

Indicators in action

Daniela Minichberger, Besiana Ninka, Bernhard Schausberger | Interact |


24.06.2023

Interact



**Co-funded by
the European Union**
Interreg

Thank you
for providing
such detailed
information!



Agenda

09.30-12.30

01

**Discussion of
the indicators**

02

**Introduction to the
survey**

03

**Wrap up and next
steps**

Objectives

- Start the review indicators based on feedback provided in the Excel file, including common Interreg indicators and programme-specific indicators
- Establish a shared understanding regarding the definition, interpretation, and application of these indicators
- Determine the next steps: how to continue





Discussion of the common indicators



**Please
prepare for
these 7
indicators**

Common Output Indicators

RCO116: Jointly developed solutions

RCO84: Pilot actions developed and implemented jointly

RCO87: Organizations cooperating across borders

RCO83: Strategies & action plans jointly developed

Common Result Indicators

RCR104: Solutions taken up or up-scaled

RCR79: Joint strategies and action plans taken up

RCR84: Organizations cooperating post-project

Programme	Name
	Strand (A, B, C, D)
Description	Indicator Code
	Indicator Name
Indicator used	SO: please list all SOs, where you use this indicator
Programming	Definition: which definition did you use internally?
	Interpretation: how did you interpret the indicator? Any difficulties with the definition?
	Assumptions: what key assumptions (per SOs) did you use for calculating the target? How did you calculate it?
	Calculation issues when programming and setting targets: what were the challenges you are facing with the calculations and target setting (per SOs)?
Guidance to applicants	Interpretation: Do applicants raise any interpretation difficulties?
	Calculation issues when guiding applicants: do you face any challenges with the applicants?
Contracting	Frequent need to amend/ change applicants' targets: did you often need to change the target values provided by the applicants?
Project monitoring	Clear-cut and valid evidence for delivery of output / result: did you manage to define the evidence for the output and result delivery? Does it work in practice?
	Establish a firm validation system: was it easy/difficult to establish a validation system? Why?
	Counting or double-counting issues: Do you face any difficulties with the counting? Which one? Why?
Communication on results	Use in communication on programme achievements among programme stakeholders: how do you communicate the programme achievements?
Any proposed amendments	If you think the indicator needs to be amended, please indicate what should be changed?
Additional comments	What else would you like to mention about this indicator?

Discussion of common indicators ...

Common Output Indicators

- RCO83: Strategies & action plans jointly developed
- RCO84: Pilot actions developed and implemented jointly

Common Result Indicators

- RCR104: Solutions taken up or up-scaled

RCO83: Strategies & action plans jointly developed 1/2

Programming	In use for (10): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOs: 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 4.2, 4.9 (PEACE+), ISO1, ISO2, all [CE, DRP (except for ISO1)]
Definition & interpretation issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More precise explanation of key terms (i.a. linking it to MRS dimension) or to SO theme (3) • Handling if several topics covered (relate to 'dominant one') (3) • Clarification regarding 'jointly developed' (drafted together) (3) • Action plan also on basis of an already existing strategy (4)
Calculation approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on data from 2014-2020 (average project budget, cost per strategy etc.) • Assumption on strategies per project (either general or differentiated per SO)
Challenges with target setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimations of type of output (if several RCOs on offer), cost per output and success rate per project and first time of perceived as challenging • First time small-scale projects in TN programmes
Reasons for not using it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Choice of RCO 116 (solutions) as more open option covering also this (1) • Not showing the investment component (2) • Notion of 'joint' in TN context (1)
Guidance to applicants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority encountered no difficulties up to now
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confusion with other documents such as guidelines (1) • Counting format: rather count as one with regional specifications instead of several regional ones (1)
Contracting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In some cases target revision necessary but not considered a major issue by the majority
Project monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some programmes provide clear-cut definition about the character of the expected output
Validation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme introduced internal benchmarking system and coordination procedure (1)
Counting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Either no difficulties (5) or too early to say (4) • Need for clear demarcation line to RCO 116 (1)

