

IMPLEMENTATION REPORT FOR THE EUROPEAN TERRITORIAL COOPERATION GOAL

PART A

IDENTIFICATION OF THE FINAL IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

CCI	2014TC16M5TN001
Title	Interreg Baltic Sea Region
Version	9999.0
Date of approval of the report by the monitoring committee	28-Jan-2025

IDENTIFICATION OF THE FINAL IMPLEMENTATION REPORT	1
KEY INFORMATION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME FOR THE YEAR CONCERNED, INCLUDING ON FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS, WITH RELATION TO THE FINANCIAL AND INDICATOR DATA.....	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PRIORITY AXIS.....	7
3.1 OVERVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION	7
3.2 COMMON AND PROGRAMME SPECIFIC INDICATORS (ARTICLE 50(2) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013)	10
PRIORITY AXES OTHER THAN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	10
TABLE 2: COMMON AND PROGRAMME SPECIFIC OUTPUT INDICATORS - 1.1A.....	10
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 1.1A.1.1	11
TABLE 2: COMMON AND PROGRAMME SPECIFIC OUTPUT INDICATORS - 1.1B.....	12
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 1.1B.1.2.....	13
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 1.1B.1.3.....	14
TABLE 2: COMMON AND PROGRAMME SPECIFIC OUTPUT INDICATORS - 2.6B.....	15
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 2.6B.2.1.....	16
TABLE 2: COMMON AND PROGRAMME SPECIFIC OUTPUT INDICATORS - 2.6G.....	17
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 2.6G.2.2	18
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 2.6G.2.3	19
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 2.6G.2.4	20
TABLE 2: COMMON AND PROGRAMME SPECIFIC OUTPUT INDICATORS - 3.7B.....	21
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 3.7B.3.1.....	22
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 3.7B.3.2.....	23
TABLE 2: COMMON AND PROGRAMME SPECIFIC OUTPUT INDICATORS - 3.7C.....	24
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 3.7C.3.3.....	25
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 3.7C.3.4.....	26
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 3.7C.3.5.....	27
TABLE 2: COMMON AND PROGRAMME SPECIFIC OUTPUT INDICATORS - 4.11C.....	28
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 4.11C.4.1.....	29
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 4.11C.4.2.....	30
PRIORITY AXES FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	31
TABLE 2: COMMON AND PROGRAMME SPECIFIC OUTPUT INDICATORS - 5. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.....	31
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 5.5.1	32
3.3 TABLE 3: INFORMATION ON THE MILESTONES AND TARGETS DEFINED IN THE PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK	33
3.4. FINANCIAL DATA.....	35
TABLE 4: FINANCIAL INFORMATION AT PRIORITY AXIS AND PROGRAMME LEVEL.....	35
WHERE APPLICABLE, THE USE OF ANY CONTRIBUTION FROM THIRD COUNTRIES PARTICIPATING IN THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME SHOULD BE PROVIDED (FOR EXAMPLE IPA AND ENI, NORWAY, SWITZERLAND)	36
TABLE 5: BREAKDOWN OF THE CUMULATIVE FINANCIAL DATA BY CATEGORY OF INTERVENTION.....	37
TABLE 6: CUMULATIVE COST OF ALL OR PART OF AN OPERATION IMPLEMENTED OUTSIDE THE UNION PART OF THE PROGRAMME AREA	41
(1) ERDF SUPPORT IS THE COMMISSION DECISION ON THE RESPECTIVE COOPERATION PROGRAMME.	41
4. SYNTHESIS OF THE EVALUATIONS.....	42
5. ISSUES AFFECTING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE PROGRAMME AND MEASURES TAKEN.....	53
(A) ISSUES WHICH AFFECT THE PERFORMANCE OF THE PROGRAMME AND THE MEASURES TAKEN.....	53
(B) OPTIONAL FOR LIGHT REPORTS, OTHERWISE IT WILL BE INCLUDED IN POINT 9.1. AN ASSESSMENT OF WHETHER PROGRESS MADE TOWARDS TARGETS IS SUFFICIENT TO ENSURE THEIR FULFILMENT, INDICATING ANY REMEDIAL ACTIONS TAKEN OR PLANNED, WHERE APPROPRIATE.	54
6. CITIZEN'S SUMMARY (ARTICLE 50(9) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013)	55
7. REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS (ARTICLE 46 OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013)	56
8. PROGRESS IN PREPARATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF MAJOR PROJECTS AND JOINT ACTION PLANS (ARTICLE 101(H) AND ARTICLE 111(3) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013 AND ARTICLE 14(3)(B) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1299/2013).....	57
8.1. MAJOR PROJECTS	57
TABLE 7: MAJOR PROJECTS.....	57
SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN IMPLEMENTING MAJOR PROJECTS AND MEASURES TAKEN TO OVERCOME THEM	57
ANY CHANGE PLANNED IN THE LIST OF MAJOR PROJECTS IN THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME	57

