CBC GR-IT, Logic Model and Methodology for Result Indicators

NOT TO BE DISSEMINATED TO EXTERNALS

Version: 2.0 (WORKING DRAFT)

Specific Objective 1.1 (Result Indicator= "Level of capacity for...")

Primary data collection by a survey

The baseline of the result indicator will be established through a mini-survey[1] among key institutions and stakeholders in the programme area (e.g. regional authorities, academia, business organisations, etc).

Also the ongoing observation of changes in the baseline values should be done on a similar survey base e.g.in 2018, 2020 and 2022).

Due to the need to deliver a baseline in a swift way, the following approach is proposed:

- The Member State identifies and nominates a number of institutions per Specific Objective, which are considered competent enough to express an opinion on the situation in their region, e.g. in the case of IP 1b a research centre and an innovation brokerage service provider (a proposal is made per Specific Objective)

- The institutions are contacted per email by means of an explanatory note and the survey will be announced on the MA website and an online survey tool will be utilised including a a limited number of questions related to the "Expected results" of each IP (See CP Section II, 2.A.5 for each IP). In case of questions and unclear issues, the MA should be contacted.

- To operationalize the level of collaboration in a specific field of action it is suggested to use closed-ended question within a matrix. Answer options are on a 1 to 6 scale with 1 indicating "no interaction or capacity at all" and 6 indicating a fully developed collaboration or capacity level. Each level is explained by certain criteria.

- The same matrix can be used in the Application Forms and Reporting Templates of the projects. The "expert survey" shall be repeated in 2018, 2020 and 2022, in order to allow the "live monitoring" of the contributions to the baseline and the SO during programme implementation. The conclusions are then triangulated and validated via a cross-cut "expert survey".

- Considering the definition of a target, it is suggested to refer to the normative qualitative target "increase"; a quantification of the progress of the indicator is not delivering added value. Instead a framework for qualitative evaluation is proposed.

---

[1] A short questionnaire of five simple questions to be distributed to a limited number of stakeholders (maximum 3-4 bodies per Specific Objective and NUTS2 region) in the Programme Area. The survey will not attempt to cover a representative sample, since it aims to establish a framework for qualitative assessment in the course of the ongoing evaluation in order to track changes or record progress. Time-frame: 4-22 May 2015 (3 weeks).

RI 1.1: "Level of capacity of businesses and innovation stakeholders to utilise the available innovation support services and clusters"

Questions

The proposed questions are:

SO1.1_QR1: To what extent do SMEs and innovation brokers in your region are having access to applied research results and technology transfer mechanisms?

SO1.1_QR2: to what extent is there exchange and networking across the border among innovation stakeholders and/or SMEs?

SO1.1_QR3: to what extent are SMEs in your area cooperating with other stakeholders (e.g. universities, laboratories, policy departments, regulators, competitors, suppliers and customers) in developing and adopting innovations?

SO1.1_QR4: how strong is the capacity in developing and adopting innovations among businesses and administration in your area?

SO1.1_QR5: to what extent are businesses in your area in the position to operate within clusters and benefit from them?

Relevant institutions proposed:

- Regional Councils for Research and Innovation (e.g. PSEK in Greece);
- Universities with a relevant department or school;
- Regional Development Agencies and chambers of commerce;
- Science & Technology parks (e.g. Technology Park of Patras), Business & Innovation Centres.

Analysis of data collected

The data collected by the survey shall be analyzed. Preliminary data shall be inspected and questions shall be turned in an overall score to allow comparison and aggregation. More sophisticated analysis (e.g. compute cross-tabulations, correlation, linear regression) might be adopted to check the robustness of the data and findings.

Different data collected through the survey have to be aggregated in order to build a single result indicator value. The calculation of the result indicator is done as follows:

- The replies of respondents of a single region are aggregated and the average is calculated;
- The average per region is weighted by the relative weight of the population of the region;
- The weighted averages are added and the value is transformed in %.

Time factor for baseline quantification

According to information by DG REGIO regarding the quantification of the baseline values for the result indicators it is not obligatory to deliver the full set when the programme document is submitted to the EC (a sample may be expected). However a CP can be approved without the inclusion of a baseline value for some result indicators if there is a commitment and an action plan to provide the

data by a certain date – generally within a year at the most of the adoption of the programme. However our intention is to conduct the first mini-survey in the first weeks of May 2015.

