of project results, durability and the uniqueness of the idea/concept. Concerning results and durability taken together it is expected that about 75% of the projects will have a full or nearly full impact as intended and 25% will have a very limited impact. Combined with the uniqueness of the project ideas and concepts this figure is slightly higher, which points to the fact that the impact of the programme is higher than the direct impact of the single projects. The lesson is that new ideas about the transnational development the BSR region would simply not be generated to the same degree without the dedicated BSR programme.

### *Inclusion of the III A Priorities and the Neighbourhood Programme*

The inclusion (and the consequent programme amendment) has been swiftly implemented. The new programme and the new application procedure/form signal dedication and commitment. Furthermore, the new IIIA Steering Committees have effectively been established and are working well. Only a few problems stand out following the successful inclusion:

- ❖ *Accessibility*: The joint application procedure seems very complex and information could be distributed wider/better
- ❖ *Integration of non-EU partners*: The tendency in the application rounds signals a good Russian, but a too low Belarusian participation
- ❖ *Resource drain*: Resources have been taken from the daily programme work impacting the ongoing project selection/

## **2. Introduction**

### **2.1 Programme history**

On September 14th 2001, the European Commission adopted the Community Initiative Programme (CIP) "Baltic Sea Region INTERREG III B - Trans-national Co-operation on Spatial Planning and Regional Development". The total eligible budget for the programme was MEUR 192.46, of which 100.22 was EU-financing from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). Strand B of the INTERREG Initiative supports trans-national co-operation to enhance balanced and sustainable development of the European Union. Eleven countries, the member states Estonia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Sweden as well as Norway, North-West Russia and Belarus participate in the programme. The Programme was amended in 2004 in order to include new elements due to the EU enlargement and Neighbourhood Programme. With the enlargement of the EU in 2004, two new Strand A (cross-border) programmes, for cooperation on Estonian – Latvian – Russian borders and Latvian – Lithuanian – Belarusian borders, were included into the implementation framework of the BSR INTERREG III B Programme. These new programmes have been integrated into the BSR Programme as Priorities 5 and 6 or so called III A priorities.

In July 2003, the Commission adopted the communication "Paving the Way for a New Neighbourhood Instrument" as the basis on which the new Neighbourhood Programmes (NP) were to be developed. The Neighbourhood Programmes are intended to foster cooperation with neighbouring non-candidate countries through better coordination of existing instruments like INTERREG with TACIS CBC. The Neighbour-hood Programmes cover the transitional period of 2004 – 2006 to prepare the adoption of the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) after 2006. Subsequently, the BSR INTERREG III B was reprogrammed to include the new Neighbourhood Programme elements and renamed BSR INTERREG III B Neighbourhood Programme. As a part of this reprogramming, an option for bilateral maritime cooperation was opened. The revised programme document was adopted by the COM on October 19th 2004. The new total programme budget is MEUR 214.62 public funding, of which MEUR 147.57 is financed by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). From the total ERDF budget, MEUR 119.78 will be allocated to the Priorities 1 – 3, MEUR 1.57 to the Priority 4 (already closed) and MEUR 18.26 to the Priorities 5 and 6. Around MEUR 7.96 of ERDF funds will be allocated to Technical Assistance (Priority 7).

## 2.2 Programme priorities and measures

### **Box 1. Priorities and measures of the BSR INTERREG III B Neighbourhood programme**

#### **Priority 1: Promotion of spatial development approaches and actions for specific territories and sectors**

Measure 1.1: Supporting joint strategies and implementation actions for macro-regions

Measure 1.2: Promoting sustainable spatial development of specific sectors

Measure 1.3: Strengthening integrated development of coastal zones, islands and other specific areas

#### **Priority 2: Promotion of territorial structures supporting sustainable BSR development**

Measure 2.1: Promoting balanced polycentric settlement structures

Measure 2.2: Creating sustainable communication links for improved spatial integration

Measure 2.3: Enhancing good management of cultural and natural heritage and of natural resources

#### **Priority 3: Transnational and bilateral institution and capacity building in the Baltic Sea Region**

Measure 3.1: Promotion of transnational institution and capacity building

Measure 3.2: Bilateral maritime cooperation across the Baltic Sea

#### **Priority 4: Special support for regions bordering candidate countries**

#### **Priority 5: IIIA cross-border co-operation priority Estonia–Latvia–Russia (North)**

Measure 5.1: Development of the Estonian-Latvian border regions

Measure 5.2: Development of the EU external border regions

#### **Priority 6: IIIA cross-border co-operation priority Latvia–Lithuania–Belarus (South)**

Topic 1: Utilising the cross-border cooperation to enhance the competitiveness and access to markets

Topic 2: Supporting the development and strengthening of co-operation at people-to-people and institution level

#### **Priority 7: Technical Assistance to support transnational and cross-border co-operation**

Measure 7.1: Technical Assistance for Management, Implementation, Monitoring and Control

Measure 7.2: Technical Assistance for other Expenditure

Measure 7.3: Technical Assistance for Management, Implementation, Monitoring and Control for Priority 4

Measure 7.4: Technical Assistance for Management, Implementation, Monitoring and Control for Priority 5 and 6

Measure 7.5: Technical Assistance for other Expenditure for Priority 5 and 6

## 2.3 Programme evaluation

In March 2003 PLS RAMBOLL Management was awarded the contract for the mid-term evaluation of the original programme following competitive tender. The contract work was started on March and terminated in October 2003.

In June 2005 Ramboll Management was asked by the Managing Authority (MA) to undertake the update of the mid-term evaluation. Given the size of the update (15.000 EUR) Rambøll Management has been invited to undertake the update in a direct agreement with the Managing Authority. According to the article 42 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999<sup>1</sup> *the "mid-term evaluation shall be updated for each Community support framework and assistance and completed no later than 31 December 2005 in order to prepare for subsequent assistance operations."*

The objective of the mid-term evaluation 2003 was to improve the quality and relevance of programming. While the core of the 2003 evaluation was in the establishment, administrative structure and initial results of the ERDF assistance, the 2005 mid-term evaluation update will concentrate on effectiveness and efficiency as well as the achievements of outputs and results to date and the likely achievement of impacts of the main programme (refer the European Commission's Working Paper 9). The inclusion of the new structures, III A Priorities and the Neighbourhood part, into the programme, is currently at the stage the main Programme III B was at the time of the mid-term evaluation 2003. Therefore, the mid-term evaluation update will also look at the process of developing the necessary administrative structures and procedures for their implementation.

Based on the analysis undertaken in the mid-term evaluation update, conclusions will be drawn on the effectiveness and impacts of the programme implementation up to mid-2005. The outcome of the mid-term evaluation update will potentially be used to adjust the programme for its final stage of implementation in order to improve efficiency and to achieve the set objectives. It will also be used for future programming to maximize the socio-economic development of the region. Finally, the information will be used for the ex-post evaluation that will be the responsibility of the European Commission.

---

<sup>1</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999 of 21 June 1999 laying down general provisions on the Structural Funds(OJ L 161, 26.06.1999, p. 1).

2.4 Table 1: BSR – projects selected for evaluation

Appl. round	Title	Measure	ERDF funds (€)	Total budget (€)
1	South Baltic Arc	1,1	587.418,75	1.710.625,00
1	SuPortNet II	1,2	1.230.653,20	3.508.767,60
1	Baltic Welcome Center/ BWC	1,2	677.372,25	1.500.000,00
1	High Quality Tourism II	2,1	1.115.924,25	2.260.969,00
1	NeLoC	2,2	1.017.467,86	2.745.335,72
1	Crossing Fences	2,3	1.161.300,00	2.385.100,00
2	STRING II	1,1	1.067.763,80	2.135.527,60
2	Via Baltica Development Zone	1,1	2.076.513,00	4.081.600,00
2	Baltic Palette II	1,1	929.700,00	2.233.350,00
2	SEAGULL	1,1	1.300.440,00	3.223.905,00
2	BothnianArc-ACTion	1,2	644.956,00	1.033.220,00
2	Bioenergy Technology Transfer Network/ BTN	1,2	895.000,00	1.336.000,00
2	SEAREG	1,3	870.970,00	1.591.940,00
2	BALTCOAST	1,3	1.687.844,50	3.259.089,00
2	Connect Baltic Sea Region/ CBSR	2,1	385.000,00	2.905.000,00
2	Rural Development Connection	2,1	1.647.000,00	3.604.253,60
2	PIPE	2,1	456.000,00	2.106.810,00
2	COMPASS	2,1	309.560,00	619.120,00
2	MECIBS	2,1	1.580.374,00	2.940.748,00
2	SEBTrans-Link	2,2	935.100,00	2.260.200,00
2	Decision Support	2,2	954.612,00	2.606.426,00
2	First Class Industrial Park/ FCIP	2,2	1.031.250,00	1.661.250,00
2	VIKINGS	2,3	667.840,00	2.168.997,50
2	EuRoB - European Route of Brick Gothic	2,3	535.950,00	1.110.400,00
2	RANE	2,3	1.197.087,20	3.199.776,00
2	Baltic Sea Virtual Campus/ BSVC	3	1.424.500,00	3.349.000,00
2	EcoForumBaltica	3	380.000,00	1.060.000,00
3	BALTIC +	1,1	1.604.512,00	3.075.450,00
3	ISLANDS IN HISTORY	4 (2,3)	436.110,20	1.522.220,40
4	NEW HANSA	2,2	561.322,00	1.049.498,00

The 30 projects in the table were chosen together with the BSR Secretariat. Of the 30 projects only 9 had delivered a final report at the stage of evaluation, whereas 21 were in the final stages of implementation. Of these 3 projects did not deliver the requested material (survey questionnaire) in time to be included in the evaluation.

### 3. Methodology and approach

#### 3.1 The III B programme part

##### 3.1.1 *Effectiveness*

Effectiveness is used as a criterion for assessing and measuring the goal attainment of projects and the delivery system in the following dimensions:

1. **Effectiveness of project output:** The degree to which the expected (planned) outputs actually have been achieved for completed projects.
2. **Effectiveness of project results:** The immediate results that can be detected on the basis of the planned and achieved outputs for completed projects.
3. **Effectiveness of project impact:** The longer term impacts, which are likely to be achieved on the basis of the immediate achieved results for the recently completed projects.
4. **Effectiveness of project seed capital:** Based on 3-4 case studies, the influence of the proactive measures to the project quality as well as the effectiveness of the seed money facility in fostering the project preparation will be explored.

##### 3.1.2 *Efficiency*

Efficiency is used as a criterion for assessing and measuring the relation between actual effectiveness and the cost of achieving this on project:

5. **Efficiency of project output:** The possibility of the same outputs having been achieved via a more cost-effective alternative. The basis will be the finalized projects and in order to make the evaluation operational within the scope of the resources available efficiency will be analyzed as:
  - The degree of attaining the budget and time plan for all completed projects
  - Appraisal of the outcome of completed projects towards their objectives and used funding (project sample checks among the completed ones)
6. **Efficiency of the proactive measures:** Based on 3-4 case studies the efficiency of the current management and implementation structure of the seed-money facility will be analyzed.