8.2. JOINT ACTION PLANS	58
TABLE 8: JOINT ACTION PLANS (JAP)	59
SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED AND MEASURES TAKEN TO OVERCOME THEM	60
9. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME (ARTICLE 50(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013 AND ARTICLE 14(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1299/2013)	61
9.1 INFORMATION IN PART A AND ACHIEVING THE OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAMME (ARTICLE 50(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013)	61
9.2. SPECIFIC ACTIONS TAKEN TO PROMOTE EQUALITY BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN AND TO PROMOTE NON-DISCRIMINATION, IN PARTICULAR ACCESSIBILITY FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES, AND THE ARRANGEMENTS IMPLEMENTED TO ENSURE THE INTEGRATION OF THE GENDER PERSPECTIVE IN THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME AND OPERATIONS (ARTICLE 50(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013 AND ARTICLE 14(4), SUBPARAGRAPH 2, (D) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1299/2013)	70
9.3. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (ARTICLE 50(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013 AND ARTICLE 14(4), SUBPARAGRAPH 2, (E) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1299/2013)	71
9.4. REPORTING ON SUPPORT USED FOR CLIMATE CHANGE OBJECTIVES (ARTICLE 50(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013)	73
9.5 ROLE OF PARTNERS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME (ARTICLE 50(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013 AND ARTICLE 14(4), SUBPARAGRAPH 1, (C) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1299/2013)	74
10. OBLIGATORY INFORMATION AND ASSESSMENT ACCORDING TO ARTICLE 14(4), SUBPARAGRAPH 1 (A) AND (B), OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1299/2013	75
10.1 PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EVALUATION PLAN AND THE FOLLOW-UP GIVEN TO THE FINDINGS OF EVALUATIONS	75
10.2 THE RESULTS OF THE INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY MEASURES OF THE FUNDS CARRIED OUT UNDER THE COMMUNICATION STRATEGY	86
11. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION WHICH MAY BE ADDED DEPENDING ON THE CONTENT AND OBJECTIVES OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME (ARTICLE 14(4), SUBPARAGRAPH 2 (A), (B), (C) AND (F), OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1299/2013)	90
11.1. PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED APPROACH TO TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING INTEGRATED TERRITORIAL INVESTMENTS, SUSTAINABLE URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND COMMUNITY LED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME	90
11.2 PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS TO REINFORCE THE CAPACITY OF AUTHORITIES AND BENEFICIARIES TO ADMINISTER AND TO USE THE ERDF	91
11.3 CONTRIBUTION TO MACRO-REGIONAL AND SEA BASIN STRATEGIES (WHERE APPROPRIATE)	92
EUSBSR	94
11.4 PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS IN THE FIELD OF SOCIAL INNOVATION	97
13. SMART, SUSTAINABLE AND INCLUSIVE GROWTH	99
14. ISSUES AFFECTING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE PROGRAMME AND MEASURES TAKEN — PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK (ARTICLE 50(2) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013)	102
ANNEX I. LIST OF ALL OPERATIONS PHASED FROM 2014-2020 INTO 2021-2027	103
ANNEX II. LIST OF NON-FUNCTIONING OPERATIONS	103
ANNEX III. LIST OF OPERATIONS AFFECTED BY ONGOING NATIONAL INVESTIGATIONS / SUSPENDED BY A LEGAL PROCEEDING OR BY AN ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL HAVING SUSPENSORY EFFECT	103
DOCUMENTS	104
LATEST VALIDATION RESULTS	105

2. OVERVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME (Article 50(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 and Article 14(3)(a) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

Key information on the implementation of the cooperation programme for the year concerned, including on financial instruments, with relation to the financial and indicator data.

The European Commission adopted the Cooperation Programme on 18 December 2014. The first meeting of the newly established Monitoring Committee (MC) took place 26-27 February 2015.

Calls for applications and project implementation

Three major calls for applications for regular projects addressing the Programme's priorities 1-3 were organised during the Programme implementation. The first two calls with a two-step application procedure took place 2014 and 2016. The MC selected 35 projects in the first call and 39 in the second call. The third call for applications was opened in 2017 as a one-step call resulting in 31 selected projects. The Financing Agreement with the Russian Federation had been signed in the end of 2018 which allowed Russian organisations to participate as partners in these projects. The 1st call projects delivered their results as planned. The 2nd and 3rd call projects were able to finalise their main outputs and achieve most of their planned results despite disruptions caused by the Covid-19 pandemic.

In 2018-2019, two calls for extension stage projects were organised. The extension stage was an instrument to support successful regular projects capitalise on their results and partnerships. Nine extension stage projects were approved in the first call and 17 in the second call. All extension stage projects successfully introduced their main outputs to the target groups and anchored them in the target groups' daily working routines.

The first project platform call was launched in 2017. Project platforms aimed to contribute to institutional capacity building in selected thematic fields in the region through synergies and capitalisation of results of projects funded by Interreg Baltic Sea Region and other programmes. Six platforms were selected in the first platform call and three more in the second call in 2018.

Priority 4 was focused on support for the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region. Within the specific objective 4.1 the Programme provided funding to seed money projects that were expected to prepare project proposals with strategic importance to one of the policy areas or horizontal actions of the EUSBSR. The first seed money call was launched in 2016 and resulted in 25 projects. The 2nd seed money call took place in 2019-2020, with the outcome of 37 projects. At least half of the seed money projects secured funding and led to a main project.

Under the specific objective 4.2, "Coordination of macro-regional cooperation", policy area and horizontal area coordinators of the EUSBSR were supported from 2015 to 2021 altogether by 35 "PAC/HAC support" projects. Three calls were organised, giving the PACs and HACs the possibility to adjust to changing management structures and get support until the end of the Programme period. The Programme funding helped the PACs and HACs to work on the implementation of the EUSBSR action plan, engage stakeholders and communicate progress. Under the same objective the Programme organised calls yearly to support the organisation of seven EUSBSR Annual Fora as separate projects over the years 2016 – 2022.

Thanks to the successful implementation of the projects, the Programme reached the targets set out in the performance framework.

Major challenges and a Programme update

At the peak of implementation, the Programme was hit by the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. It prevented travelling and face-to-face meetings between the cooperation partners, both at project level as well as at Programme level. To allow projects to adjust to the challenges of the pandemic and support them in achieving their results in the best possible quality the maximum length of the project duration was prolonged. Also, on Programme level all Committee meetings were organised on-line.

In 2020, on the request of the European Commission, ENI funds initially reserved for Belarus's participation were removed from the Programme as no Financing Agreement was concluded with Belarus. On this occasion, the output indicator targets were reviewed, and a few other technical updates were made.