Specific Objective 1.2

RI 1.2	Number of units or similar for NACE group J and M						
SOURCE EUROSTAT (2012)							
	GREECE			**ITALY**			
	Region of Epirus	**Region of Ionian Islands**	**Region of Western Greece**	**Region of Puglia**	**GREECE**	**ITALY**	**Programme Area**
J - Information and communication	250	153	524	3.623	13.256	98.244	4.550
M - Professional, scientific and technical activities	2.632	1.432	4.688	39.058	112.502	710.689	47.810
TOTAL (J&M)	2.882	1.585	5.212	42.681	125.758	808.933	52.360

Specific Objective 2.1

See Specific Objective 1.1 for the methodology to be followed.

Result Indicator:

"Level of capacity for the stakeholders in the fields of natural and cultural heritage protection and tourism to sustainably valorise natural and cultural heritage as a growth asset"

Questions

The proposed questions are:

SO2.1_QR1: to what extent are stakeholders in your area "up to date" to the latest developments in the field of sustainable valorisation of cultural heritage and natural resources?
SO2.1_QR2: to what extent is there exchange and networking across the border among cultural heritage, natural resources and tourism stakeholders?
SO2.1_QR3: to what extent are sustainable tourist destinations of high natural or cultural value in the programme area effectively promoted and marketed?
SO2.1_QR4: how strong is the capacity in developing and adopting cross-border management plans of cultural heritage and natural resources and in involving the stakeholders?
SO2.1_QR5: What potential exists in better protecting cultural heritage and natural resources from anthropogenic impacts in your area?

Relevant institutions proposed:

- Regional Development Agencies and chambers of commerce

- Associations of local/regional authorities

- Environmental organisations

- Regional Ephorates for Cultural Heritage[2];
- Management Bodies of larger protected areas.

Specific Objective 2.2

RI 2.2	Total protected site areas in the eligible Programme regions		
Source: EUROSTAT 2013 **(http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/submitViewTableAction.do)**			
COYNTRY	**NUTS II**	**km2**	**% of Programme Area**
GREECE	Region of Epirus	9.203	21,70%
	Region of Ionian Islands	2.307	5,44%
	Region of Western Greece	11.350	26,77%
ITALY	Region of Puglia	19.541	46,09%
TOTAL PROGRAMME AREA		**42.401**	**100,00%**

Specific Objective 2.3
See Specific Objective 1.1 for methodology.

Result Indicator:

"Level of capacity of regional and local authorities and public utilities operators to integrate environmental friendly processes and technologies in their operations with special attention to the coastal and maritime zones"

Questions

The proposed questions are:

SO2.3_QR1: to what extent are regional and local authorities and public utilities operators in your area aware of "state of the art" environmental friendly processes and technologies in their field of operations in order to reduce environmental burden (e.g. discharges, landfill residues etc.)?

SO2.3_QR2: to what extent is there exchange and networking among regional and local authorities and public utilities operators across the border regarding "state of the art" environmental friendly processes and technologies in their field of operations in order to reduce environmental burden (e.g. discharges, landfill residues etc.)?

SO2.3_QR3: to what extent do regional and local authorities and public utilities operators possess the means (know how and capital) to introduce environmental friendly processes and technologies in their field of operations in order to reduce environmental burden (e.g. discharges, landfill residues etc.)?

SO2.3_QR4: to what extent do regional and local authorities have the capacity to develop and monitor Marine Spatial Plans especially in the context of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and especially integrating cross border elements?

---

[2] E.g. in Greece http://www.yppo.gr/1/g1540.jsp?obj_id=11

SO2.3_QR5: to what extent do regional and local authorities have the capacity to develop, implement and monitor joint risk management and contingency plans for man-made hazards especially in small islands and coastal zones?

Relevant institutions proposed:

- Regional Directorates for Environment and Spatial Planning
- Universities with a relevant department or school
- Regional Waste Management Bodies
- Port authorities

Specific Objective 3.1

Table 2	RI 3.1 Maritime transport of passengers: Total passengers embarked and disembarked in Programme Area ports (in 1000)						
	Source: EUROSTAT						
	GREECE			ITALY			
	Region of Epirus	Region of Ionian Islands	Region of Western Greece	Region of Puglia	GREECE	ITALY	Programme Area
2011	2.567	3.211	4.344	2.175	39.140	40.998	12.297
2012	1.168	1.462	2.412	1.963	20.418	37.645	7.005

Specific Objective 3.2

Table 1	RI 3.2 Annual road freight transport loaded in the Programme Area (in 1000 tonnes) [2011]				
	EUROSTAT				
	GREECE			ITALY	
	Region of Epirus	Region of Ionian Islands	Region of Western Greece	Region of Puglia	Programme Area
	15.102	2.306	30.239	40.885	88.532