

technopolis |group|



November 2018

Evaluation of the INTERREG Europe programme-Lot 1

Annexes Lot 1



Prepared by Spatial Foresight, Technopolis Group and EureConsult

Annexes

Annex A. List of references

- Interreg Europe 2014-2020 Cooperation Programme document, Final version, 6 May 2015
- Ex-ante evaluation of the ‘Interreg Europe’ Programme under the European Territorial Cooperation Objective. Final report, June 2014
- Annual Implementation Reports 2014-2015, 2016 and 2017
- Rules of Procedure of the Interreg Europe Monitoring Committee, updated version of 16 December 2016
- Monitoring Committee notes and background documents of the meetings:
 - The 16 June 2015 in Riga
 - The 17 September 2015 in Luxembourg
 - The 9-10 February 2016 in Utrecht
 - The 4-5 October 2016 in Winterthur
 - The 13-14 December 2016 in Bratislava
 - The 21 March 2017 in Valletta
 - The 12 and 13 December 2017 in Tallinn
 - The 13 and 14 March 2018 in Sofia
- Interreg Europe Programme Manual, version of 13 April 2018
- Interreg Europe Communication Strategy, version of 19 January 2016
- Description of the functions and procedures in place for the Managing Authority and the Certifying Authority
- Special Technical Terms and Conditions (PLP)
- Setting up and implementing the Interreg Europe Policy Learning Platforms, Terms of Reference
- Setting up and implementing the Interreg Europe Policy Learning Platforms, Inception report, September 2016
- Implementation Manual to set quality standards and working templates, version of 19 May 2017
- PLP Interim implementation report, version of 19 July 2017
- Annual implementation report, version of 31 May 2018
- IE Feedback on Annual Implementation Report, version of 20 July 2017
- IE Feedback on Annual Implementation Report, version of 5 June 2018
- Performance remedy proposal: programme feedback 21/12/2016
- 2017 user survey: needs and expectations of European regions

- Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy covering impact assessment
- Good practice validation, guidance for PLP experts, version of 5 July 2018
- Good practice validation, guidance note for POs
- Good practice validation, guidance note for lead partner/project web admin
- Point of Contact Survey, autumn 2017
- Fourth call terms of reference
- Result indicators survey 2018
- Update of the programme result indicators: results of the 2018 survey
- Mid-term review guide
- Mid-term review methodology, version 3

Annex B. Survey templates

In compliance with its evaluation plan approved in March 2016, the Interreg Europe programme has launched this year a mid-term evaluation. A consortium of three companies (Technopolis, Spatial Foresight and Eure Consult) is commissioned to conduct this evaluation.

An important part of the operational evaluation is the present survey addressed to all Monitoring Committee members, as their knowledge and experience can provide a valuable contribution to the assessment of the programme implementation.

The information entered in this survey will be handled by Spatial Foresight in accordance to applicable legislation on personal data protection. The questionnaire information is treated confidentially. Contact data will only be used to contact the respondent in case of issues or further clarifications about the answers provided. Information collected with the present survey will be used only in the framework of this evaluation and for no other purposes. No personal data will be communicated to or handled by third parties.

The completion of the survey should take no more than 20 minutes of your time, depending on the answers given. We count on your contribution and we would be grateful if you could complete it by **20 July 2018 at the latest**. We are aware that the summer period may be an issue, so please do not hesitate to get back to us shall it be the case.

For any further information about the survey, please contact frank.holstein@spatialforesight.eu or amparo.montan@spatialforesight.eu

Thank you in advance for your time!

The experts team

Overall steering of the programme

1. Do you think the roles of your institution in the Interreg Europe structure are clear?

Yes

No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

2. Do you think that you are in capacity (access to information, to contact persons, etc.) to work effectively on **the steering of the programme?**

Yes

No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

3. Do you think that you are in capacity (access to information, to contact persons, etc.) to work effectively on **the approval of projects?**

Yes

No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

4. Do you think that you are in capacity (access to information, to contact persons, etc.) to work effectively as **the link with all relevant stakeholders in your country?**

Yes

No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

5. Please indicate if you have any suggestion that could improve your work as MC member

6. Are the roles of the rest of the other programme bodies (MA, JS) clear to you?

Yes

No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

7. Do you think the interaction among MC Members, MA and JS is optimal and complementary?

Yes

No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

8. Are decision-making processes of the programme and rules for **the strategic steering of the programme** relevant, clear and efficient? (e.g. quorum, consensus and majority rules, written procedures, etc.)