The military aggression of the Russian Federation on Ukraine in February 2022 had a major effect on the cooperation environment in the region. The Commission suspended the Financing Agreement with the Russian Federation, on 4 March 2022. The MA/JS had already stopped the payments to the project partners from Russia immediately upon the start of the Russian invasion on 24 February. The projects concerned finalised their activities as planned but without Russian partners.

Communication

The Programme communication was implemented according to the Communication Strategy. It included attracting applicants, supporting projects, making achievements visible, and implementing internal communication, including MC. The highlights were the two Programme conferences. The Conference in Warsaw at the Programme launch in November 2014 gathered more than 500 participants. In April 2019 more than 300 people met at the Programme Conference in Lübeck to exchange about progress made in the Programme and to understand what transnational Interreg cooperation had achieved for the region.

EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR)

The Programme significantly contributed to the EUSBSR by co-financing flagships and other projects supporting the Strategy and through project platforms linking the results of EU-funded projects to policy development in various thematic areas. In addition, the Programme supported the generation of projects relevant to EUSBSR (seed money) and the governance structures, communication, and capacity-building of the Strategy.

Audit and control

The audit and control system of Interreg Baltic Sea Region was built on the system used in the predecessor Programme. The Audit Strategy for the Programme was developed by the Programme's Audit Authority (AA), the Ministry of Justice, Cultural and European Affairs of Schleswig-Holstein, and submitted to the Commission in February 2016. The audits and system checks according to the key requirements were conducted on time throughout the Programme implementation, and with good results, proving that the Programme's audit and control system worked well. The Programme acknowledges the information from the Commission regarding the Commission auditors' ongoing work on declared follow-up measures. The amounts related to the findings in the final Compliance Audit Report were deducted from the annual accounts 2023/2024 and in all annual closure documents.

Evaluations

The Programme evaluations and the monitoring of the result indicators were carried out according to the Evaluation Plan. The evaluations included operational evaluations implemented internally and two impact evaluations for which external evaluators were contracted. All evaluations confirmed the successful implementation of the Programme and no major shortcomings were detected. Lessons learned from the evaluations were considered for the programming of 2021-2027 Programme.

3. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PRIORITY AXIS

3.1 Overview of the implementation

ID	Priority axis	Key information on the implementation of the priority axis with reference to key developments, significant problems and steps taken to address these problems
1	Capacity for innovation	<p>1st call: 12 projects approved – all finalised their implementation in 2019; 8 received their final payment in 2019, 4 in 2020 2nd call: 18 projects approved – 7 finalised in 2020, 11 in 2021; all received their final payments by end 2021 3rd call: 15 projects approved - all finalised their implementation by end 2021; all but 1 received their final payments in 2022, the last 1 in 2023</p> <p>The 1st call projects delivered their results as planned. The 2nd and 3rd call projects were able to achieve most of their planned results despite disruptions caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. The projects finalised their main outputs and introduced them to their target groups through live and online activities in order to ensure the uptake and use of the outputs after the projects had ended.</p> <p>1st Extension stage call: 4 projects approved – all finalised their implementation in 2021; 1 received its final payment in 2021, the others in 2022. 2nd Extension stage call: 8 projects approved - all finalised their implementation end 2021; 2 received their final payments in 2021, the others in 2022 All extension stage projects worked successfully on introducing their main outputs to the target groups and anchoring them in the target groups' daily working routines.</p> <p>Project Platforms: 1 project approved – it finalised its implementation and received its final payment in 2022 The platform successfully synthesised the knowledge on implementing smart specialisation strategies in Interreg projects.</p> <p>No significant problems were encountered in this priority.</p>
2	Efficient management of natural resources	<p>1st call: 13 projects approved – all finalised their implementation in 2019; 7 received their final payments in 2019, 6 in 2020 2nd call: 12 projects approved – 1 finalised its implementation end 2019, 4 in 2020 and 7 in 2021; all received their final payments by end 2021 3rd call: 9 projects approved – all finalised by end 2021 and received their final payments in 2022.</p> <p>The 1st call projects delivered their results as planned. The 2nd and 3rd call projects were able to achieve most of their planned results despite disruptions caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. The projects finalised their main outputs and introduced them to their target groups through live and online activities in order to ensure the uptake and use of the outputs after the projects had ended.</p> <p>1st Extension stage call: 4 projects approved – all finalised their implementation in 2021; one received its final payment in 2021, the others in 2022. 2nd Extension stage call: 4 projects approved - all finalised their implementation end 2021 and received their final payment in</p>

ID	Priority axis	Key information on the implementation of the priority axis with reference to key developments, significant problems and steps taken to address these problems
		<p>2022</p> <p>All extension stage projects worked successfully on introducing their main outputs to the target groups and anchoring them in the target groups' daily working routines.</p> <p>Project platforms: 5 projects approved - 2 finalised their implementation in 2021 and 3 in 2022; all received their final payments in 2022.</p> <p>The project platforms successfully synthesised knowledge from Interreg and other EU funding programme projects on water and agri-environmental management, energy efficiency, blue bioeconomy, and maritime spatial planning.</p> <p>No significant problems were encountered in this priority.</p>
3	Sustainable transport	<p>1st call: 10 projects approved - all finalised their implementation in 2019; 8 received their final payments in 2019, 2 in 2020</p> <p>2nd call: 9 projects approved – 4 finalised their implementation in 2020, 5 in 2021; 8 received their final payments in 2021, and 1 at the beginning of 2022</p> <p>3rd call: 7 projects approved – all finalised their implementation in 2021 and received their final payments in 2022</p> <p>The 1st call projects delivered their results as planned. The 2nd and 3rd call projects were able to achieve most of their planned results despite disruptions caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. The projects finalised their main outputs and introduced them to their target groups through live and online activities in order to ensure the uptake and use of the outputs after the projects had ended.</p> <p>1st Extension stage call: 1 project approved – it finalised implementation in 2021 and received its final payment in 2022</p> <p>2nd Extension stage call: 5 projects approved – all finalised their implementation by the end of 2021 and received their final payments in 2022.</p> <p>All extension stage projects worked successfully on introducing their main outputs to the target groups and anchoring them in the target groups' daily working routines.</p> <p>Project Platforms: 3 projects approved - 2 finalised in 2021 and 1 in 2022; 2 received their final payments in 2022 and 1 in 2023.</p> <p>All three platforms successfully synthesised knowledge from Interreg and other EU funding programme projects on enhancing multimodal transport corridors, maritime safety and clean shipping</p> <p>No significant problems were encountered in this priority.</p>
4	Institutional capacity for macro-regional cooperation	<p>Specific objective 4.1 “Seed money”</p> <p>1st call: 25 seed money projects were approved, 23 finalised successfully, developed a work plan for a main project and received their payment by end 2019. Two seed money projects did not fulfil the requirements and did not receive payments.</p> <p>2nd call: All 37 approved seed money projects finalised their activities in 2021. All but one project developed a work plan for</p>

