**CRITERIA TO SELECT VALUABLE OUTPUTS WITH HIGH REPLICATION POTENTIAL**
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The success of the capitalisation process is largely based on the quality and potential for replication of outputs. In the next developments, concrete outputs or deliverables are referred as solutions such as tools (e.g. Web portal, packages of products, business models, scoreboard tool, etc.), methodological approaches and strategies, guidance paper, etc. developed by the projects.

As a general rule, not all ETC project outputs/deliverables are intended to be capitalised, because they may be too specific, have limited added value compared to what is being developed elsewhere, etc.

To do this, two aspects need to be taken into account:

- A set of criteria to objectify this task

- The existence of specific expertise to perform this task.

### Proposal of specific criteria that can be used for the identification of valuable achievements to be capitalised

Two sets of criteria are proposed.

* The **first set** is made up of three criteria that could be assessed in a fairly straightforward way on the basis of existing information provided by projects beneficiaries.

*This first set of criteria could be considered as the minimum for establishing a list of achievements and solutions to capitalise on.*

* The **second set** of two criteria requires specific expertise, either at programme level and/or with the help of external experts. In addition, additional information from the project owner may be required, most often by reformatting existing information focusing on the technical and financial resources to be mobilised to achieve this solution and the necessary prerequisites.

*This second set of criteria would guarantee the feasibility of a transfer process, thus giving substance to the logic of capitalisation.*

Table 1. Sets of criteria that can be used for the selection of valuable solutions to be capitalised

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | | **Short description** | **Operational aspects to assess them** |
| 1st set of criteria | 1. **Relevance of the solution** | Solution tested and validated by a domain expert, which deserves to be shared more widely. | Need to check to what extent the solution has been tested and validated (fully - partially - not really/not at all).  Different situations may exist, in some cases the domain expert(s) will have been involved in the development of the solution, potentially with peer review, in other cases a pilot operation will have been implemented with expert assistance, etc. |
| 1. **Ready-to-use solution** | Fully or almost fully finalised solution with all deliverables and lessons learned to be exploited, availability of technical documents, methodology, detailed process description. | Crucial because all relevant information must be present, but on the other hand, its validity may be limited in time (solutions are often outdated a few years later).  Need to check the existence of relevant documents and their validity for the timing of a potential replication process.  NB. The engagement of output’s owners once the project is over can be a real challenge. Some additional support from the programme could be an option to secure his commitment. |
| 1. **Degree of willingness and commitment of the solution owner to share its main technical and financial features** | Willingness to devote sufficient time and resources, consideration of potential confidentiality and/or patent issues, etc. | Brief email / questionnaire sent to the owner of the output to ascertain their willingness as an organisation (either lead partner or partner), as well as the potential involvement of the person(s) directly involved in developing the solution. |
| 2nd set of criteria | 1. **Potential for replication or re-use of the solution** | Extent to which the solution can be decontextualised and adapted in a different context Degree of adaptation needed for replication in a new context – steps and requirements for a transfer plan. | This criterion is mainly qualitative and requires the involvement of some form of expertise. The intensity of its involvement will largely depend on the nature of the solution and its degree of complexity. |
| 1. **Added value of the solution** | Added value of the solution compared to existing solutions with similar characteristics/order of magnitude, using a form of benchmarking on a thematic basis. | At the thematic level relevant to the programme, comparison, and classification of achievements into several groups (high added value, normal added value, and low added value). The benchmarking approach could be carried out first within the programme area, and potentially extended to a European or pan-European level depending on the resources that can be used (also considering lists of existing tested and inspiring practices - e.g., from the Interreg Europe Policy Learning Platform). |

Optional criterion proposed by a CBC programme: **feedback and validation by local actors** taking into account the following questions: did the partners involved the citizens / stakeholders during their activities and/or organized specific conferences (information from project officer and communication officer)? Did the stakeholders/citizens give feedback for the project' activities?

NB. Some criteria are more demanding than others. The final list of criteria can be adjusted to the available resources and time for performing this task.

### If relevant, mobilisation of expertise to assess the added value of the achievement and its potential degree of re-use / replication

Different options are possible, such as:

* Project officers, especially when they have some thematic specialisation
* Knowledgeable organisations and stakeholders involved in the programme environment
* External providers (research centres, consultancies, etc.), ideally by maintaining some continuity if the assessment is performed on a regular basis

A mix of different options can also be explored, depending on the intensity of the assessment and the requested degree of thematic expertise.

|  |
| --- |
| **For the future programming period 2021-2027:**   * All projects’ beneficiaries should be asked to have a clearer vision from the outset of their targets and final beneficiaries (with transfer / replication perspectives) * Givers should be involved from the beginning and in a more integrated way in capitalisation processes. Additional methodological support and budget (incentives) are necessary for this |