Evaluation Plan

Approved May 15th, 2023

2021
2027

Index

1. Legal basis

- Regulation (EU) 2021/1059 on specific provisions for the ETC goal (Interreg) supported by the ERDF and external financing instruments - Art.35 Evaluation during the Programming period;
- Common Provisions Regulation (EU) 2021/1060 – Art.72 Functions of the MA

The JS/MA will be the main interlocutor for the evaluation process. The involvement of Programme bodies/actors in the Evaluation process is cited under section 6 of this Evaluation Plan.

2. Timing of the service

The Evaluation Plan will cover the whole 2021-2027 programming period, going from 01/09/2022 (start date of the strategic project ADRIONCYCLETOUR) to 31/12/2029, according to the framework established by the public procurement documents and the technical offer as consolidated in the Contract to be signed by the Managing Authority of the Programme Interreg VI-A Italy-Slovenia 2021-2027 (autonomous Region Friuli Venezia Giulia) and the contracted External Evaluator(s).

3. General sources of information

The Evaluation Plan of Interreg Programmes is prepared in compliance with:

- Regulation (EU) 2021/1059 – art. 35
- Commission Staff Working Document 8.7.2021 SWD(2021) 198 final "Performance, monitoring and evaluation of the European Regional Development Fund, the Cohesion Fund and the Just Transition Fund 2021-2027"
- INTERACT guidance on Programme evaluation (INTERACT Briefing note, Jan. 2022)
- All useful documents and sources from the 2014-20 programming period

Documents to be taken into account are listed below:
a) **Programme basic documents for the programming period 2021-27**
   - Territorial and socio economic Analisys of the Programme area
   - IP1 – Programme 2021-27
   - IP2 – Annex to the Programme 2021-27 – projects of strategic importance
   - Methodology Paper of the Performance Framework
b) **Programme basic documents, focusing on Environmental issues, for the programming period 2021-27**
   - Environmental Statement - June 2022
   - Environmental Report
   - Appropriate Statement
   - Environmental Monitoring Plan – vers.1

All the above mentioned Programme basic documents are available on the Programme website.

The relevant documents and/or links will be kept updated within the same website.

https://www.ita-slo.eu/en/programming-period-2021-2027/programme-documentation

c) **Useful Programme documents from the 2014-20 programming period**

- Evaluation reports from the 2014-20 programming period available on the Programme website: https://www.ita-slo.eu/en/documents/programme-documents, included the summary of evaluation findings at 31.12.2022 (*ex* art. 114 of CPR 2014-2020 no. 1303/2013). Some findings were also reflected into the IP 2021-2027 in its Territorial and Socio Economic Analysis and broadly in the definition of the joint Programme Strategy, challenges and policy responses.

4. Deliverables

Extensive Evaluation reports – two reports

Focusing on overall (physical, financial, procedural) performance of the programme, all Programme policy objectives and all relevant indicators (also in view of eventual indicator reprogramming) to assess efficiency, relevance, coherence and added value of EU support.

Also crosscutting objectives can be evaluated such as for example sustainable development, digital transition, social inclusion and equality, as well as complementarity with intervention of other Interreg or mainstream Programmes insisting on the same area and with EUSALP and EUSAIR Macro-Regional strategies.

The second Extended Evaluation Report shall highlight lessons learned and elements of continuity and discontinuity with the actions of the previous programming period while providing useful indications for the implementation of the territorial strategies for programming periods beyond the current one, It will thus give a picture of the Interreg Italy-Slovenia Programme over time and the overview of the evaluation findings and recommendations altogether from the previous evaluations reports – extended, impact and thematic – in order to be a useful tool for the programming periods beyond the current one.

Reports shall all include a synthesis of findings. All Reports except the first, shall contain the synthesis of findings, shaped in a dynamic and comparative way with respect to the findings of previous reports (also thematic ones when relevant) in order to offer the overview on evolution of the Programme.

Thematic Evaluation reports - four reports

The four Evaluation reports could focus on effectiveness of Programme intervention on some fields, for example on: Small Project Fund; capitalization; the three operations of strategic importance results as a whole, with particular attention to the communication part; DNSH principle as an evaluation of the environmental principles, or others as proposed by the MA in accordance with the Evaluation working group/Monitoring Committee.