ID	Priority axis	Key information on the implementation of the priority axis with reference to key developments, significant problems and steps taken to address these problems
		<p>a main project.</p> <p>Specific objective 4.2 “Coordination of macro-regional cooperation”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PAC/HAC support: policy area and horizontal area coordinators of the EUSBSR were supported from 2015 to 2021 altogether by 35 projects. Three calls were organised, giving the PACs and HACs the possibility to adjust to changing management structures and get Programme support until the end of the programme period. The Programme funding helped PACs to work on the implementation of the EUSBSR action plan, engage stakeholders and communicate progress. - Support to EUSBSR Annual Forum organisation: The Programme supported the organisation of seven EUSBSR Annual Fora as separate projects from 2016 to 2022. - Targeted support to communication activities: The ‘Let’s Communicate’ project started its activities in June 2016, finalised them in September 2022 and received its final payment in 2023. The project partners supported the group of National Coordinators of the EUSBSR in administrative tasks, the PACs in facilitating their exchange as well as communicated the progress and achievements of the Strategy. - The EUSBSR SUPPORT project offered capacity-building to PACs and HACs for implementing the Strategy over a three-year period from 2017 to 2020. <p>No significant problems were encountered in this priority.</p>
5	Technical Assistance	<p>The Technical (TA) budget comprised four funding sources, whereas ERDF was the main funding source. Other sources were ENI, Russian national funds and Norwegian funds. During the programme's implementation, the TA budget was adjusted a few times to meet the programme's needs. Originally, it was approximately EUR 21.6 million (agreed by the JPC in May 2014 and confirmed by the MC at its first meeting in February 2015). In 2018, the budget was increased by EUR 0.7 million ENI/RU funding. At the same time, savings in the years 2015-2017 were reallocated to the years 2020-2023 (all decided at the MC meeting in Sep 2018). The new total TA was then approximately EUR 22.3 million. Finally, during the MC meeting in Stockholm on 19-20 June 2023, the MC opted to use the 15% budget flexibility allowed by the STEP regulation.</p> <p>The overall TA budget finally utilised amounts to EUR 25.2 million, exceeding the previous TA budget by EUR 2.9 million, or 13%. The excess is within the budget flexibility granted by the STEP regulation. The total amount of EUR 25.2 million includes all Programme management costs, including costs for the MA/JS and contribution to the Audit Authority for the entire period 2014-2023.</p> <p>No significant problems were encountered in this priority.</p>

3.2 Common and programme specific indicators (Article 50(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013)

Priority axes other than technical assistance

Priority axis	1 - Capacity for innovation
Investment priority	1a - Enhancing research and innovation (R&I) infrastructure and capacities to develop R&I excellence, and promoting centres of competence, in particular those of European interest

Table 2: Common and programme specific output indicators - 1.1a

(I)	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value	2023	Observations
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	1,225.00	2,071.00	as per COM definition = CO01 (= 31) +CO04 The target of the indicator has been overachieved. This is a positive outcome.
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	1,225.00	1,275.00	as per COM definition = CO01 (= 23) +CO04 There is a slight deviation from the target value set for this indicator. This is a positive development.
F	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	Enterprises	1,252.00	2,040.00	The target of the indicator has been overachieved. This is a positive outcome.
S	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	Enterprises	1,252.00	1,252.00	
F	CO26	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions	Enterprises	432.00	0.00	Meeting with the Commission on 11 January 2022.: It was jointly agreed to resign from following up this indicator, because IBSR definition does not correspond to the one used by other National and CBC Programmes. For this reason, the achieved values will be set to "0". IBSR definition doesn't have a pure research aspect, but a rather wider scope focusing on cooperation.
S	CO26	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions	Enterprises	432.00	0.00	Meeting with the Commission on 11 January 2022.: It was jointly agreed to resign from following up this indicator, because IBSR definition does not correspond to the one used by other National and CBC Programmes. For this reason, the achieved values will be set to "0". IBSR definition doesn't have a pure research aspect, but a rather wider scope focusing on cooperation.
F	CO27	Research, Innovation: Private investment matching public support in innovation or R&D projects	EUR	1,505,491.00	1,587,373.00	The target of the indicator has been overachieved. This is a positive outcome.
S	CO27	Research, Innovation: Private investment matching public support in innovation or R&D projects	EUR	1,505,491.00	1,505,491.00	
F	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	36.00	36.00	
S	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	36.00	36.00	
F	PSO02	No. of documented newly developed market products and services	market products and services	73.00	89.00	There is a slight deviation from the target value set for this indicator. This is a positive outcome.
S	PSO02	No. of documented newly developed market products and services	market products and services	73.00	73.00	