	Yes	No
Relevant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Clear	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

9. Are decision-making processes of the programme and rules for the **approval of projects** relevant, clear and efficient? (e.g. quorum, consensus and majority rules, written procedures, etc.)

	Yes	No
Relevant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Clear	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

Overall management of the programme

10. Do you think the available resources at MC/MA/JS level (staff, time and financing) are sufficient to generate high quality interregional projects, and to ensure that the entire programme runs smoothly?

Yes

No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

11. Do you think the MA and JS have adequate resources(staff capacities and profiles) to fulfill their tasks? (manage the number of interregional projects applications and approved projects and to ensure the rest of programme procedures)

Yes

No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

12. Do you see any substantial weaknesses in the management (functioning of MC, MA, JS) that should be addressed?

Yes

No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

Project application and implementation

13. Do you think the tools for assisting applicants (e.g webinars, online self-assessment tool, partner search tool, project idea feedback) allow for the generation of good quality applications?

- Yes
 No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

14. Do you think the selection procedure leads to the approval of the best projects?

- Yes
 No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

15. Do you think the whole selection process is transparent?

- Yes
 No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

16. Are you satisfied with the support from the programme to the project implementation?

	Not at all satisfied	Rather not satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Fully satisfied
Programme documents and templates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reporting process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reimbursement process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mid-term review process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
General JS Support (calls and emails)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Online support (webinars and videos)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

17. Do you think the pilot action request procedure takes reasonable time for the amount of funding concerned and purposes of the pilot actions?

Yes

No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

18. Do you think the programme documents and procedures are presented in a simple and clear way for projects?

Yes

No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

19. Is iDB a useful tool for the steering and management of the programme?

Yes

No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

Policy Learning Platform (PLP)

20. Do you think the selection procedure of the PLP took reasonable time?

Yes

No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

21. Do you think the monitoring process of the PLP works smoothly?

Yes

No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

22. Do you think the day-to-day JS support so far is adequate for the PLP to achieve its targets?

Yes

No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

23. Are the PLP activities and outcomes progressing in line with the initial targets?

Yes

No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

Programme communication strategy

24. Do you think that programme communication activities serve the following objectives?

	Yes	No
Raise awareness on the programme in general	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Raise awareness of potential project leaders and partners on the programme and on the support provided by the programme	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Raise awareness of defined list of 'actors of regional relevance' of the policy learning platform's existence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase of the access to good practices	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

25. Do you think the objectives listed in the question above contribute to the following?

	Yes	No
Facilitate EU-wide policy learning and capitalisation of good practices	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support exchange of experience and good practices among actors of regional relevance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

26. Do you think the newly developed communication tools (on-line tools, hosting projects website) are of added value in raising further awareness of the programme?

- Yes
- No

If relevant, please provide further comments and / or suggestions

27. Would you suggest additional communication activities to serve the programme objectives?

About the respondent

28. Please provide your details

Name, first name

email address

country

Contact details will only be used for the purposes of this evaluation. Furthermore we may contact a few MC Members to specify their answers via phone.

29. Please indicate for how long you have been a member of the Interreg Europe MC

- Less than 2 years
- Between 2-4 years
- More than 4 years

In compliance with its evaluation plan approved in March 2016, the Interreg Europe programme has launched this year a mid-term evaluation. A consortium of three companies (Technopolis, Spatial Foresight and Eure Consult) is commissioned to conduct this evaluation.

An important part of the evaluation is the present survey addressed to all lead partners and a sample of project partners, as their knowledge and experience can provide a valuable contribution to the assessment of the programme implementation. More information on Interreg Europe programme evaluation and this survey can be found in the [introduction letter](#) from the Managing Authority and Joint Secretariat.

The information entered in this survey will be handled by Spatial Foresight in accordance to applicable legislation on personal data protection. The questionnaire information is treated confidentially. Contact data will only be used to contact the respondent in case of issues or further clarifications about the answers provided. Information collected with the present survey will be used only in the framework of this evaluation and for no other purposes. No personal data will be communicated to or handled by third parties.

The completion of the survey should take no more than 20 minutes of your time, depending on the answers given. We count on your contribution and we would be grateful if you could complete it by **20 July 2018 at the latest**. We are aware that the summer period may be an issue, so please do not hesitate to get back to us should it be the case.