Reports shall all include a synthesis of findings shaped in a dynamic and comparative way with respect to the findings of previous reports (when relevant and when findings are focused on the topic object of the thematic report) in order to offer the overview on the evolution of the Programme.

Impact assessment - one report

This report only needs to be delivered at the end of the programming period (by June 2029). It concerns the impact of the Programme on the territory, including the impact of people-to-people actions in terms of benefits versus cross-border obstacles as identified by the European Commission with its COM(2018) 373 final (Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on a mechanism to resolve legal and administrative obstacles in a cross-border context).

This Report shall evaluate the validity of the IT-SI Programme strategy in relation to the achievement of its objectives and of Programme targets indicators. It shall be evaluated the contribution of the IT-SI Programme to the achievement of the general objectives of the ESI funds 2021-2027, to the EUSALP and EUSAIR Macro-Regional strategies and crosscutting issues.

Impact Evaluation Report shall highlight lessons learned and elements of continuity and discontinuity with the actions of the previous programming period, as well as the degree of implementation of the recommendations foreseen in the previous evaluations with a view of providing useful indications for the implementation of the territorial strategies for programming periods beyond the current one.

Analysis of synergies and cooperation with other Interreg/mainstream programmes shall be assessed in line with the provisions set in IT-SI Programme - section 1.2.

The report shall all include a synthesis of findings of the impact evaluation, also with a focus on Programme bodies.

This Report has to be released according to the timing foreseen in art. 35 point 2 of EU Regulation n. 2021/1059.

Summaries

In each evaluation report (extensive, thematic, impact), a **summary of findings** should be inserted (so called "resume").

For **Programme communication and promotion purposes, <u>four</u> non-technical synthesis** of evaluation findings in a concise and infographic format, understandable to general public shall be released to be published on the Programme website/social channels in order to ensure the highest visibility to evaluation findings.

For each evaluation report a **synthesis** is to be included **on the DNSH principle** and coherence of projects financed by the Programme with environmental objectives as listed in (EU) Regulation 2020/852 and through environmental indicators as indicated in the

Programme IT-SI Monitoring Environmental Plan published on Programme It-Si website https://www.ita-slo.eu/it/programmazione-2021-2027/documenti-programma .

The list of the Evaluation deliverables is attached (Annex 1).

5. Specific sources of information for the reports and methodology

The sources of information for the listed reports, shall be:

- Programme documents;
- Desk analysis;
- Programme website;
- Programme Jems monitoring system - reports and monitoring and pieces of Information from the project application forms (on project partners-their location and typology etc., on topics, activities, deliverables, outputs, indicators, interactions with other Programmes and macro-regional strategies etc.) and set of Programme indicators;
- Thematic policy documents or umbrella policies (those related to the Programme topics, general ones like EU Green Deal etc.) and other current or future policy evidence related to the selected policy objectives of the Programme or Interreg-specific ones;
- Online interviews and surveys, upon need;
- Eventual benchmarking and case studies;
- Only if needed, consultation of official statistics, relevant additional studies and investigations.

The overall evaluation approach highlights a causal and circular relationships among policy evaluation, policy planning and policy reshaping, implying a consistent methodological framework and quality, updated and reliable data, complying with the principles of coherence, feasibility and flexibility.

Evaluation methodologies are listed in Annex 2.

6. Actors in the Evaluation process

In line with the Common Provisions Regulation (EU) 2021/1060 – Art.72 Functions of the MA, the Managing Authority is the responsible body for the Programme evaluation. In line with the INTERACT Guidance on Programme Evaluation (INTERACT Briefing note, Jan.2022), a person or a stable group of people within the MA/JS that follows the Programme evaluation will be indicated.

The **MA,** according to article 35 of Interreg Regulation has the responsibility to "*draw up an Evaluation Plan*" [...] and "*submit it to the Monitoring Committee no later than one year*

after the adoption of the programme", while ensuring, with the JS support, "*the necessary procedures to produce and collect the data necessary for evaluations*" and "*publish all evaluations on the website*".