(I)	ID	Indicator	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	2,068.00	1,434.00	671.00	552.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	1,275.00	1,275.00	1,275.00	1,255.00	1,255.00	751.00	247.00	0.00	0.00
F	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	2,037.00	1,412.00	666.00	550.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	1,252.00	1,252.00	1,252.00	1,232.00	1,232.00	734.00	242.00	0.00	0.00
F	CO26	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions	0.00	0.00	132.00	28.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO26	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions	0.00	0.00	432.00	427.00	427.00	332.00	92.00	0.00	0.00
F	CO27	Research, Innovation: Private investment matching public support in innovation or R&D projects	1,578,873.00	1,194,673.00	312,538.00	253,398.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO27	Research, Innovation: Private investment matching public support in innovation or R&D projects	1,505,491.00	1,505,491.00	1,505,491.00	1,505,491.00	1,505,491.00	849,996.00	134,157.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	36.00	20.00	8.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	36.00	36.00	36.00	33.00	31.00	19.00	8.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO02	No. of documented newly developed market products and services	89.00	76.00	10.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO02	No. of documented newly developed market products and services	73.00	73.00	73.00	73.00	73.00	58.00	8.00	0.00	0.00

(1) S=Cumulative value - outputs to be delivered by selected operations [forecast provided by beneficiaries], F=Cumulative value - outputs delivered by operations [actual achievement]

Priority axis	1 - Capacity for innovation
Investment priority	1a - Enhancing research and innovation (R&I) infrastructure and capacities to develop R&I excellence, and promoting centres of competence, in particular those of European interest
Specific objective	1.1 - 'Research and innovation infrastructures': To enhance market uptake of innovation based on improved capacity of research and innovation infrastructures and their users

Table 1: Result indicators - 1.1a.1.1

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2023 Total	2023 Qualitative	Observations
1.1.1	Capacity of research and innovation infrastructures in the Programme area to implement measures to increase the market uptake of innovation	Qualitative analysis of the state and gaps of capacity	Slightly below medium (2,7)	2014	Medium to good (3,6), focus on more efficient use of human and technical resources		2022 total: 3.4. The value for "Efficient use of human and technical resources" was 3.3.	<p>This clarification refers to all result indicators under Priorities 1, 2 and 3: The result indicators did not refer to the direct Programme beneficiaries but covered the whole population of the target group in the area. Therefore, changes in institutional capacities could only partly be linked to the Programme intervention but were to a great extent dependent on other factors outside the Programme's influence.</p> <p>The last Evaluation for 2014-2020 was carried out in 2022. It presented the final values of the result indicators. The results were already reported in AIR covering 2022.</p> <p>There was steady progress from the baseline. The target was not fully achieved.</p>

ID	Indicator	2022 Total	2022 Qualitative	2021 Total	2021 Qualitative	2020 Total	2020 Qualitative	2019 Total	2019 Qualitative
1.1.1	Capacity of research and innovation infrastructures in the Programme area to implement measures to increase the market uptake of innovation		2022 total: 3.4. The value for "Efficient use of human and technical resources" was 3.3.		The result indicators were not monitored in 2021. Final evaluation results will be reported in 2022.		3.2- Slight increase, positive trend towards target value		

ID	Indicator	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative
1.1.1	Capacity of research and innovation infrastructures in the Programme area to implement measures to increase the market uptake of innovation		3.0: Slight increase, positive trend towards target value						

ID	Indicator	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
1.1.1	Capacity of research and innovation infrastructures in the Programme area to implement measures to increase the market uptake of innovation		

Priority axis	1 - Capacity for innovation
Investment priority	1b - Promoting business investment in R&I, developing links and synergies between enterprises, research and development centres and the higher education sector, in particular promoting investment in product and service development, technology transfer, social innovation, eco-innovation, public service applications, demand stimulation, networking, clusters and open innovation through smart specialisation, and supporting technological and applied research, pilot lines, early product validation actions, advanced manufacturing capabilities and first production, in particular in key enabling technologies and diffusion of general purpose technologies, as well as fostering investment necessary for strengthening the crisis response capacities in health services

Table 2: Common and programme specific output indicators - 1.1b

(I)	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value	2023	Observations
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	6,297.00	10,369.00	CO01 = 83 enterprises receiving grants + CO04 The target of the indicator has been overachieved. This is a positive outcome.
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	6,297.00	7,072.00	CO01 = 42 enterprises receiving grants + CO04/ There is a slight deviation from the target value set for this indicator. This is a positive outcome.
F	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	Enterprises	7,000.00	10,286.00	The target of the indicator has been overachieved. This is a positive outcome.
S	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	Enterprises	7,000.00	7,030.00	There is a slight deviation from the target value set for this indicator. This is a positive development.
F	CO26	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions	Enterprises	1,214.00	0.00	Meeting with the Commission on 11 January 2022.: It was jointly agreed to resign from following up this indicator, because IBSR definition does not correspond to the one used by other National and CBC Programmes. For this reason, the achieved values will be set to "0". IBSR definition doesn't have a pure research aspect, but a rather wider scope focusing on cooperation.
S	CO26	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions	Enterprises	1,214.00	0.00	Meeting with the Commission on 11 January 2022.: It was jointly agreed to resign from following up this indicator, because IBSR definition does not correspond to the one used by other National and CBC Programmes. For this reason, the achieved values will be set to "0". IBSR definition doesn't have a pure research aspect, but a rather wider scope focusing on cooperation.
F	CO27	Research, Innovation: Private investment matching public support in innovation or R&D projects	EUR	6,120,071.00	1,099,191.00	The target value has not been reached. Some projects did not manage to attract private investments as planned. Note for 2022 value : The figure 8,100,000 was reported by mistake. The correct figure was 1,099,191.00, the same as the one reported in the current report.
S	CO27	Research, Innovation: Private investment matching public support in innovation or R&D projects	EUR	6,120,071.00	6,120,071.00	
F	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	105.00	105.00	
F	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	105.00	105.00	
F	PSO02	No. of documented newly developed market products and services	market products and services	165.00	182.00	There is a slight deviation from the target value set for this indicator. This is a positive outcome.
S	PSO02	No. of documented newly developed market products and services	market products and services	165.00	165.00	

