

**EU Programme for Cross-Border
Territorial Co-operation**

INTERREG IVA

**Northern Ireland, the Border Region of Ireland and
Western Scotland**

2007-13

Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

Special EU Programmes Body

June 2008

Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Role of Monitoring and Evaluation.....	1
3. Ex-ante evaluation.....	5
4. On-going evaluation.....	6
5. Ex-post evaluation.....	9
6. On-going monitoring.....	10
7. Environmental monitoring.....	11
8. Equality monitoring.....	12
9. Quality.....	14
10. Dissemination.....	16
11. Resources.....	16
Annex A Monitoring indicators for INTERREG IVA.....	17
Annex B Definitions and methods of collection.....	30
Annex C Environmental Indicators – baseline position.....	90
Annex D Planned evaluations.....	91

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This evaluation plan results from the recommendations contained in the European Regulations (Article 48[1] Council Regulation 1083/2006) and the European Commission's working documents¹. In the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy presented in the Operational Programme, the Managing Authority gave a commitment to produce a detailed Evaluation Plan for the programme. This plan draws on lessons learnt from the previous programmes. The plan will be agreed by the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group (MEWG), a sub-group reporting to the Programme Monitoring Committee (PMC) for the INTERREG IVA, and will be revised on an annual basis.
- 1.2. Evaluation is not just an activity carried out to comply with the regulatory requirements set out by the European Commission, but is a valuable programming tool which adds to the Structural Funds implementation and management processes. With timely, accurate and appropriate monitoring data, evaluation can be used to ensure Programmes are meeting their objectives.

2. Role of Monitoring and Evaluation

- 2.1. As stated in the EU Commission working documents², 'monitoring and evaluation are two closely related concepts'. It is important therefore to have clear definitions for them both. EVALSED³ provides the following definition of monitoring:

'An exhaustive and regular examination of the resources, outputs and results of public interventions. Monitoring is based on a system of coherent information including reports, reviews, balance sheets, indicators, etc.

¹ European Commission, (2006): The New Programming Period 2007-13, Indicative Guidelines on Evaluation Methods: Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators, Working Document No. 2 and European Commission, (2006): The New Programming Period 2007-13: Indicative Guidelines on Evaluation Methods: Evaluation during the Programme Period, Working Document No. 5

² European Commission, (2006): The New Programming Period 2007-13, Indicative Guidelines on Evaluation Methods: Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators, Working Document No. 2

³ European Commission, (2006): EVALSED: the online and interactive resource for the evaluation of socio-economic development (published on the Internet at: www.evaled.com)

Monitoring system information is obtained primarily from operators and is used essentially for steering public interventions.’

- 2.2. Monitoring is essentially the checking of outturns against expectations. Monitoring is generally straightforward if objectives and expectations are clear. The monitoring system for the EU Programmes consists of indicators which are used by the Managing Authority to assess the performance of a programme.
- 2.3. The EU Commission defines an indicator as ‘the measurement of an objective to be met, a resource mobilised, an effect obtained, a gauge of quality or a context variable’. There are three types of non-financial monitoring indicators – output, result and impact indicators. Output indicators are a measurement of initial directly-funded activity whereas result indicators are a measurement of the interim direct and immediate effects on direct beneficiaries. Impact indicators measure the longer-term effects arising from the funded actions, and these can either be directly linked to the action taken and the direct beneficiaries or be longer-term effects affecting the wider population.
- 2.4. The definition of evaluation provided by EVALSED⁴ is:
- ‘Judgement on the value of a (usually) public intervention with reference to criteria and explicit standards (e.g. its relevance, efficiency, sustainability, equity etc.). The judgement usually concerns the needs which have to be met by the intervention, and the effects produced by it. The evaluation is based on information which is specially collected and interpreted to support the judgement.’
- 2.5. Evaluation is an exercise that assesses the relevance, performance and success of on-going and completed programmes. An important aspect of evaluation involves the interrogation of the information from monitoring and other sources to find out and explain the effects of the interventions. Article 47[2] outlines that evaluation should centre on two functions; strategic and

⁴ See footnote 3

operational.

- 2.6. The **strategic** function should assess the contribution of the OP to domestic and European strategies. From an EU perspective, it is important that evaluation can show the contribution of Structural Funds in Northern Ireland and the Border Region. In addition, the impact of the programme needs to be considered in light of the domestic policy context to identify areas of synergy as well as additionality with respect to Structural Funds interventions and the domestic economy. It may focus on macro-economic impacts at an operational level or specific strategic themes within the OP (such as innovation), or horizontal priorities (equality of opportunity, environmental sustainability).
- 2.7. The **operational** function of evaluation is a key mechanism for improving programme implementation. This would focus on how the programmes are delivered and would include analysis of financial and physical data to ensure we are meeting targets, as well as making recommendations to improve performance. It should also assess the administrative functions and the quality of implementing mechanisms.
- 2.8. Evaluation must address a set of specific issues in order to adequately assess the delivery of a programme and fulfil the above requirements. Key issues identified by the Commission include:
- **Relevance:** How relevant are the programme's objectives in relation to evolving needs and priorities at a national and EU level?
 - **Efficiency:** What mechanisms have been used to turn resources into outputs or results?
 - **Effectiveness:** How far has the programme achieved its specific and global objectives?
 - **Utility:** Did the programme have an impact on the target groups or populations in relation to their needs?
 - **Sustainability:** To what extent can the changes (or benefits) be expected to last after the programme has been completed?

- **Added Value:** Would the intervention have happened without financial assistance?
- **Synergy:** Has the Programme complemented and enhanced in any way the effect of other related domestic policies?

2.9. Evaluation of the Structural Funds can be broken down into three phases: ex-ante, on-going and ex-post evaluation. For each phase, evaluations have to address a set of specific issues about the performance of the programmes. The following sections detail how the three phases of evaluation are being implemented in INTERREG IVA, with further sections covering on-going monitoring, as well as the monitoring of environment and equality within the programme.

3. Ex-ante evaluation

- 3.1. An ex-ante evaluation is key to the development of a programme. The purpose of an ex-ante evaluation is to optimise the allocation of resources and to improve the quality of programming. The main concerns should be the relevance of the programme strategy, the likely effectiveness of the programme and an assessment of the potential impact. The ex-ante evaluation should also comment on the proposed implementation systems and identify any potential risks. An ex-ante evaluation is required by the Commission and is the responsibility of the Managing Authority (Article 48 of Regulation 1083/2006).
- 3.2. Ex-ante evaluators for the programme were appointed at the beginning of the planning process and worked closely with the programme development team. The ex-ante was an iterative process and the evaluators have provided feedback and guidance, both informally and through written reports.
- 3.3. The Ex-Ante Evaluation of INTERREG IVA⁵ commented that the programme followed three earlier programmes and thus had well developed antecedents;

⁵ Economic Research Institute of Northern Ireland, Oxford Economics (2007) EU Programme for Cross-Border Territorial Co-operation: Northern Ireland, the Border Region of Ireland and Western Scotland (INTERREG IV) 2007-2013, Ex-Ante Evaluation

however, it differed from previous programmes in being more strategic. The evaluators felt that the socio-economic review provided a broad and balanced assessment of social and economic conditions in the three areas.