##### 3.1.3 *Results and impact*

In the Terms of References (ToR), these issues are singled out as separate issues and also attached to the effectiveness analyses. However, in the proposed methodology these are only a part of the effectiveness analyses. With regards to evaluation output this technicality does not represent any difference.

### **3.2 The III A priorities and the Neighbourhood part**

Regarding the III A Priorities and the Neighbourhood Programme, the developments up to mid-2005 have been studied. The implementation of the III A Priorities has just begun and by the required time period, the very first projects will only have been selected. Consequently, the main emphasis of this part of the evaluation has been on the effectiveness of the programme management and implementation structures and procedures.

Also the effectiveness of the programming procedure, implementation structures and procedures of the Neighbourhood Programme has been evaluated, focusing on assessing the process of integrating the Neighbourhood part of the programme into the BSR INTERREG III B NP implementation structure.

**Table 2: Summary of evaluation issues and method – as agreed prior to the start of the evaluation:**

<i>Criteria/ level &amp; dimension</i>	<b>Programme level</b>	<b>Priority level</b>	<b>Project level</b>	<b>Delivery system level</b>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	Likelihood on whether the objectives of the programme will be achieved by 2008 <i>Evaluators assessment based on induction from information available.</i>	Conclusions concerning programme priorities 1 – 4 based on projections and estimations <i>Evaluators assessment based on induction from information available.</i>	Analysis of the outputs, results and expected impacts towards set objectives for the completed - or near to completed – projects. <i>Survey (questionnaire) i.e. projects' self-assessment; The assessment covers 27 final stage projects (9 fully terminated and 18 near to termination)</i>  <i>Desk research (evaluators assessment of the 27 project - scoring)</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Preliminary analysis on how the project quality has been improved or is likely to improve through the pro-active measures and seed money facility. <i>Survey (questionnaire).</i></li> <li>2) Assessment of the process of integrating the III A Priorities into the programme. <i>Interviewing.</i></li> <li>3) Assessment of the process of integrating the Neighbourhood part into the BSR III B implementation structure. <i>Interviewing.</i></li> </ol>
<b>Efficiency</b>	Conclusions concerning the programme level based on projections and estimations in so far as the completed projects at this stage cannot constitute a valid basis for full scope of the programme. <i>Evaluators assessment based on induction from information available.</i>	Conclusions concerning priorities 1 – 4 based on projections and estimations in so far as the completed projects at this stage cannot constitute a valid basis for full scope of the priorities. <i>Evaluators assessment based on induction from information available.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Analysis of the degree of attaining the budget and time plan for completed projects. <i>Survey (questionnaire).</i></li> <li>2) Appraisal of the outcome of completed projects towards their objectives and used funding (project sample checks among the completed ones). <i>Case study and interviewing</i></li> </ol>	Preliminary analysis on the proactive measures and seed money facility set-up. Based on 3-4 case studies the efficiency of the management and implementation structure of the seed-money facility has been analyzed. <i>Case study and interviewing</i>

## 4. Findings and conclusions

Using the methodological structure described in Table 2 the following sections pre-sent the findings and conclusions of the evaluation.

### 4.1 Project level

#### 4.1.1 Effectiveness - project output

The issue concerns the effectiveness of achieved project outputs. The focus of the evaluation is on achievement of intended (planned) outputs, whereas unintended out-puts have not been investigated. The assessment of the 27 final stage projects (9 fully terminated and 18 near to termination) has resulted in a value judgement on the output effectiveness of each project, giving a score according to a graduated scale. The evaluation of outputs has been done both as a self-assessment by the projects and as an evaluator assessment.

**Table 3: Project output - assessment by the project lead partners and the evaluator**

Assessment criteria	Are the project outputs produced so far in line with what was planned?	
	Projects (N=27)	Evaluator (N=27)
4 = Yes, fully	33%	22%
3 = Yes, mostly	59%	52%
2 = Only limited	7%	26%
1 = No, not at all	0%	0%
0 = Not applicable/too early to assess	0 projects	0 projects
	Average score: 3.3	Average score: 3.0

Looking at Table 3 roughly 1/3 of the projects (self-assessment) and 1/4 of the projects (evaluator) have fully produced the planned outputs. About half of the projects have – according to both the evaluator and the project leads – produced most of the outputs with minor changes. Examples of such minor changes/deviations are:

- ❖ Delays mainly caused by technical issues (e.g. in implementing registrations and databases and problems with registration of financial expenditures) but where catch up has more or less taken place
- ❖ Reorganization of activities (e.g. simplifying/joining seminars and workshops), but without changing the overall aim of the output

These deviations will not affect the overall achievement of the accumulated project outputs and are as such not a threat to the accumulated results following from the activities. Looking at the assessment Category 2 (only limited production of planned activities with profound changes needed to achieve the accumulated outputs planned) the evaluator's view on the produced outputs is generally less positive than that of the project lead partners.

26 % of the projects will need to undertake profound changes to be able to produce the planned output according to the evaluator, whereas the projects

themselves put this figure at 7%. Examples of deviations requiring profound changes are:

- ❖ Financial problems with partners from the new EU- and/or non-EU-Member States, who have not been able to receive the intended funding from Phare and/or Tacis, which in some cases has resulted in lack of activities in these countries.
- ❖ Delays in the implementation of work packages, which have resulted planned activities being postponed and not yet accomplished at this very late stage of project implementation period
- ❖ Delays concerning contract negotiation with the Joint Secretariat. The project should be at milestone 3, but is only carrying out milestone 2

The evaluator's assessment concerning Category 2 is more or less the same as in the mid-term evaluation. But at that stage many of the projects still had time to catch up/implement changes. This is now much more difficult (without project prolongation) given the late stage of the implementation. This surely will have an effect on the achievement of planned results.

#### 4.1.2 *Effectiveness - project results*

The issues of project results are logically linked to those of project outputs. It deals with the achievement of immediate results expected at the stage of project (application) planning. Whereas outputs are a consequence of the project activities, the results are the products of the outputs in wider context, i.e. the effect on the administrative/planning system and/or on the socio-economic situation. Outputs are normally controlled to a very high degree by the project management organisation, whereas results usually are partly outside such control, as results typically unfold around and after project termination and therefore are influenced by many other developments taking place in the society.

The screening of the selected 27 projects shows that there are only few clear results, as most projects are still in the final stage of implementation. Only few of the outputs have at this stage materialised in clear immediate results and practically no results are visible on the wider society (socio-economic effects). Consequently the assessors – the evaluator and the project lead partners taking part in the survey – have to a large degree been forced to make a qualified prediction as to the likelihood of outputs turning into intended results.

#### **Examples of results produced at this stage:**

- ❖ The Environmental Management Systems (EMS) handbook in Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian and Russian is now being reprinted in new editions in three languages (Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian) and is being used by a large number of companies, students and authorities etc. As of present a total number of over 1000 copies have been distributed and the demand is growing.
- ❖ NeLoC has produced a "Best Practice Handbook for Logistics Centres in the Baltic Sea Region" containing information for sustainable and effective logistic centres network activities and a "Service Concept Report for Logistics Centres" comprising innovative service concepts, which can be exploited within the frame of a logistics centre. The project has created and implemented a Pan-Baltic co-operation forum for logistics centres "Baltic Sea Forum on Logistics Centres" – LC-Forum. The idea of the LC-Forum is to enable transport and logistics business to play a major role within the freight network at the wide BSR level

- ❖ The Islands in History project has collected material focusing on the Baltic islands everyday life in the 14th century. This material includes subjects such as the daily life of a merchant's family on Gotland in 1320, the organisation and content of a magnate's house on Bornholm around 1320, and numerous other smaller areas such as drinking songs, the rituals of baptism or the practice of alchemy. This also includes compiling bibliographies of relevant literature on the islands in the middle ages.

**Examples of results not yet produced at this stage:**

- ❖ Construction of a holiday apartment boat, both prototype and functional prototype has not been started.
- ❖ Establishment of a permanent international tourism route for the whole Baltica Nordica has not been established.
- ❖ Partner's destination participation delayed in relation to their contributions to virtual visitor centre,
- ❖ The Baltic Palette II should have reached a permanent agreement with academic institutions. This has not yet been accomplished.

As for outputs, the assessment of expected results has concluded in a value judgement for each project, giving a score according to a graduated scale. But please note that this judgement is more uncertain than the output assessment.

**Table 4: Project results - assessment by the project lead partners and the evaluator Assessment criteria**

Assessment criteria	Are the accumulated project results produced so far in line with what was planned?	
	Projects (N=27)	Evaluator (N=27)
4 = Yes, fully	44%	22%
3 = Yes, most of it	52%	70%
2 = Only limited	4%	7%
1 = No, not at all	0%	0%
0 = Not applicable/too early to assess	0 projects	0 projects
	Average score: 3.4	Average score: 3.2

Table 4 shows that the lead partners in the survey find that 44% of the projects will be able fully to deliver the intended results (e.g. work packages/milestones) of the application form. The evaluator has this figure at 22%. The deviation in assessment is illustrated by the following two examples, where the lead partner has marked the project results as "category 4" and the evaluator has marked it as "category 3":

- ❖ Despite the lack of Phare funding, the project has achieved some results in the new EU-member states (Latvia and Poland). However, the lack of funding has decreased the scope of the project.
- ❖ The planned cooperation has been cancelled (including three technical universities in the project). This cooperation was one of the expected outcomes. Also, the objective that participating companies and authorities would have made investments for Euro 3.000.000 has not been accomplished.

For some projects the objectives stated in the application form are so unquantifiable that it is difficult to address whether or not these objectives have actually been achieved. For instance has the assessment of establishments of networks between project partners and external partners is in some cases been evaluated as not fulfilled by the evaluator. This is primarily the situation for projects where part of the objective is to create sustainable networks on a cross functional basis, but where there is no information provided that makes it likely that these networks will continue on a sustainable basis. In other words, if there are no evidence that the networks will be active beyond project period it is not considered as a long term sustainable result by the evaluator and therefore not put under Category 4 ("yes-fully").

Adding the figures of the Category 4 and 3 together the table shows that the project lead partners and the evaluator both expect more than 90% of the projects finally to be able to reach their intended results. However, the very big difference in the assessment is that the evaluator has much more projects in Category 3, which signals much higher uncertainty concerning the final outcome. Two issues are important here:

- ❖ Will the 18 projects still not completed really be able to remedy during the final stages of the implementation. Looking at the output problems experienced this is an open question that only a future ex post evaluation will be able to answer. Everything else is purely (qualified) prediction at this stage
- ❖ Is there an acceptable basis for making the assessment? The answer is no, not fully. As seen in Annex 2 and 3 the use of quantified indicators in finalised projects and the systematic assessment (matching) of the qualitative indicators (the ones used in the original application form with the achievements in the Final Reports) is inadequate. The evaluator - like in the mid term evaluation - feels somehow hampered by the inadequate use of indicators, which as a tendency leads to a more sceptical assessment by the evaluator than the one provided by the project lead partners in the survey.