(I)	ID	Indicator	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	10,369.00	6,649.00	1,817.00	959.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	7,072.00	7,072.00	6,632.00	6,291.00	6,233.00	4,343.00	1,431.00	0.00	0.00
F	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	10,286.00	6,605.00	1,784.00	954.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	7,030.00	7,030.00	6,590.00	6,225.00	6,197.00	4,314.00	1,406.00	0.00	0.00
F	CO26	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions	0.00	0.00	466.00	296.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO26	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions	0.00	0.00	1,214.00	1,098.00	1,081.00	888.00	458.00	0.00	0.00
F	CO27	Research, Innovation: Private investment matching public support in innovation or R&D projects	8,100,000.00	591,691.00	398,691.00	398,691.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO27	Research, Innovation: Private investment matching public support in innovation or R&D projects	6,120,071.00	6,120,071.00	6,120,071.00	5,960,071.00	5,760,071.00	5,660,071.00	5,585,000.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	105.00	56.00	20.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	105.00	105.00	102.00	91.00	83.00	56.00	14.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO02	No. of documented newly developed market products and services	182.00	119.00	74.00	53.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO02	No. of documented newly developed market products and services	165.00	165.00	165.00	158.00	147.00	282.00	67.00	0.00	0.00

(1) S=Cumulative value - outputs to be delivered by selected operations [forecast provided by beneficiaries], F=Cumulative value - outputs delivered by operations [actual achievement]

Priority axis	1 - Capacity for innovation
Investment priority	1b - Promoting business investment in R&I, developing links and synergies between enterprises, research and development centres and the higher education sector, in particular promoting investment in product and service development, technology transfer, social innovation, eco-innovation, public service applications, demand stimulation, networking, clusters and open innovation through smart specialisation, and supporting technological and applied research, pilot lines, early product validation actions, advanced manufacturing capabilities and first production, in particular in key enabling technologies and diffusion of general purpose technologies, as well as fostering investment necessary for strengthening the crisis response capacities in health services
Specific objective	1.2 - 'Smart specialisation': To enhance growth opportunities based on increased capacity of innovation actors to apply smart specialisation approach

Table 1: Result indicators - 1.1b.1.2

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2023 Total	2023 Qualitative	Observations
1.2.1	Capacity (definition of capacity see section 1 Programme Strategy) of innovation actors (innovation intermediaries, authorities, research institutions, enterprises) in the Programme area to implement smart specialisation strategies	Qualitative analysis of the state and gaps of capacity	Slightly below medium (2,9)	2014	Slightly below good (3,8), focus on enhanced institutionalized knowledge and competence		2022 total: 3.2. The value for "Institutionalised knowledge and competence" was 3.0.	This clarification refers to all result indicators under Priorities 1, 2 and 3: The result indicators did not refer to the direct Programme beneficiaries but covered the whole population of the target group in the area. Therefore, changes in institutional capacities could only partly be linked to the Programme intervention but were to a great extent dependent on other factors outside the Programme's influence. The last Evaluation for 2014-2020 was carried out in 2022. It presented the final values of the result indicators. The results were already reported in AIR covering 2022. Stable value since 2020. The values were higher than the baseline, but the target value was not reached.

ID	Indicator	2022 Total	2022 Qualitative	2021 Total	2021 Qualitative	2020 Total	2020 Qualitative	2019 Total	2019 Qualitative
1.2.1	Capacity (definition of capacity see section 1 Programme Strategy) of innovation actors (innovation intermediaries, authorities, research institutions, enterprises) in the Programme area to implement smart specialisation strategies		2022 total: 3.2. The value for "Institutionalised knowledge and competence" was 3.0.		The result indicators were not monitored in 2021. Final evaluation results will be reported in 2022.		3.2 - Minor decrease since 2018, still higher than the baseline		

ID	Indicator	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative
1.2.1	Capacity (definition of capacity see section 1 Programme Strategy) of innovation actors (innovation intermediaries, authorities, research institutions, enterprises) in the Programme area to implement smart specialisation strategies		3.4: Sizeable increase, positive trend, target is in reach						

ID	Indicator	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
1.2.1	Capacity (definition of capacity see section 1 Programme Strategy) of innovation actors (innovation intermediaries, authorities, research institutions, enterprises) in the Programme area to implement smart specialisation strategies		

Priority axis	1 - Capacity for innovation
Investment priority	1b - Promoting business investment in R&I, developing links and synergies between enterprises, research and development centres and the higher education sector, in particular promoting investment in product and service development, technology transfer, social innovation, eco-innovation, public service applications, demand stimulation, networking, clusters and open innovation through smart specialisation, and supporting technological and applied research, pilot lines, early product validation actions, advanced manufacturing capabilities and first production, in particular in key enabling technologies and diffusion of general purpose technologies, as well as fostering investment necessary for strengthening the crisis response capacities in health services
Specific objective	1.3 - 'Non-technological innovation': To advance the Baltic Sea Region performance in non-technological innovation based on increased capacity of innovation actors