- 3.4. On the rationale for the programme, the evaluators felt this was strongest when directed towards public sector activity, and therefore was particularly strong for Priority 2. They felt that for Priority 1, the rationale correctly identified social and economic problems, but that the need for cross-border activity was less obvious for this priority. Nonetheless, the evaluators accepted that the existence of problems, including the under-development of tourism was sufficient rationale for intervention. The Evaluation concluded that the proposed three priorities were consistent with one another, with distinct and complementary aims.
- 3.5. In discussing coherence, the Ex-Ante Evaluation stated that the programme was consistent with other EU and national policies, while the centralisation of the delivery systems should allow for further complementarity with national agencies. Finally, the evaluators noted the key roles to be played by SEUPB which were central to the successful management and delivery of the programme.
- 3.6. The final version of the Ex-Ante Evaluation has been included in the INTERREG IVA OP, while paragraphs 2.62 to 2.77 detail the changes made to the OP as a result of the Ex-Ante.

4. On-going evaluation

- 4.1. In the 2000-06 Programming period there was a requirement for each programme to carry out a formal mid-term evaluation (MTE). This evaluation examined the initial results of the assistance provided, their relevance and the extent to which the targets had been attained. It also assessed the use of the financial resources and the operation of monitoring and implementation. The MTE had to be carried out by an independent assessor and submitted to the Commission no later than 31 December 2003. A further requirement of the regulations was to produce an update of the MTE by 31 December 2005.

- 4.2. Given the delayed start to INTERREG IIIA, the MTE was required very early in the implementation of the programme. As a result, the focus of the evaluation was on process rather than impact.
- 4.3. The mid-term update of INTERREG IIIA provided an update on the implementation of the recommendations made by the MTE and assessed the impact and added value of the programme.
- 4.4. In the 2007-13 Programmes, there is no longer a need for a mid-term evaluation or mid-term evaluation update. They have been replaced with on-going evaluation, creating a shift from regulation-based to more pragmatic and concrete needs-based evaluation (Article 48[3] of Regulation 1083/2006).
- 4.5. The Commission⁶ defines on-going evaluation as a process that takes the form of a series of evaluation exercises. Its purpose is to track the implementation and delivery of the OPs on an on-going basis and highlight any changes due to external factors that may impact on the deliverables (results, targets) of the OPs. It should also react to these changes by taking corrective action if necessary. It is also expected to complement monitoring activity and aid decision making.
- 4.6. Although the Commission recommends on-going evaluation it also asks for a flexible approach to evaluation. Evaluation will be undertaken and designed in accordance with the needs of each Member State. But Member States must be proactive in identifying real or potential difficulties which could lead to evaluation. The demand may come from policy (strategic) issues or more specific operational issues.
- 4.7. However, the Commission identified two specific cases when evaluation must be carried out:
 - i. where the monitoring of operational programmes reveals a significant departure from the initial annual goals/targets set:

⁶ European Commission, (2006): The New Programming Period 2007-13: Indicative Guidelines on Evaluation Methods: Evaluation during the Programme Period, Working Document No. 5

‘During the programming period, Member States shall carry out evaluations linked to the monitoring of operational programmes in particular where that monitoring reveals a significant departure from the goals initially set or where proposals are made for the revision of operational programmes, as referred to in Article 33. The results shall be sent to the monitoring committee for the operational programme and to the Commission’⁷.

ii. when operational programme revisions are proposed:

‘At the initiative of the Member State or the Commission in agreement with the Member State concerned, Operational Programmes may be re-examined and, if necessary, the remainder of the programme revised, in one or more of the following cases:

- a) following significant socio-economic changes;
- b) in order to take greater or different account of major changes in Community, national or regional priorities;
- c) in the light of the evaluation referred to in Article 48[3]; or
- d) following implementation difficulties’⁸.

4.8. Although a formal mid-term evaluation is no longer required by the Commission, the Managing Authority are committed to conducting an evaluation of the programme during its life-cycle. The timing of this evaluation must be balanced between having sufficient progress within the programme for an assessment of its performance to be carried out while also allowing time for amendments for the programme to be made as a result of recommendations. The Managing Authority will take advice from the MEWG on this timing, although it would be expected that it will be late 2010/early 2011.

4.9. The Managing Authority plan to carry out an evaluation of the locally-led projects funded under Priority 2, Collaboration Theme. These projects will be multi-annual plans, with the first plans covering 2007-2010. An evaluation of these projects will be carried out towards the end of 2010 to assess the

⁷ Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006, Article 48[3]

⁸ Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006, Article 33[1]

overall impact of these projects, to make an assessment of continuing need for funding and whether this method of funding is the most appropriate for the second half of the programme.

- 4.10. It may be necessary to undertake ad-hoc evaluations at a programme level or priority level. The necessity for these would be dictated by a range of factors resulting from the annual review process or under-performance of a priority and would be undertaken by an independent evaluator. It is essential to retain flexibility in how and when these evaluations are undertaken in order for specific programme and priority issues to be addressed and to maintain efficiency and effectiveness. Therefore the methodology for the ad-hoc evaluations cannot be prescriptive, particularly with regard to qualitative data which can provide useful additional information.
- 4.11. In addition to specific activity-focused evaluation, thematic evaluation may cover the horizontal themes of the programme (cross-border co-operation, equality of opportunity, sustainable development, impact on poverty and partnership) as well as vertical issues targeted by each of the priorities in respect of the over-arching programme aims.

5. Ex-post evaluation

- 5.1. The aim of the ex-post evaluation is to compare the expected objectives with those actually achieved by looking at the impact and utilisation of resources to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the assistance. The evaluation will cover the factors which contributed to the overall success or failure of implementation and the achievements and results, including their sustainability. This evaluation must be carried out by an independent evaluator within three years of the end of the programming period. The Commission has primary responsibility for the ex-post evaluation in collaboration with the Managing Authority (Article 49 of Regulation 1083/2006).