For any further information about the survey, please contact frank.holstein@spatialforesight.eu or amparo.montan@spatialforesight.eu

Thank you in advance for your time!

The experts team

* 1. Please select your project acronym.

You may type the first letter of the acronym to scroll through the list.

* 2. In which capacity are you involved in the project?

Project lead partner

Project partner

Project application phase

3. How useful do you assess the following supporting tools for the preparation of project application?

	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Rather not useful	Not useful at all	N/A
Programme documents (application pack)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Joint secretariat assistance (emails, calls)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Information events (programme, national)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Partner search support (networking events, online search tool)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Project idea feedback	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Webinars (online Q&A)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Online self-assessment tool	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please indicate if you have any suggestions for improvements

4. Are the programme documents and information provided in the call clear?

- Very clear
- Somewhat clear
- Rather not clear
- Not at all clear

Please provide any comments or suggestions for improvement

5. Did you find the whole selection procedure transparent and fair?

	Yes	No
Transparent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fair	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments or suggestions for improvement

6. To what degree did the programme documents contain all information related to the selection process (eligibility and quality assessment)?

- Extensive information
- Sufficient information
- Not sufficient information

Please provide any comments or suggestions for improvement

7. To what degree did you perceive the timeframe within which you received the approval notification as reasonable?

- Very reasonable
- Somewhat reasonable
- Rather not reasonable

Please provide any comments or suggestions for improvement

Project implementation phase

8. Are you satisfied with the support from the programme to the implementation of your project? Please rate the following support tools and processes

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Rather not satisfied	Not at all satisfied	N/A
Programme documents and templates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reporting process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reimbursement process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mid-term review process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
General JS support (calls and emails)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Online support (webinars and videos)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments or suggestions for improvement

9. Do you get useful responses by the JS in a short time frame?

- Yes
- No

Please provide any comments or suggestions for improvement

10. Is it clear to you how the project activities contribute to the programme objectives and how the indicators work in Interreg Europe?

- Very clear
- Somewhat clear
- Rather not clear
- Not clear at all

Please provide any comments or suggestions for improvement

11. How useful did you find the mid-term review in helping you better focus phase 2 of your project?

- Very useful
- Somewhat useful
- Rather not useful
- Not useful at all
- Not applicable

Please provide any comments or suggestions for improvement

12. If you have requested funding for pilot actions, was the process clear and transparent to you?

	Yes	No
Clear	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transparent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comment or suggestion for improvement

Programme rules

In this section, we would like to know your opinion on the different programme's rules and procedures also considering that Interreg Europe is subject to a number of EU regulations and national requirements.

13. Do you think the programme documents describing rules and procedures are clear?

- Very clear
- Somewhat clear
- Rather not clear
- Not clear at all

Please provide any comment or suggestion for improvement

14. Do you think rules and procedures are as simple as they can be?

- Yes
- No

Please provide any comment or suggestion for improvement

Programme communication and IT tools

15. Do you think the programme communication tools (online tools, hosting project websites) are helping to raise further awareness on the programme?

Yes

No

Please provide any comments or suggestions for improvement

16. Do the communication tools support your project effectively?

Yes

No

Please provide any comments or suggestions for improvement

17. How often do you use the communication tools as a support to your project?

On a daily basis

Once a week

Once a month

Other (please specify)

18. Is iOLF easy to use?

Yes

No

Please provide any comments or suggestions for improvement

19. Is iOLF helpful to monitor your project and report to the programme?

Yes

No

Please provide any comments or suggestions for improvement

New programme requirements for better project results

This section aims at exploring how far the new programme requirements for interregional cooperation projects are relevant for achieving the projects' objectives.

For each statement, please reflect on the pre-formulated statement and decide whether it applies in your situation. Select only one of the proposed options and explain briefly (3-4 lines max) the main reasons for your choice.

20. "The continuous interaction with the regional / local organisations in the stakeholder group is crucial to achieving the improvement of policy instruments."

- Fully relevant
- Partially relevant
- Not relevant

Please specify your answer

21. "An action plan is essential to have the main lessons learnt (and good practices identified) from the exchange of experience implemented in the region in the end."

- Fully relevant
- Partially relevant
- Not relevant

Please specify your answer

22. "The pre-defined phase 2 activities for monitoring the implementation of an action plan (maintaining contact with local/ regional stakeholders implementing the plan; interregional partner meetings to support the implementation; communication activities; etc.) are sufficient to capture the impact of the project in the different regions."