RCO83: Strategies & action plans jointly developed 2/2

Communication on results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eventually not suitable for direct communication with national policy-makers: owing to negative connotation of terms 'strategy' and 'action plans' perceived as risk (1)
Any proposed amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider that that revision/ update of existing strategies to be considered under this indicator • Rename the indicator to something like 'Jointly developed and utilized evidence and placed-based tools for territorial development' or similar variations (1) • Link it to a result indicator measuring the implementation of the strategy or action plan by the partners who developed it; follow-up to the strategy/action plan over a reasonable period of time after the end of the project or even during the implementation period of a longer-term project (1)
Additional comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The indicator does not capture other type of strategies documents such as master plans (in environment sector it is more common to develop master plans compared to strategies)/ policy papers etc. and there is no other Interreg common output indicator that can be used (1) • Opting for strategies as target unit alone may prioritize quantity over quality (1)
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fit for wide uptake and wide coverage: used across POs 1,2, 3 and 4, ISOs • Some clarifications to EC definition putting it in context of programme / SO • Target setting based on 2014-20 • No major difficulties in verification of outputs expected • For counting: half expects / experienced no difficulties, for half too early

RCR104: Solutions taken up or up-scaled 1/2

Programming	In use for (21): SOs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.4., 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 4.6, 5.2, ISO1, all (4),
Definition & interpretation issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification on terms 'taken-up or up-scaled (4) - e.g. organisation not using it before or expanding its use ... • Definition what 'solution means (1) • Clarification that organisation adopting does not have to be PP (1) • Specific sub-components related to 1) SSPs and regular projects • Hint to corresponding RCO 84 (4) or RCO 116 (1) • No difficulties /easy to understand (9)
Calculation approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based mainly on data from 2014-2020 – average project size and numbers (2) • Link to targets for RCO 84 or 116 (1:1 or 1:0.5) (8) or RCO 87 (1:0.3) (1) • Generic assumptions such as 1 per project and 20% of small-scale projects (SSPs) (3)
Challenges with target setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimations perceived as challenging (4) – in particular for new elements such as SSPs (1) • Not perceived as challenging (9)
Reasons for not using it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure of the programme, a diversified budget, most SOs with an infrastructure component (i.e. hard investment projects), time pressure, N+3 (no time to launch one call for pilot actions/solutions than another for the uptake/up-scale in a programme period) (1) • RCR does not match RCO 116 – specific RI has been developed (1)
Guidance to applicants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No difficulties up to now (6) • For some difficult to switch to take-up and/or up-scaling – they stick to detailing output (2) or think it is automatically met (1) • Difficulties similar as for RCO 116
Calculation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No or minor difficulties (10) • Some projects counted organisations instead of solutions (1) • Some use same as for RCO 116 – perceived as overly optimistic
Contracting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No particular challenges or minor ones (6) • Revision of linked RCO leads to revision of RCR (2), other problems encountered (3)

RCR104: Solutions taken up or up-scaled 2/2

Project monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific template on follow-up for applicants provided (1) • Specific instructions for applicants per indicator (1) • Durability visit (1) • Too early to say (5)
Validation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No difficulties (6) and clear-cut criteria developed (4) • Quantitative indicators bear the risk of 'achievements on paper' instead of actual achievements (1)
Counting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too early to say (9) • No difficulties or not expected (5) • No issues due to clear link to RCO (1)
Communication on results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aggregate per OS used in communication (1) • Long-term use could be presented through testimonials (1)
Any proposed amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring developments up to one year after the project completion is not feasible, therefore we would suggest removing from the definition the reference to this time-frame (1) • It would make more sense to count the number of institutions which are taking up the solutions than the uptake of the solution as such (1) • Rather counting number of scale-ups than of solutions; This adjustment would ensure that the project will focus not only on developing solutions but also on promoting them. Multiple counting would be possible (1)
Additional comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concrete indicator, showing that tangible things are done in cross-border cooperation (1)
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fit for wide uptake and wide coverage: used across POs 1,2, 3 and 4, 5 and ISOs • Some clarifications to EC definition putting it in context of programme / SO • Target setting based on 2014-20 and link to corresponding RCOs (84, 116) • No major difficulties in verification of outputs expected • For counting: one quarter expects / experienced no difficulties, for three quarters too early