#### **Achievement of larger investments**

According to the CIP/PC, and echoed in the application form, the projects are asked if they will lay grounds for large investments and - if that is the case - who will be responsible for its realisation. The evaluator has looked into the 21 projects that at the stage of application indicated that the project would lay grounds for an investment and found the following:

**Table 5: Expected investments – assessment by the project lead partners and the evaluator**

Assessment criteria	Is there any information in the project documentation, the questionnaire that points to the fact that this project will lead to/be a strong reason for a major investment?	
	Project	Evaluator
	(N=21)	(N=21)
3 = Yes, surely	29%	0%
2 = Yes, probably	52%	76%
1 = No, not at all	19%	24%
0 = Not applicable/too early to assess	0 projects	4 projects
	Average score: 2.1	Average score: 1.8

Four projects have been categorised “non applicable” as they only indicate vaguely in the application form that investments are intended as a result of the project. This has not been considered comprehensive enough to be categorised as ‘large’ investments.

According to the evaluator’s screening of the reports none of the remaining 17 projects have at this stage a clear indication of a future investment looking fully likely at this stage, whereas 76% of the projects could maybe lead to major investments. The project survey among lead partners is much more optimistic here, stating that 29% will lay grounds for any further investments and 52% probably.

Despite the difference between the evaluator and the project lead partners, it is certain (from the figures) that far from all the projects that intended an investment will be able to do so.

#### 4.1.3 *Effectiveness - project impact*

Due to a combination of the nature of the INTERREG III B projects and the indicator problem mentioned above it is not possible to follow the recommendations in the European Commissions Working Paper 9 concerning assessment of impact by using specific core indicators.

The evaluator has therefore – as an alternative – looked at impact from the point of view of project durability, e.g. is it likely that the projects will continue in such a way that results will turn into impacts. As seen in Table 6 the need for a project continuation is regarded as high in order to secure the full impact (73% of the projects).

**Table 6: Need for project continuation – project self assessment**

No. of projects	%	Would it be relevant to continue the project activities after project termination in order to secure the full impact - or higher impact - of the project results achieved during the project implementation
19	73%	Yes, surely
4	15%	Yes, to some extent
3	12%	No, not needed

Following this the evaluator has asked the lead partners (Table 7) about the commitment to continue project activities after project termination. There seems to be a rather high commitment to this, which is also what the final reports indicate.

**Table 7: Commitment to continue activities – project self assessment**

No. of projects	%	Commitment to continuing the project activities, or the continued building on the project preparing activities, after project termination
1	4%	No commitment
5	21%	Vague commitment from competent authorities
18	75%	Clear commitment from competent authorities <sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Project partner authorities or other competent authorities

**Example of a clear commitment:**

- ❖ The 6 main partners within STRING have made a commitment (a political resolution) defining the cooperation 2004-2007. Furthermore the other STRING partners are continuing some project activities
- ❖ Commitment has been given from both the Finnish Ministry of the Environment, plus cities and authorities supporting the subsidiary project: Baltic Sea Solutions.

**Example of a vague commitment:**

- ❖ There is *supposed* to be a political cooperation after the ending of the project. Probably also organizational cooperation between Farmers Unions, etc.
- ❖ There is a follow up project that partly uses the results of the former project and develops those further. The partnership has been widened.

All in all (Table 6 and 7 together) the answers from the lead partners signals a major need, but also a high commitment, to continue the activities and thereby sustain the results and wider impact. In sum this indicates that there will be a high degree of durability if this commitment is realised. However, as shown in Table 8 the likely project durability is a bit less positive assessed by the evaluator.

**Table 8: Durability of project results – evaluator’s assessment**

Assessment criteria	Is there clear information in the project documentation or the questionnaire that points to the fact that the project results will be utilised/financed/continued in such a way that the long-term project objectives will be sustained?
	N=27
<b>4 = Yes, absolutely</b>	26%
<b>3 = Yes, to a certain degree</b>	44%
<b>2 = Yes, but in a limited way</b>	30%
<b>1 = No, not at all</b>	0%
<b>0 = Not applicable/too early</b>	0 projects

**An example of a category 4 project in Table 8 above:**

- ❖ The project contributed largely to the incubation of entrepreneurial projects, which have turned out successfully, in concerns of getting people in jobs, and building cross-sectored networks with opportunities of sharing competences and knowledge. Networks including both larger private companies and public authorities have been established in a wide scale to insure continuation of the project.

**An example of a category 3 project in Table 8 above:**

- ❖ The project has carried out research and development in the field of bio-energy on a trans-national basis, which was one of the main objectives in the project. However the dissemination in spreading knowledge on the subject to other regions and getting commitment from these has not been as comprehensive as intended, therefore the results will only be sustained to a certain degree.

**An example of a category 2 project in Table 8 above:**

- ❖ The continuing of the project is a matter of initiatives and commitment from the various local and national authorities. Whether or not the services (harbour environment etc.) will be further developed after termination of the project can only be judged upon predictions. So far, the project has only received very vague commitment.

The overall conclusion is that durability is middle (evaluator) to high (projects) and that the sustainability of project impacts consequently is likely in most cases. On the other hand it is also likely that 20-30% of the projects will fade away during the years to come. Whether or not this result is acceptable for a programme as III B depends on the policy expectations at the stage of formulating the programme. These are not clear from the programme documents.

#### 4.1.4 Efficiency

The issue concerns the possibility of achieving the same/better project outputs with fewer or the same resources, i.e. finding more cost-effective alternatives via:

- ❖ Either lower cost alternatives with the same effectiveness; or
- ❖ Alternatives with same costs but higher output effectiveness.

In order to simplify the evaluation it was agreed with the MA to approach the issue in the following way:

- ❖ Survey (questionnaire) of the degree to which finalized projects have attained the planned budget and time plan
- ❖ Survey (questionnaire) of all finalized projects concerning the overall possibility of implementing the project in a more cost-effective way
- ❖ Interviewing of selected projects concerning the options for higher cost-effectiveness

The outcome of this approach is shown below:

**Table 9: Main reasons for implementation delays – self assessment**

No. of projects	%	Reason
6	22%	Problems with partners
4	15%	Problems with financing
5	19%	Technical problems with studies, permissions etc.
5	19%	Problems with BSR Authority's final acceptance
3	11%	Other (please specify): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-planning of the activities</li> <li>• Facilitation of dissemination and accounting</li> <li>• Lack of regional political commitment</li> </ul>

All together 15 of the evaluated 27 projects were delayed for different reasons as shown in Table 9.

#### **Examples of problems with partners:**

- ❖ Preparation of marketing tools prepared within the project required intensive co-operation with project partners; this cooperation was partly insufficient and delayed the production of the material. Also, the wrapping up of the project took longer time than expected
- ❖ Some partners were delayed in implementing their activities, and therefore the budget has not been utilised within the given project period, which was the reason why the project has been prolonged
- ❖ Information board and on-site installations delayed due to a late start by a few of the partners

**Examples of problems with financing:**

- ❖ Application had to be amended in order to ensure project activities TA-CIS / PHARE
- ❖ Late payments put constraints on cash flow resulting in delay of the project
- ❖ Partners reported their costs incorrectly, which was discovered quite late in the project

**Examples of technical problems with studies, permission etc:**

- ❖ Development of applied 3D-displaying technique delayed (break through technology)
- ❖ Complicated to get hold of data; data had to be produced by the project team

**Examples of the delays related to the BSR Authority's final acceptance of the application:**

- ❖ Investigation into possible economical irregularities caused a six months total stop in the activities

**Table 10: Budget changes – self assessment**

No. of projects	%	Reason
14	58%	The project has kept the original budget costs
1	4%	The project has increased the budget costs
9	38%	The project has decreased the budget costs

**Examples of decreased budget:**

- ❖ Some planned studies and activities have not been implemented
- ❖ Project did not use all funds due to favourable contracts with suppliers
- ❖ One partner had problems in realization of a small-scale investment
- ❖ Planned travel and accommodation budget was too high (less expensive, fewer trips of single partners);
- ❖ Less money spent on brochures

**Examples of increased budget**

- ❖ Supplementary funding from other sources concerning the participation of associated partners

**Table 11: Assessment of cost-effectiveness**

Assessment criteria	Could the project have been organized in a more cost-effective way?	
	Project (N=27)	Evaluator (N=27)
3 = Yes, very much	0%	4%
2 = Yes, to some degree	15%	67%
1 = No, not at all	85%	30%
0 = Not applicable/too early to assess	0 projects	0 projects
	Average score: 1.2	Average score: 1.7

**Examples of category 1 in Table 11 (evaluator's assessment):**

- ❖ Project has been delayed with a month. Considering the complexity of this project and the expected project duration of 36 month, this delay does not seem alarming. The project has achieved anticipated objectives with only a few deviations, without exceeding the budget.
- ❖ The problems that this project has encountered have all been of external character, which the project management has not possible been able to fore-see.

**Examples of category 2 in Table 11 (evaluator's assessment):**

- ❖ The delay is partly caused by some partners' inability to report financial expenses correct. These mistakes were discovered rather late in the process. These errors could have been encountered by better information/communication to the involved partners
- ❖ The time schedule has been prolonged six month due to problems of external character (Secretariat and problems with funding from Phare). Budget has been kept and planned activities seem reachable concerning the prolongation

**Examples of category 3 in Table 11 (evaluator's assessment):**

- ❖ Inability to establish a connection with the three universities in the Baltech co-operation and inability to connect with partners and authorities on an agreement on investments, points to the fact that the managing of the sub-projects have been too loose

One main theme concerning cost-effectiveness, which has been evident through the interviews with selected project managers, is the relation between efficiency and the extent to which management should be a centralized or a decentralized process. The indications from the four interviewed project managers are that the management of the projects could have been more efficient, if a more centralized decision making process had occurred.

The advantage of the decentralized decision making is however, as also pointed out by the managers, that it gives the partners a better incitement for engagement in the project. Especially in concerns of projects where dynamic development processes are taking place, it is stated that the decentralized structure encourages the project partners to be dedicated to the project. On the other hand the decentralized structure can also create a lack of control of the project partners, which can lead to unawareness of what the project partners are doing, and in which direction their result are actually going.