The **Monitoring Committee** will steer the evaluation process in line with Interreg Regulation (articles 30/1(d) and 30/2(b)): it shall "*approve the Evaluation Plan and its amendment(s)*" and "*examine the progress made in carrying out evaluations, syntheses of evaluations, and any follow-up given to findings*".

in line with the good practice of the 2014-2020 programming period, an **Evaluation Working Group** composed by representatives of the Institutional Programme partner and by the MA/JS will be established by the Monitoring Committee to better focus on the contents of evaluation deliverables.

The **European Commission**, sitting in the MC in an advisory capacity, can advise through its Programme Desk Officer the Monitoring Committee at all stages of the evaluation process.

According to art. 35.3 of Interreg Regulation, "*evaluations shall be entrusted to [...] **external experts** who are functionally independent*". They shall carry out their task on the basis of this Evaluation Plan. The Managing Authority retains the coordination responsibility on activities related to external evaluators who shall work in coordination with the Working Group on Managing Authority request. The MA/JS will provide the external experts with necessary information and inputs as well as practical insights into the programme implementation and the progress of operations identified during the monitoring process.

The Evaluation Plan approved by the Monitoring Committee shall be transmitted to the European Commission and shall be published on Programme website.

Timing for interaction among the relevant actors within the Evaluation process will be established within the procedure to contract External Evaluators for the sake of a functional management of the evaluation task for the Programme.

In the perspective of an effective evaluation, it is fundamental to involve a number of **relevant actors – internal and external to the Programme** – for their eventual specific contribution to the setting of an overall evaluation of the co-financed activities.

Below is the list and contacts of Programme Authorities and some of the relevant actors.

Table 1. Programme authorities and actors in the Evaluation process

Programme Authorities /Structures			
Authority	**Name of the institution**	**Contact name**	**Email**
Managing Authority	Autonomous Region Friuli Venezia Giulia	Laura Comelli	adg.itaslo@regione.fvg.it interreg.itaslo@certregione.fvg.it

	Central Directorate for Finance Accounting Unit		
Joint Secretariat	Autonomous Region Friuli Venezia Giulia Central Directorate for Finance Accounting Unit	Aljosa Sosol	Jts.itaslo@regione.fvg.it
Other bodies			
Monitoring Committee	For regional and national members please see the list as published on the Programme website https://www.ita-slo.eu/en/programming-period-2021-2027/programme-documentation		
Slovene National Contact Point	Ministry of Cohesion and Regional Development - Interreg and Financial Mechanisms Office - Interreg Division / Štanjel Regional Office	Danica Šantelj Arrighetti	it-si.svrk@gov.si
Regional contact point in Veneto	Directorate Joint Programming Department / European Territorial Cooperation and Macro Strategies Unit	Rita Bertocco	programmazione-unitaria@regione.veneto.it
EGTC GO – Sole Beneficiary	EGTC GO	Romina Kocina	info@euro-go.eu pec@pec.euro-go.eu
Other relevant stakeholders	In relation to strategic projects and other beneficiaries/stakeholders		

7. Evaluation Content

The overall evaluation approach must follow the new Regulations set out by the European Commission for the 2021-27 programming period and INTERACT Programme Guidance, highlighting its role of key element in the development of a systems of causal and circular relationships among policy evaluation, policy planning and policy reshaping, thus shifting the focus from the co-financed activities' implementation towards a broader assessment of the objectives' delivery capacity and of the EU funds contribution impact on policies improvement and development.

7.1 Evaluation Objectives

As the Programme basic documents are, in line with the new EU Regulations, very detailed, there is no need for extensive evaluation objectives. The Evaluation Plan should remain a "rolling document" and hence give the general framework of Evaluation Objectives, adaptable to the foreseen 7 Evaluation reports.

The design of the evaluation objectives begins with the careful consideration of the Programme strategy. In order to respond to the needs and challenges of the Programme

area, the mission of the IT-SI Programme is "*Enhanced cross-border cooperation for improving the quality of life of the population, preserving and promoting cultural and natural heritage and enhancing the climate neutrality of the Programme area through sustainable, innovative and inclusive growth*".