6. On-going monitoring

- 6.1. Alongside the development of the programme, and the ex-ante evaluation, work was carried out to produce a suite of indicators at priority and sub-priority level which could be used for the on-going monitoring of the programme. These indicators, and their targets, were informed by a number of pieces of research and a range of processes. Namely, experience gained in monitoring previous INTERREG programmes; a Logical Framework exercise carried out as part of the development of the INTERREG IVA Operational Programme; the Ex-Ante Evaluation for INTERREG IVA and consultation responses to the draft INTERREG IVA OP which included comments from existing INTERREG IVA implementing bodies.
- 6.2. The result of this work was a comprehensive list of monitoring indicators at theme level, within a priority (Annex A). In addition, a more detailed paper has been produced (Annex B) providing a definition for each indicator, as well as detailing how the information for each indicator should be collected, by whom, how often and where the information should be recorded.
- 6.3. The Letter of Offer process will be used to agree relevant monitoring indicators and targets with each operation. Operation leaders will be expected to provide updated information on their indicators on a six-monthly basis. This will allow an assessment to be made of how the project is progressing towards targets and highlight any particular areas of concern where action is required.
- 6.4. Progress reports, based on data collated from the monitoring system, will be produced for each Monitoring Committee meeting. These will describe, for each theme and priority, the progress that has been made as well as analysis of where progress is either notably good or below expectation.
- 6.5. Annual monitoring information will be used to complete the Annual Implementation Reports (AIRs) which must include the progress made in implementing the OP in relation to the specific, verifiable targets, using the indicators at priority level.⁹

⁹ Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of July 2006, Article 67 [2]

7. Environmental monitoring

- 7.1. Sustainable development cuts across the objectives of all of the EU Structural Fund Programmes including INTERREG IVA. It is important to monitor the effect of the programme on this cross-cutting issue and to identify the extent to which sustainability is mainstreamed into the outworkings of the programme.
- 7.2. A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the INTERREG IVA OP was conducted alongside the development of the programme. The SEA did not recommend major changes to the programme itself since any alternatives would have little environmental difference. However, it did recommend that a set of indicators be produced to monitor specific areas – air, human health, population, soil, geology and water. Annex C provides the baseline position for a number of indicators.
- 7.3. In addition, the Environmental Working Group of the 2000-2006 NI Community Support Framework recommended that the use of Development Path Analysis (DPA) should be continued in the monitoring of the 2007-2013 programmes in Northern Ireland.
- 7.4. DPA is a tool that helps to transform patterns of economic and social development. In the past, it was often the case that development was pursued at the expense of the natural environment. Many now realise that, if it is to be sustainable, development must go hand in hand with environmental protection. Within the Northern Ireland structural funds programmes, DPA is the main tool for helping to guide the region toward a more environmentally sustainable path of development. It is also the main tool for monitoring the extent to which this transformation is taking place.
- 7.5. DPA is based on an assumption that certain patterns of development, or “development paths,” are more environmentally sustainable than others and that regions have choices about which path to pursue. The tool recognises six development paths.

- Path A: Actions that promote activities that simply meet environmental regulations.
- Path B: Actions that clean up the mess from past activities or actions that promote physical regeneration.
- Path C: Actions that put in place environmental infrastructure to reduce the negative environmental impact of development activities.
- Path D: Actions that help organisations to meet increasing environmental standards.
- Path E: Actions that improve the resource efficiency (“eco-efficiency”) of existing activities.
- Path F: Actions that support, as well as encourage, new types of activity or behaviour using fewer environmental resources, or producing less pollution, than existing activities in the area.

7.6. The objective of the tool is to help shift activity away from Path A and toward activity under Path F. Path A is activity that simply meets minimum environmental regulations and, therefore, makes a minimal contribution to environmental sustainability. Path F makes a significant contribution; it is activity that pursues environmental protection at the same time as it pursues economic and social development. The paths in between are paths that mitigate the impact of existing activity in some way.

7.7. As part of the selection process, each application to INTERREG IVA will be assigned to a development path. The budgets of the projects will then be added together to give a profile of the amount of funding committed under each path. This will be monitored on a regular basis and reported to the programme monitoring committee.

8. Equality Monitoring

8.1. Similarly to environment, the protection and promotion of gender equality cuts across each of the EU structural fund programmes. In addition in Northern Ireland, Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998 requires that all public authorities shall, in carrying out its functions relating to Northern Ireland, have due regard to the need to promote equality of opportunity:

- between persons of different religious belief, political opinion, racial group, age, marital status or sexual orientation;
 - between men and women generally;
 - between persons with a disability and persons without; and
 - between persons with dependants and persons without.
- 8.2. Section 75 also requires public authorities to “have regard to the desirability of promoting good relations between persons of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group.”
- 8.3. In Ireland, the Equal Status Act (2000), as amended by the Equality Act (2004), applies, while the Scottish Executive’s Equality Strategy – Working Together for Equality, and the Race, Disability and Gender Duties also applies.
- 8.4. As noted above, balanced participation by men and women, and accessibility for disabled persons, are central requirements of the EU Structural Funds Regulations. In addition, Article 16 of General Regulation No 1083/2006 states that “the Member States and the Commission shall take appropriate steps to prevent any discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation during the various stages of implementation of the Funds, and, in particular, in the access to them”.
- 8.5. In order to ensure that the principle of equality of opportunity is embedded within every aspect of programme implementation, equality is one of the cross-cutting themes of INTERREG IVA. For the impact of equality of opportunity to be assessed, monitoring data must be gathered and reported on to the Programme Monitoring Committees.
- 8.6. Where projects clearly have individual beneficiaries monitoring data will be collected using a short, anonymised questionnaire designed to reflect Equality Commission best practice. The questionnaires will be returned in a Freepost envelope to the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency

(NISRA), who will analyse the returns.

- 8.7. However, individual beneficiaries may be less clear for projects that aim to benefit a larger population on an ongoing basis, e.g. infrastructure projects may benefit large numbers of people who cannot be meaningfully surveyed. In such instances, the Managing Authorities, in conjunction with NISRA, will provide advice on how an assessment of equality of opportunity can be made.

9. Quality

- 9.1. Assessing the quality of monitoring and evaluation is an integral and fundamental part of this process. Systems or evaluations that do not meet minimum quality standards could mislead decision-makers and programme managers. However, to assess evaluation quality is a complex and difficult process. The evaluations performed in the context of socio-economic development programmes and policies are too different from each other to allow the existence of few simple rules that can guarantee the quality across the board. However, the quality of the evaluation as a whole is conditional upon the presence of three distinct but interrelated aspects:

- the quality of the planning and design phase, including the commissioning of the evaluation;
- the quality of the implementation of the evaluation itself;
- the quality of the monitoring system and of the available data.

- 9.2. The following table¹⁰ presents both quality control and quality assurance criteria to bear in mind when carrying out evaluation. Further detail on each of the issues is provided by EVALSED.

¹⁰ European Commission, (2006): EVALSED: the online and interactive resource for the evaluation of socio-economic development (published on the Internet at: www.evaled.com)

Quality Control: Output Criteria	Quality Assurance: Process Criteria
Meeting needs as laid out in ToR	Coherent and evaluable objectives
Relevant scope and coverage	Well drawn terms of reference
Defensible design and methods	Sound tender selection process
Reliable data used	Effective dialogue and feedback throughout evaluation process
Sound analysis	Adequate information resources available
Credible results that relate to analysis and data	Good management and co-ordination by evaluation team
Impartial conclusions showing no bias and demonstrating sound judgement	Effective dissemination of reports/outputs to Steering Committee and policy/programme managers
Clear report with executive summaries and annexed supportive data	Effective dissemination to stakeholders

- 9.3. The existence of an Evaluation Steering Group (ESG) is an important part of the evaluation process. The principle role of the ESG is to ensure a high quality and useful evaluation. This will involve facilitating the work of the evaluators through for example, providing access to information and contacts, and elaborating evaluating questions and key issues that they feel should be informed. The ESG should not attempt to influence the evaluators to omit certain evidence or to come to conclusions they would prefer to hear that are not substantiated by the evaluation evidence.
- 9.4. Evaluation Steering Groups will be established for all major evaluations carried out under this plan. Membership for these steering groups will be drawn from the programme's MEWG.