For financial matters and technical issues a centralized set-up is recommended by the managers, as it positively influences the ability of management and monitoring of sub divisions. The number of partners involved in a project varies from one project to the other. In order to make the projects as comprehensive as possible it is desired to involve a large number of partners from a large number of nations within the BSR. However, the more partners involved in the projects, the more difficult the management of the projects will be. It is therefore more likely for a project of bigger scope not to fulfil as many results as intended (or at least for some of the involved project partners not to fulfil the intended result) compared to projects involving fewer partners. In addition the mix of nations included in the various projects also adds a dimension in terms of project management, as the inclusion of different nations increase, so does the difficulties in project management due to different cultural and linguistic barriers. It is therefore, in relation to cost-effectiveness, essential to assess the complexity of the project set-up.

## 4.2 Programme level

### 4.2.1 *Impact of the programme and its priorities*

This section deals with tentative value judgements towards the expected impact of the overall programme, based on a concluding assessment of the expected project level output/immediate results and their likelihood of eventually contributing to the objectives of the Programme Complement and the CIP. Impact is here defined as the far-reaching consequences of the programme and is based on the evaluator's projection/assessment, as the actual impact of the programme is yet to be seen. This is an important point to note and appreciate, as the full and real programme impact will only be seen years after programme termination. The analyses are - as for the project assessments - based on the evaluator's judgement of the selected projects. Like in the Mid-term Evaluations the basis for the evaluator's assessment of overall impact is the following three questions:

1. *Project results:* Are the planned accumulated results of the project's work packages planned in the application form likely to be achieved after project termination? (already shown in Table 4)
2. *Project durability:* Is there any information in the project's documentation, the questionnaire or interviewing that points to the fact that the partnership will continue after the project termination without continued external funding? (already shown in Table 8)
3. *Project concept:* Is there any information in the project's documentation, the questionnaire or interviewing that points to the fact that the project concept has brought a new/extra dimension to the BSR-region that could not have been achieved with-out the technical/professional co-operation within the project? (Table 12 below)

**Table 12: Assessment of concept additionality**

Assessment criteria	Is there information in the project documentation, the questionnaire or interviewing that points to the fact that the project idea has brought a new/extra dimension to the BSR-region that could not have been achieved without the technical/professional co-operation within the project?
	Evaluator <sup>3</sup>
	(N=27)
4 = Yes, absolutely	26%
3 = Yes, to a certain degree	59%
2 = Yes, but in a limited way	15%
1 = No, not at all	0%

Generally all of the projects bring a new dimension to the BSR. Mainly because of the cross-national cooperation supported by the programme, new dimensions are discovered in term of potential scope and comprehensiveness. As an additional view on the additionality assessment, it is questioned whether or not an alternative to the project activities would/could have happened without the set-up available through the programme.

<sup>3</sup> Note that the "base line" for assessing the degree of new dimension is the broad in house knowledge of Ramboll Management; i.e. what the evaluator finds to be a new dimension.

**Examples of an assessment of Category 4:**

- ❖ The idea of enhancing the overall tourism service of the BSR-region does bring a new dimension to the region, which probably would only have occurred on a much smaller scale with out the emergence of this project
- ❖ The idea of developing a best practice for dealing with environmental issues in harbour areas on a transnational basis does bring a new dimension to the BSR. Especially concerning the scope of nationalities this project is including.

**Examples of an assessment of Category 3:**

- ❖ The idea of researching in Viking heritage is in no way original, however the scale of the project and the possible synergies of this scale, does bring a new dimension, which would probably not have aroused with out the development of this project.
- ❖ The idea of e-learning and taken academic degrees online is not new, as several companies offer that service. The new dimension in the project exists in the joining of already established educational institutions in order to offer this new service. Through this a legitimate educational program that is comparable to the traditional academic educations, has been established.

**Examples of an assessment of Category 2:**

- ❖ The project does bring a new dimension to the BSR as an opportunity to develop the ideas and findings of the former SEB-Trans project, focusing on infrastructure development of the North-South corridors. However the trans-national cooperation is very limited and traditional.

The scoring on results, durability and concept can be summarised as this:

**Table 13: Evaluator assessment of project impact related dimensions**

Assessment criteria	Results (N=27)	Durability (N=27)	Concept (N=27)
4 = Yes, fully	22%	26%	26%
3 = Yes, most of it	70%	44%	59%
2 = Only limited	7%	30%	15%
1 = No, not at all	0%	0%	0%
0 = Not applicable/too early to assess	0 projects	0 projects	0 projects
	Av: 3.4	Av: 2.9	Av: 3.7

It is not possible to combine the figures in the different columns above (results, durability and concept value) into one single figure. However, if durability is a condition for results turning into impacts one can expect about 75% of the projects to have a full or nearly full impact and 25% to have very little or no impact. This figure is actually higher than in the mid-term evaluation. Please note that this is due to the fact that the Category 3 for Results is higher (70% against 35% in MT) and because Category 3 for Durability is higher (44% against 30% in the MT). As pointed out before, this signals a major insecurity in the evaluation of the projects, mainly due to the fact that the indicators of achievement are very weak. In the final ex post evaluation this could turn out with lower figures (impact), because the final outcome of the projects would be easier to assess and therefore categorise.

The issue of concept has a higher score than results/durability, as about 85% of the projects score relatively high and 15% relatively low. This figure is also higher than in the mid-term, and considered pretty accurate. This means that the additionality of the project concepts and ideas is relatively high.

The combination of expected result and their durability, combined with the additionality of the project ideas and concepts, leads the evaluator to conclude that the impact on programme level is higher than the direct project impact. Ideas about how best to address transnational problems and develop the BSR region would simply not be generated without the BSR programme. Although there are many reasons for the competent BSR authorities to work on improving the direct impact of the programme, there are however also reasons for being satisfied with the high degree of concept additionality and what this adds to the overall impact of the programme.

### 4.3 Delivery system level

#### 4.3.1 Effect of pro-active measures

As an integrated part of the questionnaires going to all projects, and in interviewing of selected projects, the evaluator has analysed the effect of pro-active measures. The results are shown below.

**Table 14: Self-assessment of partner search**

Has partner search seminars helped you to establish a better and more effective project?		
	N=27	%
Yes, very much	0	0%
Yes, to a certain degree	4	15%
No, not really	6	22%
Did not participate in such events	17 <sup>4</sup>	63%

**Table 15: Self-assessment of quality seminars**

Has quality seminars helped you to develop and steer your project in a more effective direction?		
	N=27	%
Yes, very much	3	11%
Yes, to a certain degree	5	19%
No, not really	5	19%
Did not participate in such events	14 <sup>5</sup>	52%

<sup>4</sup> The facility was not available from the beginning of the programme, which explains the low participation among the evaluated projects

<sup>5</sup> do.

**Table 16: Projects' self-assessment of seed capital**

Influence of seed capital on project generation		
	N=27	%
Seed capital helped generate a better quality project and eventually a more effective project?	2 <sup>6</sup>	7%
Seed capital did not make much difference on quality/effectiveness, but on partner involvement	0	0%
Did not make any significant difference on either quality/effectiveness or partner involvement	0	0%
Did not receive seed capital	25	93%

Unfortunately the number of completed projects receiving support from the pro active measures is too little to make a defensible comparison with projects not receiving this. Preliminary conclusions drawn on the basis of the figures in Table 12, 13 and 14 are:

- ❖ Partner search seminars (organised by the JTS) have a positive effect, but does apparently not make a substantial difference
- ❖ Quality seminars (organised by the JTS during implementation) have a positive effect that is higher than the partner search seminars, but again does not make a unique difference
- ❖ Seed money has a substantial impact on the few projects that received this type of funding

#### 4.3.2 *Integration of the Neighbourhood programme*

##### 4.3.2.1 Background

In July 2003, the Commission adopted the communication "Paving the Way for a New Neighbourhood Instrument" as the basis on which the new Neighbourhood Programmes (NP) were to be developed. The Neighbourhood Programmes are intended to foster cooperation with neighbouring non-candidate countries through better coordination of existing instruments like INTERREG with TACIS CBC. The Neighbourhood Programmes cover the transitional period of 2004 – 2006 to prepare the adoption of the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) after 2006. The BSR INTERREG III B was reprogrammed to include the new Neighbourhood Programme elements and renamed BSR INTERREG III B Neighbourhood Programme. In the BSR, Russia's Western regions and Belarus were covered by the NP. As a part of this reprogramming, an option for bilateral maritime cooperation was furthermore opened. The revised programme document was adopted by the Commission in October 2004.

---

<sup>6</sup> As the introduction of the seed capital facility was not fully available from the beginning of the programme, only few of the evaluated projects have had the opportunity to use this special support. Since then several other projects have taken advantage of the facility. The BSR Secretariat has conducted an internal assessment that points to the fact that these projects have benefited positively from receiving seed capital.

#### 4.3.2.2 Observations

##### *Top down approach*

As mentioned above it was policy at the Commission and Community level that drove the introduction of the NP, i.e. politics rather than concerns about the way the INTERREG programme(s) was running. This is very clear from the documents issued by the Commission on paving the way for the ENPI and the guidelines for the practical implementation of the new NP programme. The different material available for the evaluation shows the NP initiative however was very well received, or at least accepted, by the BSR authorities and stakeholders. The existing BSR countries – some however more than others – saw the new programme as an opportunity. E.g. the NP now also covers social issues (e.g. health and crime) that normally would be dealt with in a bilateral approach and not under IIIB. With regards to co-operation this opportunity was seen as particularly important for countries like Sweden and Russia.

##### *Efficient programme amendment*

The whole programme amendment has been professionally and comprehensively implemented, although it is difficult to assess the profoundness of the policy discussions that have taken place in relation to the change of the programme. However, the actual programme text signals dedication and commitment. So does the outcome of the huge – and by the Commission appreciated - technical adjustment of the application procedure and form to allow for joint application between the BSR eligible EU-countries, Russia and Belarus.

It is difficult to assess the negative effects of the comprehensive programme rework, but there are indications from interviewing that points to the fact that time has been taken away from the daily programme implementation, i.e. there has been less resources available for the ongoing assessment of applications and monitoring of projects both at the level of the Steering Committee and the Secretariat.

##### *Programme accessibility not easier*

Whether or not the joint application procedure and form has contributed to ease the process of applying can be questioned. On one hand it is clearly a necessary pre-condition for joint application, but on the other it has certainly not become easier to deal with. For some organisations that are not a part of the BSR establishment it might appear as 'inside information'. An indication of the growing complexity of the programme is the fact that the Programme Manual has e.g. grown with 50% from the 7th to the 8th application round to take account of the first full application round with the new measures under Priority 3 in use. Information and application support seems like an area that will have to be stressed (even more) in the future to secure equal and easy accessibility to and participation in the programme.

##### *Impact yet to be seen*

The impact of the new NP will have to be judged against the number of applications received and projects approved with Russian/Belarusian participation and the quality of these. Because of the political problems with signing the partnership agreement with the European Union the participation of partners from Russia/Belarus was delayed until early 2005.