According to the concentration principle of Regulations, The Programme selected the following Policy and Specific Objectives:

Table 2. PO-SO and typologies of projects according to the IP

Selected policy objective or selected Interreg-specific objective	Selected specific objective	Project typology
PO1 - A more competitive and smarter Europe by promoting innovative and smart economic transformation and regional ICT connectivity	SO 1 - Developing and enhancing research and innovation capacities and the uptake of advanced technologies	STANDARD CAPITALISATION
PO2 - A greener, low-carbon transitioning towards a net zero carbon economy and resilient Europe by promoting clean and fair energy transition, green and blue investment, the circular economy, climate change mitigation and adaptation, risk prevention and management, and sustainable urban mobility	SO 4 - Promoting climate change adaptation and disaster risk prevention, resilience, taking into account eco-system based approaches	STANDARD CAPITALISATION
PO2 - A greener, low-carbon transitioning towards a net zero carbon economy and resilient Europe by promoting clean and fair energy transition, green and blue investment, the circular economy, climate change mitigation and adaptation, risk prevention and management, and sustainable urban mobility	SO 6 - Promoting the transition to a circular and resource efficient economy	STANDARD CAPITALISATION
PO2 - A greener, low-carbon transitioning towards a net zero carbon economy and resilient Europe by promoting clean and fair energy transition, green and blue investment, the circular economy, climate change	SO 7 - Enhancing protection and preservation of nature, biodiversity, and green infrastructure, including in urban areas, and reducing all forms of pollution	STANDARD CAPITALISATION STRATEGIC (POSEIDONE)

mitigation and adaptation, risk prevention and management, and sustainable urban mobility		
PO4 - A more social and inclusive Europe implementing the European Pillar of Social Rights	SO 6 - enhancing the role of culture and sustainable tourism in economic development, social inclusion and social innovation	STANDARD CAPITALISATION SPF STRATEGIC (ADRIONCYCLETOUR and KRAS-CARSO II)
ISO 1 – A better cooperation governance	ISO 1.(b) - enhance efficient public administration by promoting legal and administrative cooperation and cooperation between citizens, civil society actors and institutions, in particular, with a view to resolving legal and other obstacles in border regions	STANDARD CAPITALISATION
ISO 1 – A better cooperation governance	ISO 1.(c) - build up mutual trust, in particular by encouraging people-to-people actions	PEOPLE TO PEOPLE

In designing evaluation objectives, the INTERACT guidance on Programme evaluation (INTERACT Briefing note, Jan. 2022) provides recommendations for the design of Evaluation Plans and objectives, setting the main goals of the evaluation process in the 2021-2027 Programming period.

In line with the Commission Staff Working Document 8.7.2021 SWD(2021) 198 final "Performance, monitoring and evaluation of the European Regional Development Fund, the Cohesion Fund and the Just Transition Fund 2021-2027" below is the synthetic description of the main principles underneath to the Evaluation objectives:

- **Effectiveness**: is the extent to which an action has been successful in achieving objectives or progressing towards them, as well as the role of the programme in generating the desired changes (evidence of the benefits brought by the Programme interventions);
- **Efficiency**: is the relationship between the funds used to achieve the set objectives and the effective change generated by the intervention (how the funds allocated to the Programme contributed to the objectives);

- **Relevance**: is the relationship between the context needs and the objectives of the intervention, therefore an intervention is appropriate to the extent that it addresses the existing problems;
- **Coherence**: analyzes the ability of different actions to work together, starting from the assumption that no policy implemented is the only one to influence an area. In fact, the overlapping and integration of different interventions and development choices necessarily influence each other. The criterion also measures internal coherence, i.e. how the various components of a programme combine to achieve its objectives;
- **European added value**: this is the extent to which the changes can be attributed to European intervention (which can be observed from different points of view, such as additional resources made available by European funds, or the benefit brought to other policies), improving the outcome achieved through national actions by the individual Member State.

Extended Evaluation Reports shall focus on efficiency, relevance, consistency and EU added-value, while Thematic Reports on effectiveness on specific topics. Extended Evaluation Reports will also assess physical, financial and procedural Programme performance and crosscutting topics such as the ones described above in section 4.