RCO84: Pilot actions developed and implemented jointly 1/2

Programming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In use for (19 out 22): 1.2, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2., 2.3, 2.4, 2.5., 2.6, 2.7, 2.8.,3.1, 3.2., 4.1., 4.2, 4.6, ISO1
Definition & interpretation issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many programmes adhered to the official definition provided by the EC staff working document A few programmes made minor adaptations to reflect specific objectives (SOs) or internal requirements from the 2014-2020 period Several programmes provided detailed clarifications on what constitutes a pilot action
Calculation approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programmes often relied on assumptions and professional judgement due to the lack of concrete data. This included estimating targets based on previous projects, historical data, and expectations at the programming stage.
Challenges with target setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some programmes faced challenges due to the late start of the programme, the introduction of new elements (e.g., PO5, direct support to SMEs), and the unreliability of targets from previous periods. Several programmes reported no specific challenges or found the process straightforward
Reasons for not using it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> did not fit in IL due to a diversified budget, thematic focus, infrastructure components, and time constraints, this was challenging for social innovation projects
Guidance to applicants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No significant interpretation issues because of proactive guidance (resolved through existing guidance documents, factsheets, and explanatory sessions) Applicants misunderstood how to count pilot actions, such as assuming multiple counts for the same tool tested in different areas or confusing small-scale investments with pilot actions.
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many programmes indicated they had not faced significant challenges with applicants regarding calculation issues Some programmes did encounter specific challenges, such as clarifying whether to count pilot actions based on the number of territories/sites or the distinct characteristics of the pilot actions

RCO84: Pilot actions developed and implemented jointly 2/2

Contracting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to amend or change applicants' targets limited due to projects being in early stages or ongoing without significant issues • Some programmes mentioned that adjustments to target values were necessary during the contracting phase, especially when applicants had misinterpreted or incorrectly set their targets initially. • Through clear communication and guidance during the contracting phase, adjustments were easily managed
Project monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programmes are generally at an early stage • Several programmes have prepared templates, methodologies, and guidance documents for monitoring indicators.
Establish a validation system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IT platforms that evolved from previous programming periods to facilitate reporting and assessment • The practical implementation and effectiveness of these validation systems will be assessed with the submission of final progress reports, typically due in early 2025. • Some programmes are still in preparation or early stages stage
Counting or double-counting issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of programmes have not encountered difficulties with counting or double-counting pilot actions so far (still early or awaiting the first project reports for submission)
Communication on results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many programmes emphasize communicating achievements through project stories and qualitative evidence of benefits to target groups • Utilization of Communication Channels (as social media, publications, events, and dedicated sections on programme websites)
Any proposed amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many programmes see no need for amendments to the indicator. • Indicator definitions satisfactory - no urgent or widespread calls for amendments. Ensure on clarity in interpretation and possibly refining common practices related to target setting and reporting
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RCO84 is generally perceived positively as a clear and practical measure of project outputs • There was a specific suggestion to consider linking RCO84 with other related indicators like RCO116 and RCR104

Comfort Break

Other common output indicators selected by you...

Common output indicators

- RCO 07 - Research organizations participating in joint research projects
- RCO 76 - Integrated projects for territorial development
- RCO 81 - Participations in joint actions across borders
- RCO 82 - Participations in joint actions promoting gender equality, equal opportunities and social inclusion
- RCO 85 - Participations in joint training schemes
- RCO 115 - Public events across borders jointly organised
- RCO117 - Solutions identified for legal/admin. Obstacles
- RCO118 - Organisations cooperating for the multi-level governance of macroregional strategies
- RCO120 - Projects supporting cooperation across borders to develop urban-rural linkages

Other common result indicators selected by you...