Table 1: Result indicators - 1.1b.1.3

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2023 Total	2023 Qualitative	Observations
1.3.1	Capacity of innovation actors (innovation intermediaries, authorities, research institutions, enterprises) in the Programme area to implement measures to increase uptake of non-technological innovation	Qualitative analysis of the state and gaps of capacity	Slightly below medium (2,9)	2014	Medium to good (3,7), focus on enhanced institutionalised knowledge and competence		2022 total: 2.9. The value for "Enhanced institutionalised knowledge and competence" was 2.8.	<p>This clarification refers to all result indicators under Priorities 1, 2 and 3: The result indicators did not refer to the direct Programme beneficiaries but covered the whole population of the target group in the area. Therefore, changes in institutional capacities could only partly be linked to the Programme intervention but were to a great extent dependent on other factors outside the Programme's influence.</p> <p>The last Evaluation for 2014-2020 was carried out in 2022. It presented the final values of the result indicators. The results were already reported in AIR covering 2022.</p> <p>The value remained on the level of the baseline. The target value was not reached.</p>

ID	Indicator	2022 Total	2022 Qualitative	2021 Total	2021 Qualitative	2020 Total	2020 Qualitative	2019 Total	2019 Qualitative
1.3.1	Capacity of innovation actors (innovation intermediaries, authorities, research institutions, enterprises) in the Programme area to implement measures to increase uptake of non-technological innovation		2022 total: 2.9. The value for "Enhanced institutionalised knowledge and competence" was 2.8.		The result indicators were not monitored in 2021. Final evaluation results will be reported in 2022.		2.8 - Significant decrease, negative trend, lower than the baseline		

ID	Indicator	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative
1.3.1	Capacity of innovation actors (innovation intermediaries, authorities, research institutions, enterprises) in the Programme area to implement measures to increase uptake of non-technological innovation		3.2: Slight increase, positive trend towards target value						

ID	Indicator	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
1.3.1	Capacity of innovation actors (innovation intermediaries, authorities, research institutions, enterprises) in the Programme area to implement measures to increase uptake of non-technological innovation		

Priority axis	2 - Efficient management of natural resources
Investment priority	6b - Investing in the water sector to meet the requirements of the Union's environmental acquis and to address needs, identified by the Member States, for investment that goes beyond those requirements

Table 2: Common and programme specific output indicators - 2.6b

(1)	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value	2023	Observations
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	996.00	2,442.00	CO01 = 32 enterprises receiving grants + CO04 The target of the indicator has been overachieved. This is a positive outcome.
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	996.00	1,039.00	CO01 = 24 enterprises receiving grants + CO04 There is a slight deviation from the target value set for this indicator. This is a positive outcome.
F	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	Enterprises	1,015.00	2,410.00	The target of the indicator has been overachieved. This is a positive outcome.
S	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	Enterprises	1,015.00	1,015.00	
F	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	44.00	45.00	
S	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	44.00	44.00	
F	PSO03	Amount of documented planned investments to be realised with other than the Programme funding	Amount in EUR	4,732,534.00	161,538,507.00	There is a deviation from the target value set for this indicator. The target value was exceeded due to one project with major investment plans. This is a positive outcome.
S	PSO03	Amount of documented planned investments to be realised with other than the Programme funding	Amount in EUR	4,732,534.00	5,932,534.00	There is a deviation from the target value set for this indicator. This is a positive outcome.
F	PSO04	No. of local/regional public authorities/institutions involved	authorities/institutions	49.00	46.00	
S	PSO04	No. of local/regional public authorities/institutions involved	authorities/institutions	49.00	46.00	
F	PSO05	No. of national public authorities/institutions involved	authorities/institutions	21.00	20.00	
S	PSO05	No. of national public authorities/institutions involved	authorities/institutions	21.00	20.00	

(1)	ID	Indicator	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	2,442.00	1,884.00	358.00	66.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	1,039.00	1,039.00	996.00	996.00	921.00	826.00	231.00	0.00	0.00
F	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	2,410.00	1,865.00	352.00	60.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	1,015.00	1,015.00	975.00	975.00	902.00	810.00	225.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	44.00	25.00	12.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	44.00	44.00	42.00	42.00	36.00	25.00	12.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO03	Amount of documented planned investments to be realised with other than the Programme funding	7,538,480.00	374,107.00	374,107.00	206,328.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO03	Amount of documented planned investments to be realised with other than the Programme funding	5,932,534.00	5,932,534.00	4,732,534.00	4,732,534.00	4,732,534.00	232,534.00	119,010.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO04	No. of local/regional public authorities/institutions involved	28.00	28.00	19.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO04	No. of local/regional public authorities/institutions involved	46.00	46.00	46.00	46.00	41.00	28.00	19.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO05	No. of national public authorities/institutions involved	20.00	9.00	4.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO05	No. of national public authorities/institutions involved	20.00	20.00	19.00	19.00	17.00	11.00	4.00	0.00	0.00

(1) S=Cumulative value - outputs to be delivered by selected operations [forecast provided by beneficiaries], F=Cumulative value - outputs delivered by operations [actual achievement]

Priority axis	2 - Efficient management of natural resources
Investment priority	6b - Investing in the water sector to meet the requirements of the Union's environmental acquis and to address needs, identified by the Member States, for investment that goes beyond those requirements
Specific objective	2.1 - 'Clear waters': To increase efficiency of water management for reduced nutrient inflows and decreased discharges of hazardous substances to the Baltic Sea and the regional waters based on enhanced capacity of public and private actors dealing with water quality issues

Table 1: Result indicators - 2.6b.2.1

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2023 Total	2023 Qualitative	Observations
2.1.1	Capacity of public authorities / practitioners (from water management, agricultural, forestry, fisheries etc. sectors) in the Programme area to implement measures to reduce nutrient inflows and decrease discharges of hazardous substances	Qualitative analysis of the state and gaps of capacity	Slightly below medium (2,7)	2014	Medium to good (3,6), focus on better ability to attract new financial resources		2022 total: 3.3. The value for "better ability to attract new financial resources" was 2.3.	<p>This clarification refers to all result indicators under Priorities 1, 2 and 3: The result indicators did not refer to the direct Programme beneficiaries but covered the whole population of the target group in the area. Therefore, changes in institutional capacities could only partly be linked to the Programme intervention but were to a great extent dependent on other factors outside the Programme's influence. The last Evaluation for 2014-2020 was carried out in 2022. It presented the final values of the result indicators. The results were already reported in AIR covering 2022.</p> <p>Steady progress from the baseline towards the target, but the target was not achieved. Negative development regarding the specific focus on ability to attract new financial sources.</p>