**Table 17: Russian and Belarusian project participation in III B**

Round		Applications				Contracted projects				
No.	Date	Received	BY partners	RU partners	Total partners	Winners	With BY	With RU	Total	Supported by Tacis
1	Dec 01	39	1	13	<b>14</b>	6	0	2	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
2	May 02	60	3	28	<b>31</b>	21	1	11	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>
3	Dec 02	37	2	20	<b>22</b>	16	2	9	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>
4	Jun 03	19	2	9	<b>11</b>	6	0	3	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
5	Jun 04	39	3	18	<b>21</b>	19	2	8	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
6	Dec 04	32	3	15	<b>18</b>	15	2	10	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>
7	Jun 05	46	5	21	<b>26</b>	17	4	10	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>
8	Dec 05	52 <sup>7</sup>	3	34	<b>37</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Total</b>		<b>336</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>180</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>15</b>

Table 17 shows that with regards to applications the number of Russian partners is increasing rapidly, whereas there is no such tendency on the Belarusian side. It is still too early to know if this tendency holds and if it will be passed on to the winning (contracted) projects. Although the impact (in terms of long term effect and quality) is impossible to predict at this stage, the preliminary figures raise a question on what needs to be done to involve more Belarusian partners. It seems that these have not really been able to access the programme.

#### 4.3.3 Integration of the INTERREG III A priorities

##### *Background*

Also as a result of the enlargement two new INTERREG IIIA cross-border cooperation priorities have been integrated into the NP programme. One priority is for Estonia-Latvia-Russia (North) and the other for Latvia-Lithuania-Belarus (South), using the existing implementation structures to manage the priorities, however with each their Steering Committee and support by a secretarial branch office in Riga.

##### *Top down approach*

The arrangement with inclusion of IIIA builds on a proposal from the European Commission and has effectively been accepted by the old and new member states. The idea of using the implementation system of BSR INTERREG IIIB for the implementation of INTERREG IIIA during the remaining programme period seems well justified from the point of view of generating experience and efficiency. Although the decision has been imposed on the

<sup>7</sup> The total number of applications received was 64. However, 12 were upgrading of old submissions, which for the first time was made possible in this application round.

old/new member states there seems to be full consensus on the matter among the involved parties.

*Efficient programme elaboration and management*

Compared to the time normally used to establish a new programme the work has been swift and efficient and the system was ready for receiving the first applications in January 2005. The IIIA working groups set up to establish the new priorities have reached agreements in time and the two new Steering Committees have effectively been established. There is apparently an active and high participation in the IIIA ST-meetings and the members are well prepared and informed about the projects. They often have pre-meetings to insure the sufficient knowledge of specific projects. The two new Committees are probably more oriented towards concrete issues than the Steering Committee of IIIB, due to the fact that the IIIA projects are easier to comprehend than the more complex IIIB projects

*Programme accessibility relatively easy*

The new Riga branch office has worked hard with information to potential applicants and to avoid confusion between IIIA and IIIB priorities. It has used the website, special manuals, seminars and direct office personnel assistance to inform applicants. There is however no advertising on the programme's call for proposals. The office has not prioritised that due to the size of the countries that apply. The remarks concerning the joint application form as mentioned above for the IIIB-part naturally also apply to the IIIA-part.

*Impact yet to be seen*

The impact of the new NP will have to be judged against the number of applications received and projects approved with Russian/Belarusian participation and the quality of these. Because of the political problems with signing the partnership agreement with the European Union the participation of partners from Russia/Belarus was delayed until early 2005.

**Table 18: Russian and Belarusian project participation in III A**

Round		Applications			Contracted projects			
No.	Date	Received	BY partners	RU partners	Winners	With BY	With RU	Sup-ported by Tacis
North 1	Jan 2005	21	n/a	0	6	n/a	0	0
North 2	Jun 2005	15	n/a	4	5	n/a	1	0
South 1	Jan 2005	31	7	n/a	6	2	n/a	0
South 2	Jun 2005	21	6	n/a	9	4	n/a	2
<b>Total</b>		<b>88</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>

Table 18 does also show – as Table 17 for projects under III B – that with regards to applications the number of Russian partners is increasing, whereas there is no such tendency on the Belarusian side. Again it is much too early to say if this tendency holds and if it will be passed on to the winning (contracted) projects. So far the latter is not the case. During the interviewing it has become evident that there is a problem with regards to involv-

ing Belarusian partners. This is mainly due to the Belarusian Government, which is controlling the process and applicants in a way that makes it difficult for Belarusian organisations, especially on local level, to apply without prior “central endorsement”.

## 5. Lessons and recommendations

### 5.1 Project level

#### 5.1.1 *Achievements of project output*

It is the evaluators assessment that 3/4 of the projects more or less will achieve their intended outputs. The last 1/4 will only achieve this with profound changes, which naturally is only possible for the still not completed projects (9 of the 27 evaluated projects).

Typical output problems relate to:

- ❖ Financial problems with Phare and/or Tacis financing
- ❖ Planned activities being postponed and not yet accomplished
- ❖ Delays concerning contract negotiation with the Joint Secretariat

The Phare financial problem is now solved. The Tacis financial problem is probably solved to the degree possible by the new NP arrangements. Concerning delays in planned activities, the key to avoiding this is a more effective project steering (see Section 5.1.4 below). With regards to interventions from the secretariat this should carefully be considered and, if and when needed, undertaken in a dialogue with the projects in order to assist them in how best to remedy the consequences of imposed delays.

Where reduced output appears the Steering Committee should assess this carefully and be willing to accept this, if there are good explanations (external uncontrollable factors) and/or if the single project in question has still achieved relevant and good results. Where this is not the case financial reductions of the project grant might be appropriate.

#### 5.1.2 *Achievements of project results*

Bearing in mind the output problems experienced for many of the projects, one should be very cautious in expecting that these problems will be fully remedied in such a way that the expected results are going to be fully achieved. The evaluator estimates that 22% of the projects will reach their results fully and 70% partly. The rest will only achieve the planned results in a limited way. It should be noted that "limited" covers a continuum, where some projects will reach more and others very little of the planned results

One single important problem in achieving the expected results is the fact that major intended investments will be difficult to reach for about 25% of the projects that at the planning stage intended to lead to investments. However, for the rest of the projects (75%) there is a lack of clear evidence and substantiation of how to obtain the investments. Despite this doubt the evaluator has assessed that positive outcome is likely. But it must be stressed that at best only 75% of the projects will actually lead to major investments.

A special problem in assessing investments – and results in general – is the low quality of the indicators used in the application form. As demonstrated in Annex 2 and 3 quantitative result indicators are missing in almost every single case and the qualitative indicators are badly applied. The special Final Report template introduced by the secretariat on "results" has apparently not forced the projects to be more precise in describing their achievements. The reading of the 9 completed projects makes the evaluator to suggest that something radical needs to be done on the issue of indicators.

Otherwise it will not be possible for project and programme planners to:

- ❖ Measure results and impacts and therefore draw useful lessons on how to improve the design of future programmes like the BSR
- ❖ Demonstrate accountability towards the participating (and financing) partners and stake holders

The responsible authorities and players should carefully consider this issue for the future programmes, but not only that. The evaluator recommends to define (reconstruct) at least one key indicator for each expected results of all not yet completed work packages. Such key indicators must be described precisely in both a qualitative and quantitative way.

It is recommended that the Steering Committee, based on a proposal from the secretariat, propose such indicators to the project Lead Partner based on the principle *“what would we as a minimum expect from this Work Package in terms of a clear and durable result that unfolds at the latest within one year after project termination – described and indicated as quantitative as possible”*

Clearly this would imply a thorough discussion with the project lead partners and these might not finally agree with the SC on the suggested result and constructed indicators. However, this is not really important, as the aim is not about controlling the project, but about the programme authorities learning what is actually appropriate to expect (when public money is spent) and what is actually possible to achieve (in the real world).

### 5.1.3 *Achievements of project impact*

Due to a combination of the nature of the INTERREG III B projects and the indicator problem mentioned above it is not possible to follow the recommendations in the European Commissions Working Paper 9 concerning assessment of impact by using specific core indicators.

The evaluator has therefore – as an alternative – looked at impact from the point of view of project durability, e.g. is it likely that the projects will continue in such a way that results will turn into impacts.

The overall conclusion is that durability is middle to high and that the sustainability of project impacts consequently is likely in most cases. There is however a real risk that a minor part of the projects (20-30%) will see their results fade away during the years to come.

The durability problems occur when the internal commitment is weak or where relevant external competent authorities have not been involved (no commitment from e.g. from state authorities). Whereas the high involvement of local and regional authorities is a sound and good feature of the programme, it should be clarified for each single application if a possible involvement of – or external commitment from – additional competent authorities is needed in order to create a stronger and more balanced partnership and project framework in relation to securing the durability of the project results. It is the responsibility of the Steering Committee to pursue this issue.

#### 5.1.4 *Project efficiency*

The issue concerns the possibility of achieving the same/better project outputs with fewer or the same resources, i.e. finding more cost-effective alternatives. In order to simplify the evaluation of this issue it was agreed with the MA to approach the issue drawing an overall conclusion, based on cases and a survey of how the projects have attained their time and budget plans. The single most important issue related to efficiency is delay in implementation. As mentioned in Section 5.1.1 there are different reasons for this:

- ❖ External reasons, like lack of external funding and delays in approval/payment from the BSR-authorities
- ❖ Internal reasons, like partners lacking behind or too complex project set up

In relation to the latter it is recommended, based on interviewing with project managers, to avoid projects with too many partners, unless this is concretely justified/needed to achieve the project objectives. Size in itself cannot be a goal. Secondly, regardless of the number of partners, considerations should be given to intensifying the partnership commitments, not just at political level, but also in relation to the technical part of the implementation.

## 5.2 **Programme level**

### 5.2.1 *Impact of the programme and its priorities*

The assessment of expected impact of the projects under the programme is constructed on the basis of a combined assessment of project results, durability and idea/concept. Concerning results and durability combined (leaving out the less tangible notion of idea/concept) it is expected that about 3/4 of the projects will have a full or nearly full impact as intended and 1/4 will have very limited impact. This figure is actually higher than in the mid-term evaluation, but it should be noted that there is a major insecurity related to these figures because of the fact that the indicators of achievement for results are so weak.

Looking at project idea/concept alone the rating is slightly better than for results/durability in the evaluation, which demonstrates a clear additionality of most of the project concepts/ ideas. The integration of expected result and their durability, combined with the additionality of the project ideas and concepts, points to the fact that the impact of the programme is higher than the direct impact of single projects.

The lesson is that ideas about how best to address transnational problems and how to develop the BSR region would simply not be generated to the same degree without the type of initiative that the BSR programme represents.