Common result indicators

- RCR 82 - Legal or administrative obstacles across borders alleviated or resolved

Programme specific indicators proposed by you... 1/2

Programme specific indicators

- Organisations with increased institutional capacities due to their participation in cooperation activities across borders
- Policy instruments addressed
- People with increased capacity due to their participation in the Platform activities
- Organisations with increased capacity due to their participation in interregional cooperation
- Tools implemented for mitigating pollution
- Interregional policy learning events organised
- Good practices identified
- Policy instruments improved thanks to the projects

Programme specific indicators proposed by you... 2/2

Programme specific indicators

- Funds influenced
- Population benefiting from protection measures against climate related natural disaster
- Tools implemented for mitigating pollution
- Investments in education, training and life-long learning services
- Population living within the area covered by the tools implemented for mitigating pollution

PSI: Organisations with increased institutional capacities due to their participation in cooperation activities across borders 1/2

Programming	In use for (5 out of 22): SOs 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 3.1, 3.2, ISO6.6, All Soss except SO 4,1, Priority 4
Definition & interpretation issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The indicator was developed by several transnational programmes and was further adjusted to address programme needs. • No difficulties /easy to understand • The indicator is linked to both RCO87 and RCO84
Calculation approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumptions on qualitative and quantitative analysis based on data from previous programming period • Linked to targets for RCO 118 (1)
Guidance to applicants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No difficulties up to now (3); • Factsheets were prepared and additional guidance was provided to the project partners (2)
Calculation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No or minor difficulties (3) • Projects either set high values or did not count external organisations (1) • Difficulties to understand the link between Output and Result (1)
Contracting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No particular challenges or minor ones (5)
Project monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator reporting module and/or specific survey within the partnership on follow-up for applicants provided (2) • No practical implementation yet (3)
Validation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quite a firm validation system put in place (3) • To be created soon (2)

PSI: Organisations with increased institutional capacities due to their participation in cooperation activities across borders 2/2

Counting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a risk of double counting at programme level, especially in the case of large organisations as for example universities, different departments are "hiding" behind the organisation's name. However those departments increase their institutional capacity within different contexts. How to decide at which level not to count organisations appearing more than once on the list? (2) • No difficulties encountered (1) • Not started yet (2)
Communication on results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aggregated at programme level and used in communication activities/social media channels (3) • Promote achievements in a thematic session of the programme website (1) • Project stories (2) • A dedicated section on the landing page of the project websites showing the target values for all indicators per project (1) • No experience yet (1)
Any proposed amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is still too early to take conclusions (1) • No (1)
Additional comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no common indicator that could capture the dimension of increased institutional capacity.
Conclusion	

Floor is open for discussion

- Do you agree with the findings?
- Do you have any major concerns?
- Comments?





Introduction to the survey



Survey

Draft survey 2021-2027 Interreg common indicators review

A. Respondent

- Which Interreg strand do you represent? (Multiple answer list)
- What is your role? (Multiple answer list)

B. Overall assessment of 21-27 Interreg common indicators

- What is your opinion on the streamlining of common indicators for 2021-2027, compared with previous programming periods? ([ranking](#) 1-6)

(Very negative / Negative / Slightly negative / Slightly positive / Positive / Very positive)

- Comment box:
Please provide details.
- Has your programme opted for ERDF/mainstream common indicators over Interreg-specific common indicators? (Y/N)
 - Comment box:
If yes, why?
 - Are there any major activities in your programmes not covered by Interreg common indicators? (Y/N)
 - Comment box:
If yes, please specify and explain how you accounted for this?
 - For which stakeholders are the indicators most useful?
 - How would you further improve the current common indicators? (Any general recommendations are welcome, [e.g.](#), regarding definitions, guidance, etc.)
 - Optional question: We would appreciate your feedback to learn! Please provide us brief hints on major challenges you have encountered with Common indicators wat different stages of the programme life cycle.