10. Dissemination

- 10.1. All major evaluation reports, at programme or priority level or a thematic evaluation, will be presented to the PMC. These presentations will be accompanied by a response from the MA on each recommendation presented within the report, detailing whether the recommendation has been accepted and how it is being taken forward. When requested by the PMC, the MA will provide further updates on these recommendations.
- 10.2. In the interest of transparency and in order to stimulate public debate on evaluation findings, all evaluation reports will be published. This will involve broader circulation of evaluation documents and also examples of good practice. The most effective method for this is to use the SEUPB website supplemented with presentations. This will aim to promote interest in evaluation and strengthen its credibility. Information sharing will be particularly useful when undertaking thematic evaluations. It will be important, however, to ensure that evaluation reports are presented in an accessible format with summaries, interpretation and sign posting.

11. Resources

- 11.1. In accordance with the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality (Article 13 of Regulation 1083/2006), Member States are responsible for monitoring their OPs, for carrying out on-going evaluations and for taking corrective measures when problems arise. In accordance with the principle of independence, evaluations shall be carried out by experts or bodies (internal or external) that are functionally independent of the certifying and audit authorities (Article 47[3] of Regulation 1083/2006). The independence of evaluation can also be enhanced by the presence of steering groups in which various stakeholders are represented.
- 11.2. As stated in the Regulations, evaluations shall be funded from the budget for technical assistance (Article 47[4] of Regulation 1083/2006).

ANNEX A: MONITORING INDICATORS FOR INTERREG IVA

Priority 1: Cooperation for a more prosperous cross border region

Business Support

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
Output	200 businesses assisted analysed by new/existing and by type of activity: developing new and innovative products and processes, improving sales and marketing skills	0	Project monitoring	Six monthly
Result	40% of assisted businesses developing new products	0	Project monitoring	Six monthly
	40% of assisted businesses developing new processes	0	Project monitoring	Six monthly
	10% increase in sales in supported businesses resulting from sales and marketing activities	The baseline will be the most recent level of sales (£) in each supported existing business at the outset of receiving support	Project monitoring Baseline data will be collected and recorded by the implementing agents in respect of each business at the beginning of the project	Six monthly
Impact (Direct)	20% of assisted businesses enter new markets, both domestic and international	0	Project monitoring	After 2 years
	Increase in turnover of firms 2 years after receiving support	The baseline will be the value of annual turnover (£)	Project monitoring	After 2 years

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
		amongst assisted existing businesses for the most recent year available at the outset of the project	Baseline data will be collected and recorded by the implementing agents in respect of each assisted firm at the beginning of the project	
	80% of new firms still in existence after 2 years of receiving support	0	Project monitoring	After 2 years
	5% of turnover in assisted businesses after 2 years comes from export sales	Value of export sales as proportion of turnover will be collected from each assisted <i>existing</i> business at the beginning of the project Baseline for assisted <i>new</i> businesses equals zero	Project monitoring Baseline data will be collected and recorded by the implementing agents in respect of each existing business at the beginning of the project	After 2 years
	50 new jobs created	0	Project monitoring	Six monthly

Investment in business infrastructure

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
Output	5 incubation units developed	0	Project monitoring	Six-monthly
Result	300,000m ² floor space constructed/refurbished	0	Project monitoring	Six-monthly

Impact	75% of floor space has been bought or is being rented by firms after 2 years [Target to be confirmed]	The baseline for this indicator will be the achieved value of the result indicator (floor space constructed / refurbished)	Project monitoring	After 2 years
	20 businesses occupying this space, analysed by numbers within creative industries, financial and customer services	0	Project monitoring	After 2 years

Networking

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
Output	25 networking projects supported	0	Project monitoring	Six-monthly
Result	200 businesses collaborating on a cross-border basis as a result of participation in networks	0	Project monitoring	Six-monthly
Impact	40% of cross-border networks still in existence after 2 years	The baseline will be the achieved value of the number of cross-border networks supported	Project monitoring	After 2 years

Tourism

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
Output	10 new products developed/existing products enhanced, analysed by new/existing and niche areas (culture, heritage, natural resources, marine and water based)	0	Project monitoring	Six-monthly
	10 tourism marketing/brand products completed, analysed by new/existing and niche areas (culture, heritage, natural resources, marine and water based)	0	Project monitoring	Six-monthly
Result	5% increase in tourism visitors (tourist and domestic) to supported existing tourism products/facilities	The baseline will be the annual number of visitors to supported products / facilities for the latest year available prior to Interreg IV support	Project monitoring Baseline data will be collected and recorded by the implementing agents in respect of each assisted tourism product or facility at the beginning of each project	Annually
Impact (Direct)	80% of new tourism products/facilities still in existence after 2 years	0	Project monitoring	After 2 years
Impact (Global)	10% increase in the numbers of visitors to each of Scotland, Border Region and Northern Ireland – April to September	Scotland 7.7m Border Region 0.3m NI 1.2m	VisitScotland Central Statistics Office Northern Ireland Tourist Board	Annually
	5% increase in the numbers of visitors to each of Scotland, Border Region and Northern Ireland – October to March	Scotland 9.7m Border Region 0.3m NI 0.8m	VisitScotland Central Statistics Office Northern Ireland Tourist Board	Annually

	Increase in average length of stay	Scotland 5.4 Border Region 5.6 NI 4.8 (nights)	VisitScotland Central Statistics Office Northern Ireland Tourist Board	Annually
--	------------------------------------	---	--	----------

Priority 2: Cooperation for a sustainable cross-border region

Cooperation for development

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
Output	10 cross-border projects supported (research projects, action/strategic plans)	0	Project monitoring	Six-monthly
	15 strategic local authority initiatives supported	0	Project monitoring	Six-monthly
Result	1,000 beneficiaries of supported cross-border public services	0	Project monitoring	Six-monthly
	100% of research projects completed	The baseline will be the achieved number of research projects supported as measured by the output indicator, cross-border research projects supported	Project monitoring	Six-monthly
	15 conferences and seminars held (with 600 attendees)	0	Project monitoring	Six-monthly
Impact (Direct)	80% of innovative cross-border projects funded still in existence 2 years after the end of the Programme	0	Project monitoring	2 years after the end of the Programme
	15 solutions to cross-border problems addressed through joint action	0	Project monitoring	2 years after the end of the Programme

Infrastructure

Transport

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
Output	3 km of roads upgraded/restored/built	0	Project monitoring	Six-monthly
Result	<p>Increase in traffic flow of vehicles/freight after one year [Target will be set when roads to be included for funding have been identified]</p> <p>Reduction in journey times (mins) [Target will be set when roads to be included for funding have been identified]</p>	<p>The baseline will be the volume of traffic flow along assisted roads prior to receiving Interreg IV support</p> <p>The baseline will be the average journey time in minutes along assisted roads prior to receiving Interreg IV support</p>	<p>Project monitoring</p> <p>Baseline data will be collected and recorded by the implementing agents in respect of each assisted road at the beginning of each project</p>	Post-project
Impact	<p>Improved safety (reduction in the number of accidents after 2 years) [Target will be set when roads to be included for funding have been identified]</p>	<p>The baseline will be the annual number of KSI (killed or seriously injured) accidents along assisted roads for the most recent year available prior to Interreg IV support</p>	<p>Project monitoring</p> <p>Baseline data will be collected and recorded by the implementing agents in respect of each assisted road at the beginning of each project</p>	Post-project