As highlighted in section 5, Evaluations should also build on the information collected through the set of Programme indicators (output and result indicators). The achievement of foreseen targets will have to take into account also information on indicators quantification and eventual external factors which may impact on the achievement of indicators targets and milestones (ref. Methodology Paper of the Performance Framework).

Also, Evaluation objectives shall serve:

- to highlight Programme visibility;

- to measure results in terms of better capacity of innovation and higher competitiveness of enterprises, also in a networking perspective;

- to enhance territorial attractiveness through promotion and safeguard of resources;

- to valorise experiences of cross-border governance and institutional cooperation, also developing innovative models of joint management.

7.2 Evaluations and Evaluation Questions

As the Programme basic documents are, in line with the new EU Regulations, very detailed, there is no need for extensive evaluation questions. These are included in the Annex 2, remaining a "rolling document" and hence give the general framework of Evaluation Questions, adaptable to the foreseen six Evaluation reports.

Evaluations must be fine-tuned with:

- the overall Programme strategy and development and effectiveness dynamics in the area;

- the evolution of territorial needs;

- the Programme performances, in terms of delivery, results, impact (referring to specific objectives, typology of operations);

- the Programme governance, managing and control dynamics during Programme life cycle;

- the previous Programme's evaluation activities and documents, even in a follow-up perspective;

- different relevant actors, in terms of impact on quality of life, quality of services, development and opportunities;

- evaluation questions must pay attention to innovative instruments, services and methods, supported by the Programme;

- not only with quantitative effects, but also to raise the awareness of the actual impact of the Programme on creating conditions for change and for local development.

Evaluation questions must be clear, relevant and focused to assess outcomes and impact of the Programme and to provide updated orientations to decision-makers. Evaluation questions are declined at the project level and at Programme level. Last but not least, evaluation questions need to be closely interrelated with the evaluation deliverables in a fine-tuning perspective.

With reference to the efficiency of the Programme structure and procedures, including simplification and reduction of administrative burden, Evaluation questions can be as follows:

Table 3. Evaluation-questions with reference to the efficiency of Programme structure and procedures

EVALUATION CRITERIA	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	EVALUATION PRODUCTS
Performance (financial/physical/procedural)	**EQ.P.1** How the programme is being implemented and managed?	**First extensive Evaluation Report** **Second extensive Evaluation Report**
Efficiency	**EQ.E.1** How effective are the programme management structure and procedures?	**First extensive Evaluation Report**
	EQ.E.2 How effective is the monitoring system in supporting the implementation phase?	**Second extensive Evaluation Report**

	EQ.E.3 Were there delays or other problems in granting the resources?	Impact Evaluation Report
	EQ.E.4 Were the general objectives of the Fund achieved at reasonable cost?	Impact Evaluation Report
Simplification and reduction of administrative burden	EQ.S.1 Did the procedures bring about simplification for the beneficiaries of the CP?	**First extensive Evaluation Report**
	EQ.S.2 How user friendly are programme procedures and forms, manuals	**Second extensive Evaluation Report**

For the list of evaluation questions, see Annex 2 to this Plan.

8. Analysis of interaction with other Programmes financed by Structural Funds

The patterns of interaction among the Programme and the other financial and investment programmes, plans and instruments operating in the area shall be taken into consideration to foster coordination and synergies with other European Structural and Investment Funds (especially complementarities with other Interreg Programmes and with mainstream Programmes insisting on the same area) as well as with other relevant Union policies, strategies and instruments, included the European Macroregional Strategies.

9. Training programmes for staff dealing with evaluation

MA/JS and External Evaluators will follow workshops/trainings on evaluation provided by the EC and Interact. Training activities may refer to:

- planning and managing evaluations, for quality control of evaluation reports;
- awareness raising on evaluation, as shared learning exercise;
- qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and methods for impact assessment;
- coaching for MA/ JS staff.

In order to ensure a good quality of data including a harmonised understanding of indicator definitions, the JS will continue offering, as in 2014-2020, useful information to beneficiaries through information provided in the Programme document/guidelines/manuals/video tutorials, workshops and bilateral meetings with the JS, clarification process related to progress report monitoring indicators which serve as relevant input to the Programme evaluation.

Close cooperation between the External Evaluators and the JS is foreseen as described in section 6.