Stage	Brief hint on challenges encountered
Programming	
Guidance to applicants	
Contracting	
Project monitoring	
Communication results	

C. Feedback on the common indicators used in your programmes

- Which Interreg common indicators do you use in your programmes? (Multiple answer list)

For each common indicator selected, the following questions to appear:

- Please rank the indicator along the RACER criteria:

	Low					High
Relevance	1	2	3	4	5	6

(Does the indicator measure relevant outputs/results of the actions financed by the programme?)

Comment box:

Acceptability	1	2	3	4	5	6
---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

(Are the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders for the indicator clear?)

Comment box:

Please let us know if you've encountered difficulties in explaining the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders related to the indicator use?

Clarity	1	2	3	4	5	6
---------	---	---	---	---	---	---

(Is the indicator unambiguous and easy to interpret by the project beneficiaries?)

Comment box:

Please identify any difficulties encountered in defining the indicator.

Ease of use	1	2	3	4	5	6
-------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

(Is the indicator easy to monitor? Are there any problems with reporting the indicator??)

Comment box:

Please identify any difficulties encountered in measuring or collecting indicator data.

Robustness	1	2	3	4	5	6
------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

(Is the indicator robust against manipulation, [i.e.](#), is the use of the indicator likely to distort behaviour (over/underreporting)?)

Comment box:

Please share any practical observations you've had in any of the feedback loops with beneficiaries and applicants!

- What key assumptions did you make when calculating the unit cost?

- Is the indicator used in all specific objectives, when relevant? (Y/N)

- Comment box:
- Are any of the indicators included in your programme no longer relevant for programme actions? (Y/N)
 - Comment box:
If yes, which, and why?

D. Programme specific indicators

- Does your programme use programme specific indicators? (Y/N)

If Yes:

- Why have you chosen programme-specific output indicators over common indicators?
- Are there other common output/result indicators not included in your programme that could nonetheless sufficiently cover the type of intervention of your programme?

- Does the monitoring of the programme specific indicator(s) cost more/less/the same as common indicators (in terms of capacity, effort and time)? (More/less/The same as common indicators)

- Comment box:
Please provide details.



Feedback on the draft survey

Informal working group on Interreg common indicators


24th June 2024

Main trends of feedback

- Clarification
 - Of terms, e.g. ‘unit cost’, ‘acceptability’.
 - Meaning
- More specificity (*what exactly do we want to know?*)
 - Focusing our scope
- Improving the structure
 - User friendliness
 - Navigability

Let's take another look at the survey.

Next steps



Thank you



© European Union 2024

Unless otherwise noted the reuse of this presentation is authorised under the [CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license. For any use or reproduction of elements that are not owned by the EU, permission may need to be sought directly from the respective right holders.



Wrap up and next steps



The timeline for 2024

24 June	Summer	22-23 October	November
<p>Online meeting</p> <p>Continue discussions about those common Interreg indicators that had a high uptake & have received rather controversial labels in Riga.</p>	<p>Survey</p> <p>Online survey among all programmes on the use of indicators.</p>	<p>In-person meeting, Vienna</p> <p>In-person meeting (lunch–lunch) to discuss the findings from the survey and results of previous discussions</p>	<p>In-person meeting, Brussels</p> <p>Presentation of the outcome of the discussions at the ‘harvesting event’</p>

Thank you for being here!

Your opinion matters to us.

Please take a few minutes to provide us with feedback to help us improve our services.



Cooperation works

All materials will be available on:


[Interact library](#)

Background information


The uptake of the **Interreg** common indicators...