Alternative energy and the environment

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
Output	10 renewable energy/energy efficiency projects assisted	0	Project monitoring	Six-monthly
	5 environmental management projects funded	0		
Result	6 renewable energy sources created or developed.	0	Project monitoring	Post-project
	250 households who switch to/take up renewable energy methods of production.	0	Project monitoring	Post-project
	150 businesses switch to/take up renewable energy methods of production.	0		
Impact (Direct)	12% of electricity demand met from indigenous renewables.	3.5%	Project monitoring	Post-project
Impact (Global)	Reduction in per capita emissions of CO ₂ of 0.5 tonnes	13 tonnes per capita	Project monitoring	Annual

Telecommunications

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
Output	2 telecommunications projects funded – telecommunication line/infrastructure installed	0	Project monitoring	Six-monthly
Result	25% reduction in time taken to transmit data between North America and North West.	80 Milliseconds	Project monitoring	Post-project

	5 percentage point increase in the take up and use of broadband by business.	58%		
--	--	-----	--	--

Priority 3: Technical assistance

Programme information and publicity

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
Output	2 public launches of the Operational Programme	0	Project monitoring	Six monthly
	Publication of Monitoring and Evaluation Plan	0	Project monitoring	
	25 dissemination activities supported	0	Project monitoring	Six monthly
	100 press releases	0	Project monitoring	Six monthly
Result	Average of 60 hits per month on website	0		
	200 publicity and information enquiries	0		
Impact	Increased overall awareness of the Operational Programme	<p>First survey will be conducted in Autumn 2007</p> <p>Baseline will be the proportion of respondents who were aware of the Programme as at Autumn 2007</p>	Omnibus Survey	Annually

	Increased awareness of the role of the EU in the Operational Programme	<p>First survey will be conducted in Autumn 2007</p> <p>Baseline will be the proportion of respondents who understood the role of the EU in the Programme as at Autumn 2007</p>	Omnibus Survey	Annually
--	--	---	----------------	----------

Management, monitoring and evaluation of the Programme

Type	Indicator	Baseline	Source	Timeframe
Output	7 Technical Assistance projects funded	0	Programme monitoring	Six monthly
Result	14 monitoring reports completed [Target based on 2 reports per year for 7 years]	0	Programme monitoring	Six monthly
	6 evaluation reports completed [Target includes 2 overall programme evaluations, 4 thematic evaluations]	0	Programme monitoring	Six monthly
Impact	100% of reports submitted to the EU Commission comply with regulations	0	Programme monitoring	Six monthly
	100% of recommendations from evaluation reports responded to and implemented where appropriate	0	Programme monitoring	Six monthly

APPENDIX B: DEFINITIONS AND METHODS OF COLLECTION

VERSION 1 – APRIL 2009

Introduction

This paper provides detailed definitions of each of the indicators presented in the INTERREG IVA Operational Programme. It will be useful for the Joint Technical Secretariat (JTS) as a guide when setting indicators and targets for each operation. Similarly, it will be used by Lead Partners of the locally-led operations when setting indicators and targets for their sub-projects. The JTS and Lead Partners will also refer to the document when reporting progress against the indicators over the life of the programme.

The detailed definitions include:

- Indicator type
- Target
- Sub-indicators (if they exist)
- Sub-division (if required)
- Unit of measurement
- Timeframe of availability – how often the information should be collected
- Data source – who is responsible for collecting the data
- Verification by – who is responsible for verifying the data collected

The following paragraphs provide some additional information about the collection methods and the storage of the information on the System 2007 Database, as well as some general definitions.

Application and Monitoring Database

The application and monitoring database for the 2007-13 round of EU Programmes is known as System 2007. System 2007 holds information on five EU Programmes: INTERREG IVA, PEACE III, the Competitiveness and Employment ERDF Programme and ESF Programme and the Rural Development Programme. The database, which has been designed by RMA Systems, is a web-based system which allows:

- Applications to be made online
- Appraisal information to be recorded

- Letters of offer/rejection to be issued
- Financial monitoring information to be recorded and
- Non-financial monitoring information to be recorded.

The database design includes a number of standard reports which can be used to report on the information held, while a report writing facility allows ad hoc reports to be produced.

The indicators presented in the INTERREG IVA Operational Programme are available on System 2007. When the Letter of Offer is being agreed for each project, indicators will be selected and targets for achievement set. These will be used to assess the performance of the project throughout its lifetime. Every six months the project will be required to provide updates on their indicators to the Lead Partner, who will be responsible for inputting the information to the database.

General Definitions

Indicator¹¹

The measurement of an objective to be met, a resource mobilised, an effect obtained, a gauge of quality or a context variable. An indicator should be made up by a definition, a value and a measurement unit. For the purposes of EU Structural Funds there are four types of indicators – input, outputs, results and impacts.

- Inputs refer to the budget allocated to each level of the assistance. These financial indicators are used to monitor progress in terms of the commitment and payment of the funds available for any operation, measure or programme in relation to its eligible cost.
- Outputs relate to activity. They are measured in physical or monetary units (e.g. length of road constructed, number of firms financially supported, etc.).
- Results relate to the direct and immediate effect on direct beneficiaries brought about by a programme. They provide information on changes to, for example, the behaviour, capacity or performance of beneficiaries. They can be physical (reduction in journey times, number of successful trainees, etc.) or financial (leverage of private sector resources, decrease in transportation costs, etc.).
- Impacts refer to the consequences of the programme beyond the immediate effects. There are two types of impact: specific impacts are those effects occurring after a certain lapse of time but which are directly linked to the action

¹¹ European Commission, (2006): The New Programming Period 2007-13, Indicative Guidelines on Evaluation Methods: Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators, Working Document No. 2

taken and the direct beneficiaries; while global impacts are longer-term effects affecting a wider population and may not be capable of being disentangled from wider effects beyond the particular programme.

Any analysis of outputs, results and impacts will be within the context of the inputs.

Beneficiary¹²

For the purposes of the EU Structural funds a beneficiary has been defined in Regulation as an operator, body or firm, whether public or private, responsible of initiating, for initiating and implementing, operations. For INTERREG IVA the beneficiary is the Lead Partner.

Participant

For the purposes of INTERREG IVA a participant is defined as someone who

- is registered with an operation or project, or
- attends a structured programme of events on an ongoing basis.

If an individual attends more than one event within a single operation they should be counted as *one* participant; however, if an individual attends two or more events which are not part of a single operation, they should be counted for *each* operation.