10. Use and communication of evaluations

The evaluation reports will be published on the Programme website and be transmitted through the SFC system to the EC. There shall be links between evaluation, communication and capitalization activities, creating mutual learning and synergies. In this sense:

- capitalization activities might benefit from the results of the analysis of projects or project clusters in the framework of the impact evaluation;
- evaluation might use capitalization activities to analyse policy perspective.

As happened in 2014-2020 period, the MA will use evaluation outcomes as a tool to improve the implementation of the programme and to possibly inform the development of the next programme post 2027.

11. Overall budget for implementation of the Evaluation Plan

From the core Technical Assistance budget (TA), a budget of EUR 110,000 (VAT included) is reserved for Programme evaluation for the whole programming period 2021-2027.

Refer to Annex 1 for dedicated funds per evaluation deliverable.

12. Quality management strategy

The Programme is committed to quality management of all steps in the evaluation cycle listed in the following table:

Table 4. Table on Quality management

Elements of evaluation	Considerations for quality assurance in the process
Planning	
Evaluation expertise	Briefing or training of internal/external actors (MA/JS team, external evaluators on their behalf) depending on the level of expertise
Timing	Due consideration, regular discussion within the WG
Scope and relevance of evaluation	Well drawn terms of reference
Defensible design and methods	Sound tender selection
Implementation	
Open and transparent process	Use of internal information available in Jems and the programme website with open access to key stakeholders, regular information to the MC
Reliable data used	Clear definition of operations' indicators. Clear methodology for reporting. Internal check on indicators reported by operations.

Sound analysis	Comprehensive and shared stock-taking at the start, use of adequate sources, transparent methods.
Credible results that relate to analysis and data	Exchange and brainstorming at regular basis and when needed MA/JS/external evaluators on scope and meaning of monitoring data.
Impartial conclusions showing no bias and demonstrating sound judgement	Effective dissemination and discussion within the WG and transparent reporting to the MC; based on sound preparation of meetings (planning, rules of procedures), adequate formats allowing for open discussion, experienced leadership in the process.
Clear report with executive summaries	Dissemination to all stakeholders
Commitment to follow-up	Effective preparation of meetings with the MC; information showing crisp and clear pathways from finding to proposed remedial action
Communication	Involvement of project communication experts in the process; due consideration of different target groups.

Annexes

1. Evaluation deliverables, funds and timing
2. Evaluation Questions and Evaluation methodologies

ANNEX 1 - Evaluation deliverables, funds and timing

Table 5. Deliverables and funds

Deliverable	Qantity	
Executive summary on communication	4	
Executive summary on DNSH principle	7	
Extended Evaluation Report + synthesis	2	
Impact Evaluation Report + synthesis	1	
Thematic Evaluation Report + synthesis	4	
Total maximum amount (VAT excluded)		**90.000,00 €**

Table 6. Indicative Timing for deliverables

Indicative timing	Deliverable
15/12/2024	I Thematic Evaluation Report + synthesis
	I Executive summary DNSH on I Thematic Evaluation Report
31/10/2025	II Thematic Evaluation Report + synthesis
	II Executive summary DNSH on II Thematic Evaluation Report
30/11/2025	I Executive summary communication of findings for general public (infographic)
30/11/2026	I Extended Evaluation Report + synthesis
	III Executive summary DNSH on II Thematic Evaluation Report
15/12/2026	II Executive summary communication of findings for general public (infographic)
31/05/2027	III Thematic Evaluation Report + synthesis
	IV Executive summary DNSH on III Thematic Evaluation Report
15/12/2027	III Executive summary communication of findings for general public (infographic)
31/03/2028	IV Thematic Evaluation Report + synthesis
	V Executive summary DNSH on IV Thematic Evaluation Report
30/11/2028	II Extended Evaluation Report + synthesis
	IV Executive summary DNSH on II Extended Evaluation Report
15/12/2028	IV Executive summary communication of findings for general public (infographic)
30/05/2029	Impact Evaluation Report + synthesis
	VI Executive summary DNSH on Impact Evaluation Report

ANNEX 2 - Evaluation methodologies and indicative Evaluation Questions

EVALUATION METHODOLOGIES

In this Annex are included <u>possible methodologies</u> the External Evaluator might decide to be applied, without prejudice to his freedom in the choice of methodologies according to the data collection method and tools he will consider most effective (to be agreed with the Managing Authority/Working Group), as well as on the basis of the availability of data. The evaluations should also build on the information collected through the Programme set of indicators.