The recommendation is therefore to continue with the chosen programme concept for partnership and idea/concept generation, but adjust it for the efficiency problems related to huge partnerships and at the same time work harder with improving the likelihood for real and more tangible results of the ideas/concept, e.g. in relation to major investments.

### 5.2.2 *Effectiveness of pro-active measures*

Unfortunately the number of completed projects receiving support from the pro-active measures is too little to make a defensible comparison with projects not receiving this. Preliminary conclusions drawn on the basis of the evaluation shows that:

- ❖ Partner search seminars (organised by the JTS) have a positive effect, but does apparently not make a substantial difference
- ❖ Quality seminars (organised by the JTS during implementation) have a positive effect that is higher than the partner search seminars, but again does not make a unique difference
- ❖ Seed money has a substantial impact on the few projects that received this type of funding

It is recommended to continue with all three activities and to re-evaluate on a stronger statistical basis.

### 5.2.3 *Integration of the Neighbourhood programme and INTERREG III A*

It was the European Commission that drove the introduction of the NP and the integration of INTERREG III A into the new programme. It was policy at the macro level that was behind the former and practicalities that was behind the latter. Both the old and new BSR EU-countries welcomed and accepted this approach by the Commission and also saw it as an opportunity – some however more than others – to include a bilateral approach under IIIB.

The whole programme amendment (both with NP and III A) has been swiftly implemented; although it is difficult to assess the profoundness of the policy discussions that have taken place in relation to the change of the programme. The actual programme text signals dedication and commitment. So does the outcome of the huge technical adjustment of the application procedure and form, which now allows for joint applications between the BSR eligible EU-countries and Russia/Belarus. The new IIIA Steering Committees have effectively been established and are working with high participation and insight on this matter.

Only a few problems stand out following the successful programme amendment:

- ❖ **Accessibility:** The joint application procedure seems very complex and difficult to handle for organisations that are new to the programme and not a part of the “BSR establishment”. It is consequently recommended to put more emphasis on external information and assistance. As a minimum the application rounds should be publicly announced.
- ❖ **Integration of non-EU partners:** The impact of the new NP programme and the III A priorities are yet to be seen on the project result level. The tendency in the applications received for the latest application rounds signals a good Russian participation, but a too low Belarusian participation. The BSR authorities, not at least the Commission, will need to explore and try to solve the type of problems behind the low Belarusian participation. There are indications that the reasons are political rather than technical.
- ❖ **Resource drain:** Interviewing points to the fact that time has been taken away from the daily programme implementation because of the comprehensive programme rework, i.e. there has been less resources available for the ongoing assessment of applications and monitoring of projects both at the level of the Steering Committee and the Secretariat.

## Annex 1: List of interviews and material used

<b>Interviewee</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Date</b>
1. Susanne Scherrer, JTS	Telephone	September 2005
2. Marta Plichta, JTS	Telephone	September 2005
3. Ieva Kalnina, JTS	Telephone	September 2005
4. Harry Ekestam, III B Steering Committee	Telephone	September 2005
5. Marijus Gudynas, III A South St.Com (Chair)	Telephone	September 2005
6. Jan-Henrik Johansson, PM Baltic Palette	Telephone	September 2005
7. Rolf A. Karlson, PM Seagull	Telephone	September 2005
8. Carina Johnsson, PM Baltic+	Telephone	September 2005
9. Gunnar Platz, PM SupportNet II	Telephone	October 2005
10. Niels Bjerring Hansen, DG Regio (now former)	Telephone	October 2005

## Annex 2: Overall project impact – quantification

The following table shows the results of analysing the use of quantified indicators in the application forms and final reports.

- ❖ The statements are more or less randomly chosen as an illustration of how the project's intended impacts are described and explicated in the various application forms.
- ❖ The use of indicators (and the possible reconstruction of these if absent in the application) in the Final reports
- ❖ Evaluator's example of possible quantifications that could have been applied

<b>Project:</b>	<b>Baltic Palette</b>
Is an overall aim (impact) stated in the application form?	Yes: <i>'In the year 2020 BPR will be known as a globally competitive research and business arena.'</i>
Are the results of the work packages quantifiable in the application form? Example:	No: WP 2: <i>'To develop a comprehensive and efficient network for passenger travel and cargo traffic within a poly-centric urban system, to co-ordinate development of transport corridors in the BPR and to form inter-modal transport strategies.'</i>
If yes, what are the indicators?	-
Are the results reconstructed in a quantifiable way in the final report, and what are the indicators?	No.
Example of an alternative quantified result:	Establishment of a comprehensive network involving at least 15 private partners/companies and at least 2 public authority, divided upon 3 nations in the BSR.
<b>Project:</b>	<b>Compass</b>
Is an overall aim (impact) stated in the application form?	Yes (among others): <i>'Increase the competitiveness of the BSR regions by attracting sustainable private sector investments.'</i>
Are the results of the work packages quantifiable in the application form?	Partly: <i>'Feasibility study, a cluster analysis. Creation of a comparative cost model for four industries represented in or targeted by the regions involved'</i>
If yes, what are the indicators?	Maybe a report, containing strategies engaging different problems.
Are the results reconstructed in a quantifiable way in the final report, and what are the indicators?	Partly, different strategies are mentioned as part of this analysis.
Example of an alternative quantified result:	A clear study content including specified industries in a specified number of countries in the BSR to be finalised at adopted at a specific time

<b>Project:</b>	<b>EcoForumBaltica</b>
Is an overall aim (impact) stated in the application form?	Partly: <i>'Develop the Spatial planning/Waste management process'</i>
Are the results of the work packages quantifiable in the application form?	Yes.
If yes, what are the indicators?	Number of companies and authorities that will receive written material as a result of the process is stated. Amount of Euro that will be invested as a result of the process is stated. Number of people who are planned to be visiting for competence exchange co-operation is stated.
Are the results reconstructed in a quantifiable way in the final report, and what are the indicators?	The results are tangible stated in relation to the objectives in the application form.
Example of an alternative quantified result:	
<b>Project:</b>	<b>EuroB</b>
Is an overall aim (impact) stated in the application form?	Yes: <i>'The aim of the EuRoB project is to develop and establish a culture tourism route – the "European Route of Brick Gothic" – through a network of cities with brick gothic heritage around the Baltic Sea.'</i>
Are the results of the work packages quantifiable in the application form? Example:	No: <i>'Preparing a route with anchor point, the course of the route, documentation of the relevant brick gothic objects. Preparing a marketing strategy.'</i>
If yes, what are the indicators?	
Are the results reconstructed in a quantifiable way in the final report, and what are the indicators?	Yes, number of printed material is stated (though not to whom or where it is distributed). Number of attendants in workshops etc. is mentioned.
Example of an alternative quantified result:	Other than <i>'integration of the route into existing tourism structures'</i> there is no tangible link mentioned on how this project will have an impact outside the frames constituting the project. E.g. making the route part of one of the major travel agencies programme, and have this travel agency marketing the product of the project.

<b>Project:</b>	<b>High Quality Tourism</b>
Is an overall aim (impact) stated in the application form?	No.
Are the results of the work packages quantifiable in the application form? Example	No: <i>A network of regional, national and transnational entrance gates. Thematic touristic routes and visions of thematic places/parks.</i>
If yes, what are the indicators?	
Are the results reconstructed in a quantifiable way in the final report, and what are the indicators?	Partly: Number of attendants in training courses and workshops are mentioned.
Example of an alternative quantified result:	To establish a network with 'x'-number of participants, 'these' specific industrial tourism sectors, in 'these' specific countries. 'X' number of workshops will be carried, with 'x' number of attendants. 'X' number of students will have completed a well defined training course.
<b>Project:</b>	<b>Islands In History</b>
Is an overall aim (impact) stated in the application form?	Yes: <i>'To strengthen the identity of Baltic island populations and establish a strong inter-island network'</i>
Are the results of the work packages quantifiable in the application form? Example:	No: <i>'The project will result in a common network with the following features: Joint, internal website, strengthened co-operation, staff exchanges for events.....'</i>
If yes, what are the indicators?	
Are the results reconstructed in a quantifiable way in the final report, and what are the indicators?	The amount of outputs are reconstructed quantifiable, however the content of the outputs are not: <i>1 General guidelines for dissemination and educational concepts; 3 manuals with concepts for dissemination and organizing medieval markets; 3 manuals about dissemination with specific topics; 2 manuals with concepts for historic dinners; 3 manuals for guided tours; 2 manuals about how to organize volunteers; 2 manuals for day-long educational concepts; 9 guidelines for shorter educational concepts; 2 guidelines for regional co-operation.</i>  <i>5 network meetings; 2 workshops; 6 staff exchanges; 1 lecture, 3 concerts, 2 seminars.</i>
Example of an alternative quantified result:	2 workshops with each 12 participants from three different nations. Workshop is going to focus on: 'X'; 'Y'. Workshop should be evaluated by participants.

<b>Project:</b>	<b>NeLoc</b>
Is an overall aim (impact) stated in the application form?	Yes: The NeLoC project is expected to improve logistics competitiveness in the region and strengthen the role of logistics centres as a part of transport networks
Are the results of the work packages quantifiable in the application form? Example:	No: <i>'Contacts to possible logistics partners and customers will be improved and co-operation among logistics centres in the BSR will be widely established.'</i>
If yes, what are the indicators?	
Are the results reconstructed in a quantifiable way in the final report, and what are the indicators?	Outputs are listed. The content of these outputs are not.
Example of an alternative quantified result:	Building a network that will improve logistic by increasing the overall effectiveness by 10% in relation to 'X' and 'Y'.
<b>Project:</b>	<b>PIPE</b>
Is an overall aim (impact) stated in the application form?	No.
Are the results of the work packages quantifiable in the application form?	No.
If yes, what are the indicators?	
Are the results reconstructed in a quantifiable way in the final report, and what are the indicators?	Yes, to some degree: <i>WP 3 – Crossborder network and learning</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>7 conferences and workshops for all partners, including 2 youth conferences</i></li> <li>• <i>14 exchange workshops of youths and teachers (connected to WP 1 and 2)</i></li> <li>• <i>10 seminars and workshops with limited transnational participation</i></li> <li>• <i>Transnational Expo with awards</i></li> <li>• <i>Regional Youth Identity analysis including 4 regions in 3 countries</i></li> <li>• <i>Project manual</i></li> <li>• <i>Methodology guidelines</i></li> </ul>
Example of an alternative quantified result:	A final methodology report 7 conferences concerning the subjects 'X' and 'Y'. Evaluation of the conferences by the participants with a satisfaction degree of 'X'%

<b>Project:</b>	<b>String II</b>
Is an overall aim (impact) stated in the application form?	Yes: <i>'The overall objective of the STRING project is to promote coherent regional and spatial development in the entire STRING area'</i>
Are the results of the work packages quantifiable in the application form?	Partly: <i>'Marketing and Information Strategy of the STRING area by visualizing some cultural and natural assets, homepage, best practice experience.'</i>
If yes, what are the indicators?	Outcome is described.
Are the results reconstructed in a quantifiable way in the final report, and what are the indicators? Example:	No, only limited: <i>'The fact that 50 partners and more than 150 people have worked regularly within the STRING project and their experience gained...'</i> Also the sub-parts of the marketing and information strategy are mentioned.
Example of an alternative quantified result:	A marketing and strategy report concerning the topics 'X' and 'Y', receiving commitment from 'X' number of national authorities.
<b>Project:</b>	<b>SupportNet II</b>
Is an overall aim (impact) stated in the application form?	Yes: <i>'Promote sustainable boat tourism which generates growing employment and income, particularly in small harbour communities having lost traditional functions.'</i>
Are the results of the work packages quantifiable in the application form?	No: <i>'Involvement of private investors in the implementation of plans.'</i>
If yes, what are the indicators?	
Are the results reconstructed in a quantifiable way in the final report, and what are the indicators?	No. Output is only described, nothing quantifiable.
Example of an alternative quantified result:	Involvement of minimum 'X' number of private investors dedicating minimum a total of Euro 'X'

### Annex 3: Evaluation problems caused by lack of indicators

The table below illustrates the problem of evaluating project outputs at project termination in accordance to intended project outputs stated in different work packages in the application form. This is done by randomly choosing single work packages within the terminated projects and illustrating statements from the application form and final report, where these specific outputs are described both qualitative and quantitative.