For locally-led operations under Priority 2, Theme 1, the identification of the participant will be at the lower project level, i.e. if an individual attends more than one event within a single project they should be counted as *one* participant; however, if an individual attends two or more events which are not part of a single operation, they should be counted for *each* project.

Each participant should be asked to complete an Equality Monitoring Form.

Attendee

For the purposes of INTERREG IVA an attendee is defined as someone who attends a one-off event. Attendees should not be asked to complete an Equality Monitoring Form.

¹² Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006, Article 2

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 1: Enterprise

1.1

Indicator	Businesses assisted
Target	200
Indicator type	Output
Definition of the indicator	Number of new or existing businesses assisted within the Theme, where 'assisted' can include financial, training, accommodation, marketing/advertising or other advisory assistance.
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	Analysed by: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• new businesses• existing businesses (New + Existing businesses should total to 200) Also analysed by purpose of assistance: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• developing new and innovative products• developing new and innovative processes• improving sales and marketing activities (The total of these three will not necessarily add to 200 since funding could be provided for more than one purpose)
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat
Linked indicators	

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 1: Enterprise

1.2

Indicator	Businesses developing new products
Target	40%
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	Number of assisted businesses which develop new products as a percentage of all assisted businesses
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Percentage
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to database – recorded on the database as a <i>number</i> – percentage will be calculated centrally
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat
Linked indicators	

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 1: Enterprise

1.3

Indicator	Businesses developing new processes
Target	40%
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	Number of assisted businesses which develop new processes as a percentage of all assisted businesses
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Percentage
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to database – recorded on the database as a <i>number</i> – percentage will be calculated centrally
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat
Linked indicators	

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 1: Enterprise

1.4

Indicator	Increase in sales from sales and marketing activities
Target	10%
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	Levels of sales in assisted businesses who have undertaken sales and marketing activities
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Percentage – stored on database in £ or € – percentage calculated centrally
Timeframe of availability	Annual turnover recorded on database for <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the financial year <i>before</i> any activity takes place, and• the financial year <i>following completion</i> of the activity
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat
Linked indicators	

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 1: Enterprise

1.5

Indicator	Entering new markets
Target	20%
Indicator type	Impact
Definition of the indicator	Number of assisted businesses who enter new markets, both domestic and international, as a proportion of all assisted businesses
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Percentage – stored on database as a <i>number</i> – percentage calculated centrally
Timeframe of availability	Available 2 years following project end date
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 1: Enterprise

1.6

Indicator	Turnover of firms
Target	Increase
Indicator type	Impact
Definition of the indicator	Proportion of firms who report an increase in total turnover
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Available 2 years following project end date
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 1: Enterprise

1.7

Indicator	Turnover generated from export sales
Target	5%
Indicator type	Impact
Definition of the indicator	Proportion of total turnover in assisted business which after 2 years comes from new export sales
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Percentage – stored on database as a £ or € – percentage calculated centrally
Timeframe of availability	Available 2 years after project end date
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 1: Enterprise

1.8

Indicator	Survival rates
Target or direction of change	80%
Indicator type	Impact
Definition of the indicator	New firms which have received support which are still in existence 2 years after project completion
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Percentage – stored on database as a <i>number</i> – percentage calculated centrally
Timeframe of availability	Available 2 years after project end date
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 1: Enterprise

1.9

Indicator	Employment creation
Target	50
Indicator type	Impact
Definition of the indicator	Total new full-time equivalent jobs created within supported businesses
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number of jobs measured in full-time equivalents (not head count)
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

*NOTE:

It is impossible to define full-time work due to the variation in working hours between industries.

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 1: Enterprise

2.1

Indicator	Incubation units developed
Target	5
Indicator type	Output
Definition of the indicator	Number of incubation units either created or refurbished
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 1: Enterprise

2.2

Indicator	Floor space constructed/refurbished
Target	30,000 m ²
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	Area of floor space (in square metres) constructed or refurbished within the funded incubation units
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	Analysed by <ul style="list-style-type: none">• area of floor space constructed• area of floor space refurbished
Unit of measurement	Square metres
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 1: Enterprise

2.3

Indicator	Floor space bought or rented after 2 years
Target	75%
Indicator type	Impact
Definition of the indicator	Proportion of all constructed/refurbished floor space, within the incubation units funded, which has either been bought or is being rented 2 years after project completion
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Percentage – stored on database as a <i>number (square metres)</i> – percentage calculated centrally
Timeframe of availability	2 years after project end date
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 1: Enterprise

2.4

Indicator	Incubation Unit occupation
Target	20
Indicator type	Impact
Definition of the indicator	Number of businesses occupying the new or refurbished floor space within the incubation units
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	Analysed by <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Creative industries• Financial and customer services• Other
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	2 years after project end date
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 1: Enterprise

3.1

Indicator	Networking projects supported
Target	25
Indicator type	Output
Definition of the indicator	Number of networking projects supported. A network is defined as a group of companies/individuals/interested parties who share ideas, best practice or experience. A network will consist of <i>at least</i> two businesses. If two or more businesses are involved in a network this counts as <i>one</i> network.
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 1: Enterprise

3.2

Indicator	Involvement in networks
Target	200
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	<p>Number of businesses involved in the networks funded. If the same business is involved in more than one network it should be counted in the number of businesses for <i>each</i> network it is involved with, i.e. 2 or more.</p> <p>Current definition will lead to an element of double-counting however, organisers of one network may not be aware if a business involved in another network. Would it be possible for networks to provide list of all companies involved to allow duplication to be avoided?</p>
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 1: Enterprise

3.3

Indicator	Network survival rate
Target	40%
Indicator type	Impact
Definition of the indicator	Number of networks still in existence 2 years after project end date, as a proportion of the total number of networks funded.
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Percentage – stored on database as the <i>number of networks in operation after 2 years</i> – percentage calculated centrally
Timeframe of availability	2 years after project completion
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 2: Tourism

4.1

Indicator	Tourism product development
Target	10
Indicator type	Output
Definition of the indicator	Number of new tourism products/facilities developed or existing products/facilities enhanced.
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	Analysed by <ul style="list-style-type: none">• New• Existing (New + Existing should add to 10) And by <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Culture• Heritage• Natural resources• Marine and water• Other
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 2: Tourism

4.2

Indicator	Tourism marketing development
Target	10
Indicator type	Output
Definition of the indicator	Number of new tourism marketing or brand products developed or existing products enhanced.
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	Analysed by <ul style="list-style-type: none">• New• Existing And by <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Culture• Heritage• Natural resources• Marine and water
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 2: Tourism

4.3

Indicator	Visitors
Target	5%
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	Increase in the number of visitors to those products or facilities which receive funding for enhancement
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Number of visitors to facilities recorded on the database for the calendar year <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>before</i> product enhanced• <i>2 years after</i> project end date
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat
Linked indicators	

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 2: Tourism

4.4

Indicator	Tourism products/facilities survival rate
Target	80%
Indicator type	Impact
Definition of the indicator	Number of <i>new</i> tourism products or facilities funded which are still in existence after 2 years
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Percentage – stored on database as a <i>number</i> – percentage calculated centrally
Timeframe of availability	2 years after project completion
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 2: Tourism