- Fully relevant
- Partially relevant
- Not relevant

Please specify your answer

23. "The implementation of one or more pilot actions in phase 2 is important for achieving the project's objectives."

- Fully relevant
- Partially relevant
- Not relevant

Please specify your answer

Envisaged policy change and the levels of learning

This section aims at exploring the nature of the envisaged changes of a policy instrument (types of improvement) and the scope of the learning process that is needed for actually influencing the policy instrument (levels of learning).

When answering the following questions, please consider also the descriptions provided in the Interreg Europe programme manual (pages 43, 54-57).

24. Which types of policy improvements are foreseen in your action plan?

Depending on the regional/ local approach adopted in your action plan, please select one or more type(s) of improvement below (multiple choice possible). You can also mention other possible improvements not covered by type 1 to 3.

- Type 1:** Implementation of new projects
- Type 2:** Change in the management of the policy instrument (improved governance)
- Type 3:** Change in the strategic focus of the policy instrument (structural change)
- Other improvements not corresponding to types 1-3 (please comment)

25. How important are the different levels of learning for actually influencing the addressed policy instruments?

Please select for each learning level only one option that corresponds most to your experience and comment your overall choice.

	Very important	Important to some extent	Rather not important	Not important at all
How important is the learning at the level of individuals for influencing the policy instrument? (i.e. staff members of the partner organisations increasing their capacity by a direct involvement in all project activities)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How important is the learning at the level of the project partner organisations for influencing the policy instrument? (i.e. through a sharing of individual learning within the project partner organisation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How important is the learning with other local / regional stakeholders for influencing the policy instrument? (i.e. through continuous interaction within the stakeholder groups)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please specify your answers or comment on the learning processes indicated above

Contact details

26. Please provide your contact details

Name, first name

email address

Organisation

Country

Annex C. Interview templates

Questions for the Programme Director

(the questions to the rest of the JS staff and MA are adaptations from this matrix and are not included in this document for efficiency reasons)

Overall steering of the programme

- 1 What is your opinion on the functioning of the MC and the decision-making process of the Interreg Europe programme? Do you think that MC members know clearly about their roles in the programme? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
- 2 What is your opinion about the MC members activity? Do they play an active role in the programme and make the MC an efficient steering body? Could you provide concrete examples? Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
- 3 What is your opinion about the interaction among MC members, MA and JS. Do you think they complement each other? Would you have any example to illustrate your answer? Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
- 4 What is your opinion about the decision-making processes for the strategic steering of the programme? Do you think they are relevant, clear and efficient? (e.g. quorum, consensus and majority rules, written procedures, etc) Would you have any example to illustrate your answer? Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
- 5 What is your opinion about the decision-making processes for the approval of projects? Do you think they are relevant, clear and efficient? (e.g. quorum, consensus and majority rules, written procedures, etc) Would you have any example to illustrate your answer? Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.

Overall management of the programme

- 6 What is your opinion about the available resources at MC/MA and JS level (staff, time and financing) to generate and manage high quality projects? Are they sufficient? Would you have any example to illustrate your answer? Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
 - 7 What is your opinion about the available resources at MC/MA and JS level to manage the programme and ensure that it runs smoothly? Are they sufficient? Would you have any example to illustrate your answer? Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
 - 8 Do you see any substantial weakness in the management of the programme that should be addressed? If yes, what is the origin of it (workload, external factors)? Would you have any suggestion for improvement?
-
- 9 What is your opinion about the MA and JS skills and profiles to manage the number of interregional projects applications and approved projects? Would you have any suggestion for improvement?
 - 10 What is your opinion about the MA and JS skills and profiles to ensure the smooth running of the programme? Would you have any suggestion for improvement?
 - 11 About the workload of the JS staff; on average, do you know how many projects are assigned per officer? Do you think it is reasonable? Would you have any suggestion for improvement?

Project application and implementation

- 12 What is your overall opinion on the tools for assisting applicants (e.g application pack, JS assistance, information events, partner search support, project idea feedback, online tools)? Do you think they allow for the generation of good quality applications? Are they working as expected? Which ones are the most relevant? Would you have any suggestion for improvement?
- 13 What is your opinion about the time lapse between the call and the approval of projects? Is it reasonable? Do you think it could be reduced and how?