<b>Project:</b> Baltic Palette	
<b>WP4:</b> <b>Title:</b> Baltic Palette Sustainable Tourism	<b>Planned results:</b> (1) Market analysis, (2) supply study, (3) product development, (4) marketing material for promotion of tourism in the BPR
Application form:	Out of the four different intermediate results, focus has been on the fourth: Marketing material.  The indicators for the remaining three intermediate results are however in no terms any clearer than that of number four. <b>Qualitative indicators:</b> None <b>Quantitative indicators:</b> None
Final report:	<i>'In 2003 the Baltic Palette brochures were published in English, Finnish and Swedish. In 2004 new and updated brochures were published in English, Estonian, Finnish, Latvian, Russian and Swedish. A newsletter was also published in Swedish in 2004.'</i>  <b>Qualitative indicators:</b> Publishing of brochures in various languages. <b>Quantitative indicators:</b> None
Evaluation problem:	It is unclear whether or not this marketing material has actually been made, as it is not indicated what 'marketing material' implies, nor is it indicated how the marketing material was supposed to be distributed.
Alternative criteria that could have been applied:	<b>Qualitative:</b> Describe through which media the marketing is intended (brochures, newspaper, magazines, television, internet, tourist offices etc), what the marketing is aiming at (tourist, tourist agencies, travel agencies etc.). <b>Quantitative:</b> Number of brochures, number of countries the marketing is aimed for.

<b>Project:</b> Compass	
<b>WP1:</b> <b>Title:</b> Creation of comparative cost model	<b>Planned results:</b> Comparative cost model for four industries (clusters) in four countries.
Application form:	<b>Qualitative indicators:</b> Based on employment data, wage levels and company data the main growth cluster for each region will be analysed <b>Quantitative indicators:</b> None
Final report:	<i>under output number nine(guides and manuals):</i> Technical (programming) guidelines for the main COMPASS Modules <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cluster Analysis</li> <li>2. Site Selection Factor Analysis</li> <li>3. Cost Comparison Analysis</li> </ol> <b>Qualitative indicators:</b> No description of the content of the analysis, who, how or what the analysis involve. <b>Quantitative indicators:</b> No description of how many data sources are used to secure the validity of the analysis.
Evaluation problem:	It is stated what the comparative model should be based on (employment data, wage levels and company data). However there are no quantitative indicators addressing the number of companies that are to be included nor is the scope of employment data described
Alternative criteria that could have been applied:	<b>Qualitative:</b> The basis of this analysis is described vaguely in terms of which data to be used etc. However what is the output going to be? A report? <b>Quantitative:</b> Employment data from how many? Company data from how many companies? How big a report?

<b>Project:</b> EcoForumBaltica	
<b>WP4:</b> <b>Title:</b> Supporting of trade and co-operation between companies and authorities in the participating countries. <b>Planned results:</b> The generation/ support of 3,000,000 Euro of investments by participating companies and authorities. Development of easily accessible information on financing, investment support and suppliers.	
Application form:	<b>Qualitative indicators:</b> Development of easily accessible information <b>Quantitative indicators:</b> Generation/ support of 3,000,000 Euro
Final report:	(From the fifth activity report): <i>'The effects of the investment support activities have been poor. The targets have not been met but the project will have a long-term effect that is hard to estimate at present.'</i> (Final report): Nothing is mentioned that could indicate information on financing, investment support and suppliers. Nothing is mentioned in relation to the 3.000.000 Euro that should have been generated/supported. <b>Qualitative indicators: -</b> <b>Quantitative indicators: -</b>
Evaluation problem:	It is not possible to see the result of this work package in the final report. Even if the result is poor (as stated in the activity report) this result could be included in the final report.
Alternative criteria that could have been applied:	<b>Qualitative:</b> Who have been involved, why was the dedication to achieving this result not more comprehensive. <b>Quantitative:</b> Amount of money generated/supported

<b>Project:</b> EuRoB	
<b>WP2:</b> <b>Title:</b> Designing the "European Route of Brick Gothic" <b>Planned results:</b> Route catalogue with the relevant objects and other tourist attractions, determining the route, anchor points and transport links	
Application form:	<b>Qualitative indicators:</b> The background for selecting objects is described in the first milestone. This includes a questionnaire that is to be sent out to project partners who reply with a description of the building, history, structural condition, forms of exploitation and integration into the city (location, accessibility, and traffic links). On basis of this information a committee decides which objects to include in the route. <b>Quantitative indicators:</b> None
Final report:	(Fifth activity report): <i>'22 cities have been involved in seven different countries.'</i> <b>Qualitative indicators:</b> A route has been established involving seven countries. <b>Quantitative indicators:</b> The number of countries involved.
Evaluation problem:	The scope of the route is difficult to address, as there is no quantitative ambition for instance to the number of cities to include, number of countries, number of objects/buildings etc. amended for inclusion.
Alternative criteria that could have been applied:	<b>Qualitative:</b> Criteria for the selected objects. <b>Quantitative:</b> Amount of selected objects

<b>Project:</b> High Quality Tourism II	
<b>WP3:</b> <b>Title:</b> Development of Marketing and Distribution of Regional Products / Regional Marketing	<b>Planned results:</b> Improve the sales of regional products; use products as advertising and image mediums for the regions; bundling of tourist offers (packaging)
Application form:	<b>Qualitative indicators:</b> (Total description of milestone 3): <i>'Finalising the marketing concept; actionplan including localisation, agreements, costs; how to perform the action plan; marketing activities; preparing small scaled investments; transnational seminar'</i> (Total description of milestone 5): <i>'Information and marketing activities; test of regional products; transnational seminar.'</i> <b>Quantitative indicators:</b> None
Final report:	The only sign of marketing material is following statement in the final report under 'Brochures': <i>'Advertisements about ice age route MLD in 3 tourism-brochures.'</i> Concerning improved sales of regional products it is stated in the sixth activity report that: <i>'Structures for direct marketing of regional products Green Markets have started in Mecklenburg Lake District very successful'</i> <b>Qualitative indicators:</b> Structures have been started successfully for direct marketing. <b>Quantitative indicators:</b> None
Evaluation problem:	There is no tangible indication of what the aim with the marketing is. It is stated that the aim is to improve sales, but there are no indications on how this should be done or what the criteria for this improved sale and marketing is. It is therefore difficult to assess what the output of the work package is, and almost impossible to assess whether or not this output has been produced.
Alternative criteria that could have been applied:	<b>Qualitative:</b> Description of how the marketing and distribution should be carried out, by whom, to whom. Possible involved companies and agencies. <b>Quantitative:</b> Percentile improvement of sales. Number of countries, companies/agencies involved in the marketing.

<b>Project:</b> Islands In History	
<b>WP3:</b> <b>Title:</b> Educational and Education-pack Models for Cultural Milieus <b>Planned results:</b> New educational tools and working models	
Application form:	<b>Qualitative indicators:</b> In the work packages planned workshops are described, focus of the workshops etc. The development of the educational tool is mentioned with the different iterations that this process involves for instance test, implementation, preparation, evaluation etc. <b>Quantitative indicators:</b> None
Final report:	(Final report): <i>'By developing new and improved dissemination and educational concepts we have expanded and raised the quality of the dissemination of the Baltic islands' medieval history'</i> (Final report under 'individuals involved'. Under 'Training' nothing is stated): <i>5 network meetings.</i> <i>2 workshops</i> <i>6 staff exchanges.</i> <i>1 lecture.</i> <i>3 concerts</i> <i>2 seminars.</i> <b>Qualitative indicators:</b> It is stated that educational concepts have been produced. <b>Quantitative indicators:</b> Number of seminar, workshops etc.
Evaluation problem:	The scope of the educational tool and a proof of concept have not been stated. It is therefore unknown what the educational tool actually is, and if this educational tool is working, which level it is working and who is using the tool. The criteria stated in the work packages in the application form are qualitative indicators. However in the process of reporting none of these indicators are mentioned
Alternative criteria that could have been applied:	<b>Qualitative:</b> In the reporting process the qualitative indicators should be addressed. <b>Quantitative:</b> Number of seminars, workshop etc. should be stated in the application form

<b>Project:</b> NeLoc	
<b>WP2:</b> <b>Title:</b> Networking of logistics centres	<b>Planned results:</b> A logistics centres Best Practises Handbook. Innovative service concepts for sustainable & effective logistics centres network activities. Develop and implement a co-operation Forum for logistics centres in BSR
Application form:	Focus is here amended on the point: 'Develop and implement a co-operation Forum for logistics centres in BSR'. <b>Qualitative indicators:</b> No qualitative indicators on who should be included in the network. In the application form the expected output is described as: <i>'Contacts to possible logistics partners and customers will be improved and co-operation among logistics centres in the BSR will be widely established.'</i> <b>Quantitative indicators:</b> None
Final report:	(Activity report five under 'achievements so far'): <i>'The project has created and implemented a Pan-Baltic co-operation forum for logistics centres "Baltic Sea Forum on Logistics Centres" – LC-Forum.'</i>  <i>' The idea of the LC-Forum is to enable transport and logistics business to play a major role within the freight network at the wide BSR level, i.e. to put the focus on logistics centres and intermodality as well as on business and political levels. It also creates and ensures an active, dynamic and successful network.'</i>  (Final report): <i>'The LC-Forum is developed and implemented in the Baltic Sea Region in order to strengthen the spatial perspective through Logistics Centres.</i>  <i>The feedback has been very positive hence the LC-Forum will continue as a joint follow-up activity between the partners after the closure of the NeloC project.'</i>  <i>'Furthermore the LC-Forum will ensure an active East-West co-operation in the future due to a diversified constellation of members from all countries around the Baltic Sea Region.'</i>  <b>Qualitative indicators:</b> That the forum is successful.