4.5

Indicator	Visitors numbers – April to September
Target	10% increase
Indicator type	Impact (Global)
Definition of the indicator	Number of tourist visitors to Scotland, Border Region and Northern Ireland between April and September in a calendar year
Sub-indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 10% increase in the number of tourist visitors to Scotland• 10% increase in the number of tourist visitors to Border Region• 10% increase in the number of tourist visitors to Northern Ireland
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Baseline (2006) Scotland 7.7m, Border Region 0.3m, Northern Ireland 1.2m Updated annually. Final position taken in 2013.
Source	VisitScotland Central Statistics Office Northern Ireland Tourist Board
Verified by	-

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 2: Tourism

4.6

Indicator	Visitors numbers – October to March
Target	5% increase
Indicator type	Impact (Global)
Definition of the indicator	Number of tourist visitors to Scotland, Border Region and Northern Ireland between October and March
Sub-indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 5% increase in the number of tourist visitors to Scotland• 5% increase in the number of tourist visitors to Border Region• 5% increase in the number of tourist visitors to Northern Ireland
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Baseline (2006) Scotland 9.7m, Border Region 0.3m, Northern Ireland 0.8m Updated annually. Final position taken in 2013.
Source	VisitScotland Central Statistics Office Northern Ireland Tourist Board
Verified by	-

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 1: CO-OPERATION FOR A MORE PROSPEROUS CROSS BORDER REGION

Theme 2: Tourism

4.7

Indicator	Visitor stay
Target	Increase
Indicator type	Impact (Global)
Definition of the indicator	Average length of stay of tourists in each of Scotland, Border Region and Northern Ireland
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	Split for <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Scotland• Border Region• Northern Ireland
Unit of measurement	Nights
Timeframe of availability	Baseline (2006) Scotland 5.4, Border Region 5.6, Northern Ireland 4.8 Updated annually. Final position taken in 2013.
Source	VisitScotland Central Statistics Office Northern Ireland Tourist Board
Verified by	-

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 1: Collaboration

5.1

Indicator	Programme projects supported
Target	10
Indicator type	Output
Definition of the indicator	Number of programme projects supported within this theme (<i>exclude</i> those strategic local authority initiatives included in next output indicator)
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	Analysed by <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Research projects• Action/strategic plans
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 1: Collaboration

5.2

Indicator	Strategic local authority initiatives supported
Target	15
Indicator type	Output
Definition of the indicator	Number of initiatives which have been developed by local authorities funded by the Theme
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 1: Collaboration

5.3

Indicator	Recipients of supported programme public services
Target	1,000
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	People who benefit from the collaborative programme projects supported Benefit will be defined following analysis of the types of operation being funded
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 1: Collaboration

5.4

Indicator	Research projects completed
Target	100%
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	Research projects funded by the theme which are taken through to completion
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Percentage
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to database – recorded on the database as a <i>number</i> – percentage will be calculated centrally
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 1: Collaboration

5.5

Indicator	Conferences and seminars held
Target	15
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	Conferences and seminars held by either the programme projects or the local authority initiatives
Sub-indicators	600 attendees
Subdivision	Split by <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of conferences with number of attendees• Number of seminars with number of attendees
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 1: Collaboration

5.6

Indicator	Survival rates
Target	80%
Indicator type	Impact
Definition of the indicator	Innovative cross-border projects which are still in operation 2 years after Programme completion
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Percentage – stored on database as a <i>number</i> – percentage calculated centrally
Timeframe of availability	2 years after Programme completion
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 1: Collaboration

5.7

Indicator	Solutions to cross-border problems
Target	15
Indicator type	Impact
Definition of the indicator	Solutions to cross-border problems addressed through joint action Will require qualitative research to assess the types of problems and solutions which have been addressed
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Programme completion
Source	Lead Partners? Managing Authority?
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat?

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 2: Infrastructure

6.1

Indicator	Length of road upgraded/restored/built
Target	3
Indicator type	Output
Definition of the indicator	
Sub-indicators	Number of projects funded
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Kilometres
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 2: Infrastructure

6.2

Indicator	Traffic flow
Target	Increase (target to be set when roads to be included for funding have been identified)
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	Volume of traffic flow along assisted roads after one year
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number of vehicles per day
Timeframe of availability	Vehicles per day recorded on database <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>before</i> project begins, and• <i>one year after</i> project is completed
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 2: Infrastructure

6.3

Indicator	Journey times
Target	Reduction (target to be set when roads to be included for funding have been identified)
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	Average journey time along assisted roads
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Minutes
Timeframe of availability	Average journey time recorded on database <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>before</i> project begins, and• <i>one year after</i> project is completed
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 2: Infrastructure

6.4

Indicator	Number of accidents
Target	Reduction (target to be set when roads to be included for funding have been identified)
Indicator type	Impact
Definition of the indicator	Annual number of KSI (killed or seriously injured) accidents along assisted roads
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Annual number of KSI accidents recorded on database <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>before</i> project begins, and• <i>one year after</i> project is completed
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 2: Infrastructure

7.1

Indicator	Renewable energy/energy efficiency projects assisted
Target	10
Indicator type	Output
Definition of the indicator	Will be defined further when more aware of types of projects to be funded
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to the database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 2: Infrastructure

7.2

Indicator	Environmental management projects funded
Target	5
Indicator type	Output
Definition of the indicator	Will be defined further when more aware of types of projects to be funded
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to the database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 2: Infrastructure

7.3

Indicator	Renewable energy sources created or developed
Target	6
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	Will be defined further when more aware of types of projects to be funded
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to the database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 2: Infrastructure

7.4

Indicator	Households switching to renewable energy
Target	250
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	Number of households who switch to / take-up renewable energy methods of production
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to the database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 2: Infrastructure

7.5

Indicator	Businesses switching to renewable energy
Target	150
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	Number of businesses who switch to / take-up renewable energy methods of production
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to the database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 2: Infrastructure

7.6

Indicator	Electricity demand met from indigenous renewables
Target	12%
Indicator type	Impact (Global)
Definition of the indicator	The proportion of electricity demand met from indigenous renewables
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Percentage
Timeframe of availability	Baseline (2006) 3.5% Annual update Final position taken in 2013
Source	DETI
Verified by	-

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 2: Infrastructure

7.7

Indicator	CO₂ emissions
Target	0.5 tonnes reduction
Indicator type	Impact (Global)
Definition of the indicator	Reduction in per capita emissions of CO ₂
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Tonnes
Timeframe of availability	Baseline (2006) 13 tonnes per capita Annual update available. Final position taken in 2013.
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	-

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 2: Infrastructure

8.1

Indicator	Telecommunications projects funded
Target	2
Indicator type	Output
Definition of the indicator	Projects funded to install telecommunication line or infrastructure
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to database
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 2: Infrastructure

8.2

Indicator	Reduction in time taken to transmit data between North America and the North West
Target	25%
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	Time taken to transmit data between North America and the North West of Ireland and Northern Ireland
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Milliseconds
Timeframe of availability	Baseline 80 Milliseconds Final position taken <i>Post</i> project
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 2: CO-OPERATION FOR A SUSTAINABLE PROGRAMME REGION