- 14 What is your opinion about the selection procedure? Does it lead to the approval of the best projects? Do you think it is transparent? Please explain why and which stage of the selection process could be improved.
- 15 What is your opinion on the complaint procedure? What do you think is the most usual aspect mentioned in the complaint procedure document? Would you have any suggestion to improve the process?
- 16 What is your opinion about the support tools from the programme to project implementation (programme documents and templates, reporting and reimbursement process, mid-term review, JS support and online tools)? Do you think they are working as expected? Would you have any suggestion for improvement?
- 17 What is your overall opinion about the reporting and monitoring tools and procedures that the programme uses? Do you think they allow for an easy and smooth monitoring of the projects? Would you have any suggestion for improvement on a specific tool or procedure?
- 18 What is your opinion about the indicators system and how projects report on them? Do you think it is clear for projects how the project activities contribute to the programme objectives and to the indicators at programme level? Does the system allow to verify both output and result indicators? Would you suggest any improvement so that the message gets clearer to projects?
- 19 What is your opinion on the mid-term review process? Do you think it is helping better focus phase 2 of projects? Do you think the procedure is adapted (time required, timing...)? Would you introduce any improvement in that process?
- 20 What is your opinion about the pilot actions funding procedure? Do you think the procedure takes reasonable time for the amount of funding and purposes of the pilot actions? Would you introduce any improvement in the process?
- 21 What is your opinion on the clarity of the programme documents and procedures? Do you think they are presented in a simple and clear way for projects? Would you introduce any improvement?
- 22 What is your opinion on the project funding for projects? Do you think it is adequate for projects to reach the outputs?

23 What is your opinion on iDB and iOLF? Are they useful tools for the management of the programme? Did they help you save time in your tasks related to the programme? Would you introduce any improvement?

Communication

24 What is your opinion about the programme communication activities? Do you think they serve the following objectives?

- a. raise awareness on the programme in general
- b. raise awareness of potential project leaders and partners on the programme and on the support provided by the programme
- c. raise awareness of defined list of 'actors of regional relevance' of the Policy Learning Platform's existence
- d. increase of the access to good practices

25 Would you suggest any improvement in the communications activities so that the objectives related to raising awareness and access to good practices could be better achieved?

26 What is your opinion of the newly developed communication tools (on-line tools, hosting projects website)? Are they of added value in raising further awareness (in general or to potential project leaders and partners) of the programme?

27 What is your opinion on the programme communication activities in terms of

- a. facilitating EU-wide policy learning and capitalisation of good practices
- b. supporting exchange of experience and good practices among actors of regional relevance?

28 Do you think the programme communication activities target these objectives? Would you have any suggestion on communication activities so that they contribute to these objectives more effectively?

PLP

29 What is your opinion about the setup of PLP? Would you introduce any improvements to make it more efficient?

30 About the way the PLP are set up, would you introduce any improvements to allow a better implementation of the activities?

31 Do the PLP-related tasks take reasonable time of the JS staff?

32 What is your opinion about the support of the JS to the PLP? Is it helping the PLP achieve their targets? Would you suggest any improvement in this support?

- 33 What is your opinion on the selection procedure of the PLP? Do you think it took reasonable time?
- 34 Were the human resources of the JS and MA devoted to the PLP selection procedure reasonable?
- 35 What is your opinion on the monitoring process of the PLP? Do you think it works smoothly? Would you suggest any improvement in this process?
- 36 What is your opinion on the resources allocated (staff involved, structure of the processes, time spent) to the monitoring structure of the PLP? Would you introduce any improvements?

Questions for the MC members

Overall steering of the programme

- 1 As MC member, do you think your role in the programme steering is clear? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
- 2 Do you think that you are in capacity (access to information, to contact persons, etc.) to work effectively in the steering of the programme? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
- 3 Do you think that you are in capacity (access to information, to contact persons, etc.) to work effectively on the approval of projects? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
- 4 Do you think that you are in capacity (access to information, to contact persons, etc.) to work effectively as the link with all relevant stakeholders in your country? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
- 5 Please indicate if you have any suggestion that could improve your work as MC member in the steering of the programme.
- 6 Are the roles of the rest of the other programme bodies (MA, JS) clear to you? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
- 7 Do you think the interaction among MC Members, MA and JS is optimal and complementary? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.

- 8 Are decision-making processes of the programme and rules for the strategic steering of the programme (as regards e.g. quorum, consensus and majority rules, written procedures, etc):
- relevant,
 - clear and
 - efficient?

If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.