	<b>Quantitative indicators:</b> Involvement of all countries around the BSR
Evaluation problem:	The scope of the network is not stated in the application form – for which logistic centres is the forum intended? An indicator for a successful forum is not stated, this could be described as: 'A forum with 50 participating companies'.
Alternative criteria that could have been applied:	<b>Qualitative:</b> Success criterion that addresses the sustainability of the forum, describing how the forum is planned to be financed after project termination. <b>Quantitative:</b> Scope/number of involved logistic centres.
<b>Project:</b> String II	
<b>WP4:</b> <b>Title:</b> Compatible Development of Business and Competencies <b>Planned results:</b> Business Development Forum: Promotion of transregional networks, SME pilot action. Sub-project: Online based training in vocational and further training Sub-project: Increased use of ICT by SME's	
Application form:	Focus is here amended on the point: 'Business Development Forum: <i>'Promotion of transregional networks, SME pilot action.'</i> <b>Qualitative indicators:</b> The background for setting up the forum is vaguely described in terms of: Set-up of homepage, set-up of seminars. <b>Quantitative indicators:</b> <i>'Identification of 15 companies to be involved within promotion of e-business'</i>
Final report:	(Activity report five under 'achievements so far'): <i>'Establishment of networks in the three business sectors: New Media, Life Sciences and Food 2004'</i> <i>'Discussions and exchange of experience concerning strategies for sustainable development in coastal areas. Six relevant forums, working groups and international contacts have been established, ..... Business Forum.... Seminars, meetings and workshops have</i>

	<p><i>been carried out to develop and specify ideas and strategies.'</i></p> <p>(Final report):  <i>'Expertise for SMEs concerning e-business. Each participating SME has been offered individual guidance concerning the introduction/enhancement of the use of ICT in their business'</i></p> <p><b>Qualitative indicators:</b>  That each participating SME has been offered individual guiding.</p> <p><b>Quantitative indicators:</b>  None.</p>
Evaluation problem:	<p>The only indicator is that 15 companies are to be selected for the forum. The criteria for these companies are not indicated. How the forum should be sustained is not indicated. In the reporting process very little is mentioned about the results and outputs of this work packages.</p>
Alternative criteria that could have been applied:	<p><b>Qualitative:</b>  Success criterion that addresses the sustainability of the forum, describing how the forum is planned to be financed after project termination.</p> <p><b>Quantitative:</b>  None</p>
<b>Project:</b> SupportNet II	
<p><b>WP3:</b>  <b>Title:</b>  Environment friendly boat tourism</p> <p><b>Planned results:</b>  Concept for wastewater collection from boats; concept and its implementation for voluntary agreements between boat tourist and nature protection sectors based on wide publicity and information</p>	
Application form:	<p><i>'Concepts for wastewater collection from boats defined and tested.'</i></p> <p><b>Qualitative indicators:</b>  None</p> <p><b>Quantitative indicators:</b>  None</p>
Final report:	<p>(Activity report six under 'achievements so far'):  The outputs of the work package are listed in the activity report. These include:</p>

	<p><i>'For two important boating regions, concepts for compatible respect of nature protection and of tourist development have been shown, based on detailed use assignments with voluntary agreements as permanent management (Strelasund and Greifswalder Bodden).'</i></p> <p><i>'List of hazardous waste alternate treatment related to boat tourism has been published'</i></p> <p>(Activity report six under 'accumulated results'):</p> <p><i>'Tourists are now better informed about environmental matters. Therefore they will change their behaviour and the treat to nature can be minimised. '</i></p> <p>(Final report):</p> <p><i>'During technical harbour planning procedures environmental impact assessments and co-maitibility studies has been perpared and succuessfully approved for the projects in Stralsund, Gustow, Putbus, Klütz, Göhren and Greifswald. Moreover environmental Impact Assessments has been elaborated for Narva River Marinas (Estonia) and Marinas on the Russian Island.'</i></p> <p><b>Qualitative indicators:</b> Environmental impact assessment and comparability studies have been made. Various harbours have been involved.</p> <p><b>Quantitative indicators:</b> None.</p>
Evaluation problem:	The concept of this wastewater collection and what it implies is not described sufficiently to assess the outcome of the process. The output is vaguely described, which makes the assessment of whether or not the produced output is in line with what was intended very difficult.
Alternative criteria that could have been applied:	<p><b>Qualitative:</b> Set-up criterions for the concept of waste water collection.</p> <p><b>Quantitative:</b> None</p>

## Annex 4: The questionnaire used for project survey

# *Project questionnaire*

The Baltic Sea Region INTERREG IIIB Neighbourhood Programme; Mid-term Evaluation Update; Implemented by Rambøll Management on behalf of the Managing Authority

**Please return the questionnaire by to the following address:**

*RAMBØLL Management A/S, Olof Palmes Allé 20 - 8200 Aarhus N,  
Att.: René Chester Goduscheit. Please return both by email and normal post.*

***Please note that all answers will be treated strictly confidential by the evaluator and will not be handed over to any other authority.***

## Partners and partnership

1. Lead partner is the following type of organisation **(please put a cross)**

	X	Question
(1)		Central Government ministry
(2)		Other type of Central Government institution
(3)		Regional or County Council
(4)		Municipality
(5)		Association of public nature
(6 )		Other (please specify):

2. EU member states involved as partners **(please give no. of partners)**

	No	Country
(1)		Denmark
(2)		Finland
(3)		Germany
(4)		Sweden

3. EU partners are the following types of institutions **(please give number according to type, e.g. 2 partners are ministries and 1 partner is a municipality)**

	No	Type
(1)		Central Government ministry
(2)		Other type of Central Government institution
(3)		Regional or County Council
(4)		Municipality
(5)		Association of public nature
(6 )		Other (please specify):

4. Non EU member states involved as partners **(please give no. of partners)**

	No	Country
(1)		Belarus
(2)		Estonia
(3)		Latvia
(4)		Lithuania
(5)		Norway
(6)		Poland
(7)		Russia

*Project implementation and outcome*

5. Project status

	X	Has the project terminated
(1)		yes
(2)		no

6. Project duration

Start date planned in original application (mm/yy):
End date planned in original application (mm/yy):
Actual start date – defined as conclusion of contract with BSR MA (mm/yy):
Revised end date expected at the time of actual start of the project (mm/yy):
Actual or expected end date at this stage (mm/yy):

7. If delayed, what are the main reasons **(more than one cross is possible)**

	X	Question
(1)		Problems with partners
(2)		Problems with financing
(3)		Technical problems with studies, permissions etc.
(4)		Problems with BSR Authority's final acceptance of the application
(5)		Other (please specify):
		Please give short explanations to the reasons ticked of above:

8. Budget

Total budget planned in the original application (mio. EUR):
Total budget (actual or expected) at the termination of the project (mio. EUR):

9. Budget changes

	X	Question
(1)		The project has kept the original budget costs
(2)		The project has increased the budget costs
(3)		The project has decreased the budget costs
		Please give explanations to the reasons for budget changes and how these have been financed.
		Please also explain how this has influenced the results of the project, positively or negatively.

10. Looking back at the way you have organised the project, do you find that this could have been done in a more cost-effective<sup>8</sup> way?  
**(please put a cross)**

	X	Question
(1)		No
(2)		Yes, very much
(3)		Yes, to some degree
(4)		If yes in 2 or 3, please explain:

---

<sup>8</sup> Same results with fewer resources or more results with same resources.

11. Considering the different work packages and corresponding milestones stated in the latest approved application, please assess the *project outputs achieved* – or about to be achieved (**please put a cross**)

	X	Question
(1)		Project has/will reach all the work packages/milestones stated
(2)		Project has/will reach the work packages/ milestones stated with
(3)		Project has/will only reach the work packages/milestones stated due to profound changes (of one or more work packages/ milestones)
(4)		Project has/will not be able to reach all the work packages/milestones stated
		If cross in 2, 3 or 4, please explain:

12. Considering the planned accumulated results of the work packages (expected outcome as stated in the latest approved application) please state the expected *project results* at this stage (**please put a cross**)

	X	Question
(1)		Project has/will be able to produce all the planned accumulated results
(2)		Project has/will be able to reach the planned accumulated results with
(3)		Project has/will only be to able reach the planned accumulated results because of due to profound changes (of one or more work packages)
(4)		Project has/will not be able to reach the planned accumulated results (of one or more work packages)
		If cross in 2 or 3, please explain:

13. Project investment activities (**more than one cross is possible**)

	X	Question
(1)		The project includes small scale infrastructure investment
(2)		The project has prepares for larger infrastructure investment
(3)		None of the above is included

14. Project investment outcome **(please put a cross)**

	X	Question
(1)		The project has/will surely lead to larger infrastructure investment
(2)		The project has/will probably lead to larger infrastructure investment
(3)		The project has/will not lead to larger infrastructure investment

15. Would it be relevant to continue your project activities after project termination in order to secure the full impact - or higher impact - of the project results achieved during the project implementation **(please put a cross)**

	X	Question
(1)		Yes, surely
(2)		Yes, to some extend
(3)		No, not needed
If yes in 1 or 2 please continue to the question below		

16. Commitment to continuing the project activities, or the continued building on the project preparing activities, after project termination **(please put a cross)**

	X	Question
(1)		The project has received no commitment
(2)		The project has received a clear commitment from competent
(3)		The project has received a vague commitment from competent au- thorities
(4)		If cross in 2 or 3, please explain from whom and on what conditions:

---

<sup>9</sup> Project partner authorities or other competent authorities

17. Pro-active measures – partner search **(please put a cross)**

	X	Has partner search seminars helped you to establish a better and more effective project?
(1)		Yes, very much
(2)		Yes, to a certain degree
(3)		No, not really
(4)		Did not participate in such events

18. Pro-active measures – quality seminars **(please put a cross)**

	X	Has quality seminars helped you to develop and steer your project in a more effective direction?
(1)		Yes, very much
(2)		Yes, to a certain degree
(3)		No, not really
(4)		Did not participate in such events

19. Pro-active measures – seed capital **(please put a cross)**

	X	
(1)		Seed capital helped generate a better quality project and eventually a more effective project?
(2)		Seed capital did not make much difference on quality/effectiveness, but on partner involvement
(3)		Did not make any significant difference on either quality/effectiveness or partner involvement
(4)		Did not receive seed capital