Table 7. Evaluation methodologies per typology of Report

Impact Evaluation	Counterfactual analysis, literature review, focus group information, data analysis from case studies (if available)
Extensive Evaluations	Analysis of monitoring and administrative data (desk analysis), interviews or online surveys, surveys, field research, Counterfactual tools
Thematic evaluations	Analysis of monitoring and administrative data (desk analysis), interviews or online surveys, surveys, field research, Counterfactual tools, eventual case studies and focus groups

Other methodologies could be the benchmark with best competitors and multi-criteria analysis, at discretion of the Evaluator.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

General evaluation questions derive from Policy objectives and Specific objectives of the Programme.Table 8. Policy objectives and Specific objectives of the Interreg VI Italy-Slovenia 2021-2027

Policy Objective	Specific Objective
PO 1 - A more competitive and smarter Europe	**SO 1.1** - Developing and enhancing research and innovation capacities and the uptake of advanced technologies
PO 2 - A greener, low-carbon transitioning towards a net zero carbon economy and resilient Europe	**SO 2.4** - Promoting climate change adaptation and disaster risk prevention, and resilience, taking into account eco-system based approaches
	SO 2.6 - Promoting the transition to a circular and resource efficient economy
	SO 2.7 - Enhancing protection and preservation of nature, biodiversity and green infrastructure, including in urban areas, and reducing all forms of pollution
PO 4 - A more social and inclusive Europe	**SO 4.6** - Enhancing the role of culture and sustainable tourism in economic development, social inclusion and social innovation
ISO 1 – Better Cooperation Governance	**ISO 1 (b) -** Enhance efficient public administration by promoting legal and administrative cooperation and cooperation between citizens, civil society actors and institutions, in particular with a view to resolving legal and other obstacles in border regions
	ISO 1 (c) - Build up mutual trust, in particular by encouraging people-to-people actions

In particular, for Extensive Evaluations, the following indicative guiding questions might be an useful framework:

Table 9. Indicative questions for Extensive Evaluations

Indicative guiding questions for Extensive Evaluations	How many and which typology of **partners** are involved in the projects (e.g. public, private and public interest ones, organizational typology, national/regional/local, etc.)?
	Which are projects, partners, activities that **enhance territorial attractiveness** through promotion and safeguard natural and cultural of resources?
	Which are projects, partners, activities that valorise **experiences of cross-border governance and institutional cooperation**, also developing innovative models of joint management?

In addition, below are the indicative guiding questions more linked with Programme Policy and Specific Objectives.

Table 10. Indicative questions per SO/ISO

SO	Indicative questions* *they might be non-exclusively for the SO for which they are indicated in this table
SO 1.1.	Which are the **highly innovative** projects, partners, activities, esp. those contributing more to the competitiveness? Which are the developed solutions to be highlighted as good practice?
SO 2.4.	Which are the **risk prevention and ecosystem-based** approaches in the approved projects, esp. those contributing to climate change adaptation? Which are the developed solutions to be highlighted as good practice?
SO 2.6.	Which are the **circular and resource efficient economy** approaches in the approved projects? Which are the developed solutions to be highlighted as good practice?
SO 2.7.	Which are the **protection and nature preservation, biodiversity and green infrastructure**, approaches in the approved projects? Do they involve urban and rural areas? Which are the developed solutions to be highlighted as good practice?
SO 4.6.	Which are the **cultural and sustainable tourism (enhancing economic development, social inclusion and social innovation)** approaches in the approved projects? Which are the developed solutions to be highlighted as good practice?
ISO1b	Which are the **public administration efficiency and legal/administrative cooperation and citizen cooperation** approaches in the approved projects**? Which are the developed solutions to be put** highlighted as **good practice?**
ISO1c	Which are the approved projects and approaches that contributed to **building mutual trust and encouraged people-to-people actions**? Which are the developed solutions to be highlighted as good practice?