- 9 Are decision-making processes of the programme and rules for the approval of projects relevant, clear and efficient? (e.g. quorum, consensus and majority rules, written procedures, etc.) If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement

Overall management of the programme

- 10 What is your opinion about the available resources at MC/MA and JS level (staff, time and financing) to generate and manage high quality projects? Are they sufficient? Would you have any example to illustrate your answer? Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
- 11 Do you think the MA and JS have adequate resources (staff capacities and profiles) to fulfill their tasks? (manage the number of interregional projects applications and approved projects and to ensure the rest of programme procedures). If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
- 12 Do you see any substantial weaknesses in the management (functioning of MC, MA, JS) that should be addressed? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.

Project application and implementation

- 13 Do you think the tools for assisting applicants (e.g webinars, online self-assessment tool, partner search tool, project idea feedback) allow for the generation of good quality applications? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
- 14 Do you think the selection procedure leads to the approval of the best projects? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.

- 15 Do you think the whole selection process is transparent? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
- 16 Are you satisfied with the support from the programme to the project implementation?
- programme documents and templates
 - reporting process
 - reimbursement process
 - mid-term review process
 - general JS support (calls and emails)
 - online support (webinars and videos)

If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.

- 17 Do you think the pilot action request procedure takes reasonable time for the amount of funding concerned and purposes of the pilot actions? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
- 18 Do you think the programme documents and procedures are presented in a simple and clear way for projects? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
- 19 Is iDB a useful tool for the steering and management of the programme? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.

Policy Learning Platform

- 20 Do you think the selection procedure of the PLP took reasonable time? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
- 21 Do you think the monitoring process of the PLP works smoothly? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.
- 22 Do you think the day-to-day JS support so far is adequate for the PLP to achieve its targets? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.

23 Are the PLP activities and outcomes progressing in line with the initial targets? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.

Programme communication strategy

24 Do you think that programme communication activities serve the following objectives?

- raise awareness on the programme in general
- raise awareness of potential project leaders and partners on the programme and on the support provided by the programme
- raise awareness of defined list of 'actors of regional relevance' of the policy learning platform's experience
- increase the access to good practices

If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.

25 Do you think the objectives listed in the question above contribute to the following (the two operational objectives of the programme)?

- facilitate EU-wide policy learning and capitalization of good practices
- support exchange of experience and good practices among actors of regional relevance

If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.

26 Do you think the newly developed communication tools (on-line tools, hosting projects website) are of added value in raising further awareness of the programme? If you have any, please provide examples to illustrate your answer. Please indicate if you would have any suggestion for improvement.

27 Would you suggest additional communication activities to serve the programme objectives?

Questions to lead partners

Project application phase

1 What is your experience with the supporting tools (e.g. application pack, JS assistance, information events, online tools, project idea feedback) for the preparation of project application? Please provide some examples to show how these tools worked for your project.

- 2 Would you improve something in these tools to make them more effective?
- 3 What is your experience with the selection procedure? Did you find it transparent and fair?
- 4 What is your opinion and experience on the timeframe within which you received the approval notification? Would you consider it reasonable? Please elaborate on your answer.

1.1 Project implementation phase

- 5 What is your experience with the support tools from the programme to the implementation of your project (e.g. programme documents and templates, reporting and reimbursement processes, mid-term review, JS support, online support...)? Please provide some examples to show how these tools worked for your project.
- 6 Would you improve something on these tools to make them more effective?
- 7 What is your experience when reporting on indicators, both output and result indicators? Would you suggest any improvements in this respect?
- 8 What is your experience with the mid-term review process? Did it help you better focus phase 2 of your project?
- 9 Would you improve something in the mid-term review process to make it more effective?
- 10 In case you asked for pilot action funding, what was your experience with the funding for pilot actions? Was the process clear and transparent to you?

Programme rules

- 11 What is your experience with the programme documents describing all rules and procedures for application, selection, implementation, and closure? Are they clear to you?

Programme communication and IT tools

- 12 Do you think the programme communication tools (online tools, hosting project websites) are helping raise further awareness (to other potential project partners or to the wide public) on the programme? What is your experience? Would you have any example to provide? Would you suggest any improvement to reach those target groups?

- 13 Do the communication tools support your project effectively? What is your experience? Would you suggest any improvement?

- 14 Is iOLF easy to use? What is your experience?

- 15 Is iOLF helpful to monitor your project and report to the programme? What is your experience?

- 16 Do you see any need for change, and if so what would be your recommendations to improve the functioning of iOLF?