Theme 2: Infrastructure

8.3

Indicator	Business broadband take-up
Target	5 percentage points
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	Proportion of businesses in the eligible area who take-up and use broadband.
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Percentage points
Timeframe of availability	Baseline 58% Final position 2 years following project completion
Source	Lead Partners
Verified by	Joint Technical Secretariat

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 3: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Theme 1: Programme information and publicity

9.1

Indicator	Public launches of the Operational Programme
Target	2
Indicator type	Output
Definition of the indicator	
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly update of the database
Source	Managing Authority
Verified by	-

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 3: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Theme 1: Programme information and publicity

9.2

Indicator	Publication of Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
Target	-
Indicator type	Output
Definition of the indicator	Monitoring and Evaluation Plan published on the SEUPB website, including all versions following annual review
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	-
Timeframe of availability	As soon as Plan is cleared for publication by the Monitoring Committee
Source	Managing Authority
Verified by	-

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 3: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Theme 1: Programme information and publicity

9.3

Indicator	Dissemination activities supported
Target	25
Indicator type	Output
Definition of the indicator	Activities providing information on the Programme, including <ul style="list-style-type: none">• updates on progress and• monitoring and evaluation to media and the general public?
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to the database
Source	Managing Authority
Verified by	

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 3: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Theme 1: Programme information and publicity

9.4

Indicator	Press releases
Target	100
Indicator type	Output
Definition of the indicator	Number of press releases issued by SEUPB providing information on INTERREG IVA
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to the database
Source	Managing Authority
Verified by	-

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 3: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Theme 1: Programme information and publicity

9.5

Indicator	Hits per month on website
Target	60
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	Average number of hits per month on the INTERREG IV pages of the website
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly update of the database
Source	Managing Authority
Verified by	-

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 3: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Theme 1: Programme information and publicity

9.6

Indicator	Publicity and information enquiries
Target	200
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	Number of publicity and information enquiries to SEUPB about INTERREG IV
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly update of the database
Source	Managing Authority
Verified by	-

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 3: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Theme 1: Programme information and publicity

9.7

Indicator	Overall awareness of the Operational Programme
Target	Increase
Indicator type	Impact
Definition of the indicator	Proportion of respondents to the SEUPB survey who had heard of INTERREG
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Percentage
Timeframe of availability	Baseline (June 2007) 5% Annual update
Source	SEUPB Communications Team
Verified by	-

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 3: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Theme 1: Programme information and publicity

9.8

Indicator	Awareness of the role of the EU in the Operational Programme
Target	Increase
Indicator type	Impact
Definition of the indicator	Proportion of respondents to the SEUPB Survey who were aware of the role of the EU in the Programme
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Percentage points
Timeframe of availability	Baseline (June 2007) 14% were aware that SEUPB's work involved EU funding Annual update
Source	SEUPB Communications Team
Verified by	-

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 3: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Theme 2: Management, monitoring and evaluation of the programme

10.1

Indicator	Technical Assistance projects
Target	7
Indicator type	Output
Definition of the indicator	Number of projects funded under the Technical Assistance Priority.
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Six monthly input to the database
Source	Managing Authority
Verified by	-

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 3: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Theme 2: Management, monitoring and evaluation of the programme

10.2

Indicator	Monitoring reports completed
Target	14
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	One detailed monitoring report produced for each Monitoring Committee meeting
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Annual input to the database
Source	Managing Authority
Verified by	-

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 3: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Theme 2: Management, monitoring and evaluation of the programme

10.3

Indicator	Evaluation reports completed
Target	6
Indicator type	Result
Definition of the indicator	Number of evaluation reports completed on the Programme
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	Split by <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Overall Programme• Thematic
Unit of measurement	Number
Timeframe of availability	Annual input to the database
Source	Managing Authority
Verified by	-

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 3: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Theme 2: Management, monitoring and evaluation of the programme

10.4

Indicator	Reports submitted to the EU Commission comply with regulations
Target	100%
Indicator type	Impact
Definition of the indicator	Reports, including Annual Implementation Reports, formally submitted to the Commission complying with EU Regulations
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Percentage – database will store the total number of reports submitted to the Commission, <i>and</i> the number of reports which comply with regulations
Timeframe of availability	Annual input to the database
Source	Managing Authority
Verified by	-

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 3: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Theme 2: Management, monitoring and evaluation of the programme

10.5

Indicator	Recommendations from evaluation reports responded to by Managing Authority and implemented where appropriate
Target	100%
Indicator type	Impact
Definition of the indicator	Managing Authority will respond to <i>all</i> recommendations in Evaluation Reports, and implement where appropriate
Sub-indicators	-
Subdivision	-
Unit of measurement	Percentage – database will store the total number of recommendations from evaluation reports, <i>and</i> the total number of recommendations to which the Managing Authority has responded.
Timeframe of availability	Annual input to the database
Source	Managing Authority
Verified by	-

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 3: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Theme 2: Management, monitoring and evaluation of the programme

ANNEX C: ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT INDICATORS – BASELINE POSITION

Indicator	Baseline	Year	Source
Nitrogen oxide emissions (thousand tones)	UK: 1,627	2005	AEA Energy and Environment
Annual average urban background PM ₁₀ levels (µg m ⁻³)	UK: 24	2006	AEA Energy and Environment
Share of organic area in total utilized agricultural area (%)	UK: 3.8% Ireland: 0.8%	2005	Eurostat
Biological quality of rivers (% of river length classified as good quality)	NI: 56% Scotland: 87%	2005	EHS, SEPA
Population (million)	NI: 1.7 Ireland: 4.2 Scotland: 5.1	2006	NISRA, CSO, GRO(S)
Life expectancy at birth - Males	NI: 76.0 Ireland: 75.1 Scotland: 74.2	2003-05 2002 2003-05	NISRA, CSO, GRO(S)
Life expectancy at birth - Females	NI: 80.8 Ireland: 80.3 Scotland: 79.3	2003-05 2002 2003-05	NISRA, CSO, GRO(S)

INTERREG IVA – INDICATOR DEFINITIONS

PRIORITY 3: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Theme 2: Management, monitoring and evaluation of the programme

ANNEX D: PLANNED EVALUATIONS

Planned evaluations	Scope	Key questions	Dissemination	Timetable	Who will evaluate (internal/external)	Structure of steering group (where known)	Cost £ (where known)
Evaluation of Priority 2, Theme 1	All locally-led projects in this Theme	What has been the overall impact of these projects? Is there a need for further funding in these areas? Is the locally-led consortium the most appropriate to manage this funding?	SEUPB website	Late 2009/ Early 2010	External	MEWG	
Evaluation of INTERREG IVA	Entire programme	To produce a synthesis of the work carried out in the ongoing evaluations. To review monitoring data and performance indicators with the purpose of assessing progress towards the key objectives and to recommend corrective actions if there is under-performance. To support any proposed changes to the operational programme or reallocation of financial resources.	SEUPB website	Late 2010/ Early 2011	External	MEWG	