Row Labels	PO1 Smarter Europe	PO2 Greener Europe	PO3 Connected Europe	PO4 Social Europe	PO5 Europe closer to citizens	PO6 Interreg: Cooperation Governance	PO7 Interreg: Safer and more secure Europe	Grand Total
OUTPUT	204	630	41	378	17	282	14	1566
RCO115 Interreg: Public events across borders jointly organised	2	26	1	13		25		67
RCO116 Interreg: Jointly developed solutions	47	130	9	68	5	31		290
RCO117 Interreg: Solutions identified for legal/admin. obstacles		1	2	4		20		27
RCO118 Interreg: Organisations cooperating for MLG of MRSs						4		4
RCO120 Interreg: Projects supporting urban-rural linkages		1	1	1		1		4
RCO81 Interreg: Participation in joint actions across borders	9	61	1	34		48	4	157
RCO82 Interreg: Participations in horizontal principles actions				8		1		9
RCO83 Interreg: Strategies and action plans jointly developed	26	130	12	53	3	43	2	269
RCO84 Interreg: Pilot actions developed and implemented jointly	49	149	6	54	4	17		279
RCO85 Interreg: Participations in joint training schemes	7	15	1	46		8	2	79
RCO86 Interreg: Joint administrative or legal agreements signed					1	4	1	6
RCO87 Interreg: Organisations cooperating across borders	51	117	8	97	4	80	5	362
RCO90 Interreg: Projects for innovation networks across borders	13							13
RESULT	137	416	31	284	14	201	13	1096
RCR104 Interreg: Solutions taken up or up-scaled	58	156	11	73	5	32		335
RCR79 Interreg: Joint strategies and action plans taken up	27	128	11	52	3	38	2	261
RCR81 Interreg: Completion of joint training schemes	7	14		46		8	2	77
RCR82 Interreg: Legal/admin. obstacles alleviated or resolved		1	2	4		20		27
RCR83 Interreg: Persons covered by joint agreements signed					1	3	1	5
RCR84 Interreg: Organisations cooperating post-project	38	85	7	86	5	72	5	298
RCR85 Interreg: Participations in actions post-project	7	32		23		28	3	93
Grand Total	341	1046	72	662	31	483	27	2662

Use of Interreg common **output** indicators
















Use of Interreg common **result** indicators



Dotting exercise on RCOs – IKF Riga, March 2024

Interreg Indicators	Result dotting	Uptake by programmes	Comment
RCO115: Public events across borders jointly organized	I ■■■ ■■■	67	Priority
RCO116: Jointly developed solutions	■■■ ■■■ ■■■ ■■■ ■■■ ■■■	290	Top priority for discussion!
RCO117: Solutions for legal / administrative obstacles	I ■■■ ■■■	27	Obstacles key policy issue?
RCO118: Organisations cooperating for MLG of MRSs	- -	4	Low priority
RCO120: Projects supporting urban-rural linkages	■■■ ■■■	4	Low priority – cancel?
RCO82: Participations in horizontal principles actions	■■■ ■■■ I	9	Low priority – cancel?
RCO83: Strategies & action plans jointly developed	■■■ ■■■ ■■■ ■■■	269	High uptake but all clear?!
RCO84: Pilot actions developed & implemented jointly	■■■ ■■■ ■■■ ■■■ ■■■ I	279	Top priority!
RCO85: Participations in joint training schemes	■■■ II ■■■ II	79	Priority
RCO86: Joint administrative or legal agreements signed	■■■ ■■■ I	6	Low priority – cancel?
RCO87: Organisations cooperating across borders	■■■ ■■■ ■■■ ■■■ ■■■ ■■■	362	Top priority!
RCO90: Projects for innovation networks across borders	■■■ ■■■	13	Low priority

Dotting exercise on RCRs – IKF Riga, March 2024

Interreg Indicator	Result dotting	Uptake by programmes	Comment
RCR104: Solutions taken up or up-scaled	 (12) 	335	Top priority!
RCR79: Joint strategies & action plans taken up	 	261	Top priority!
RCR81: Completion of joint training schemes	 	77	Priority but less need for discussion
RCR82: Legal / administrative obstacles alleviated or resolved	 	27	Low priority
RCR83: Persons covered by joint agreements signed	 	5	Low priority – cancel?
RCR84: Organisations cooperating post-project	 	298	Top priority!
RCR 85: Participation in actions post-project		93	Priority