ID	Indicator	2022 Total	2022 Qualitative	2021 Total	2021 Qualitative	2020 Total	2020 Qualitative	2019 Total	2019 Qualitative
2.1.1	Capacity of public authorities / practitioners (from water management, agricultural, forestry, fisheries etc. sectors) in the Programme area to implement measures to reduce nutrient inflows and decrease discharges of hazardous substances		2022 total: 3.3. The value for "better ability to attract new financial resources" was 2.3.		The result indicators were not monitored in 2021. Final evaluation results will be reported in 2022.		3.0 - Slight increase, positive trend		

ID	Indicator	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative
2.1.1	Capacity of public authorities / practitioners (from water management, agricultural, forestry, fisheries etc. sectors) in the Programme area to implement measures to reduce nutrient inflows and decrease discharges of hazardous substances		2.9: Slight increase, positive trend towards target value						

ID	Indicator	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
2.1.1	Capacity of public authorities / practitioners (from water management, agricultural, forestry, fisheries etc. sectors) in the Programme area to implement measures to reduce nutrient inflows and decrease discharges of hazardous substances		

Priority axis	2 - Efficient management of natural resources
Investment priority	6g - Supporting industrial transition towards a resource-efficient economy, promoting green growth, eco-innovation and environmental performance management in the public and private sectors

Table 2: Common and programme specific output indicators - 2.6g

(1)	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value	2023	Observations
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	622.00	1,507.00	CO01 = 42 enterprises receiving grants + CO04 The target of the indicator has been overachieved. This is a positive outcome.
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	622.00	709.00	CO01 = 43 enterprises receiving grants + CO04 There is a slight deviation from the target value set for this indicator. This is a positive outcome.
F	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	Enterprises	614.00	1,465.00	The target of the indicator has been overachieved. This is a positive outcome.
S	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	Enterprises	614.00	666.00	There is a slight deviation from the target value set for this indicator. This is a positive outcome.
F	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	57.00	57.00	
S	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	57.00	57.00	
F	PSO03	Amount of documented planned investments to be realised with other than the Programme funding	Amount in EUR	4,010,000.00	7,486,466.00	The target of the indicator has been overachieved. This is a positive outcome.
S	PSO03	Amount of documented planned investments to be realised with other than the Programme funding	Amount in EUR	4,010,000.00	4,010,000.00	
F	PSO04	No. of local/regional public authorities/institutions involved	authorities/institutions	78.00	189.00	The target of the indicator has been overachieved. This is a positive outcome.
S	PSO04	No. of local/regional public authorities/institutions involved	authorities/institutions	78.00	78.00	
F	PSO05	No. of national public authorities/institutions involved	authorities/institutions	26.00	25.00	
S	PSO05	No. of national public authorities/institutions involved	authorities/institutions	26.00	26.00	

(1)	ID	Indicator	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	1,507.00	871.00	525.00	479.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	709.00	709.00	631.00	618.00	612.00	326.00	115.00	0.00	0.00
F	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	1,465.00	840.00	508.00	468.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	666.00	666.00	591.00	579.00	576.00	296.00	92.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	57.00	32.00	14.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	57.00	57.00	54.00	52.00	46.00	32.00	14.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO03	Amount of documented planned investments to be realised with other than the Programme funding	7,486,466.00	7,486,466.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO03	Amount of documented planned investments to be realised with other than the Programme funding	4,010,000.00	4,010,000.00	4,010,000.00	4,010,000.00	3,510,000.00	3,510,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO04	No. of local/regional public authorities/institutions involved	189.00	47.00	17.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO04	No. of local/regional public authorities/institutions involved	78.00	78.00	78.00	71.00	70.00	50.00	17.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO05	No. of national public authorities/institutions involved	25.00	13.00	6.00	6.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO05	No. of national public authorities/institutions involved	26.00	26.00	26.00	26.00	24.00	19.00	6.00	0.00	0.00

(1) S=Cumulative value - outputs to be delivered by selected operations [forecast provided by beneficiaries], F=Cumulative value - outputs delivered by operations [actual achievement]

Priority axis	2 - Efficient management of natural resources
Investment priority	6g - Supporting industrial transition towards a resource-efficient economy, promoting green growth, eco-innovation and environmental performance management in the public and private sectors
Specific objective	2.2 - 'Renewable energy': To increase production of sustainable renewable energy based on enhanced capacity of public and private actors involved in energy planning and supply

Table 1: Result indicators - 2.6g.2.2

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2023 Total	2023 Qualitative	Observations
2.2.1	Capacity of public/private actors in energy planning and supply (authorities, agencies, enterprises, NGOs in energy, waste, forestry and agricultural sector) in the Programme area to implement measures to increase the use of sustainable renewable energy	Qualitative analysis of the state and gaps of capacity	Basic to medium (2,4)	2014	Medium to good (3,5), focus on increased capability to work in transnational environment		2022 total: 2.6. The value for "Increased capability to work in transnational environment" was 2.8.	<p>This clarification refers to all result indicators under Priorities 1, 2 and 3: The result indicators did not refer to the direct Programme beneficiaries but covered the whole population of the target group in the area. Therefore, changes in institutional capacities could only partly be linked to the Programme intervention but were to a great extent dependent on other factors outside the Programme's influence.</p> <p>The last Evaluation for 2014-2020 was carried out in 2022. It presented the final values of the result indicators. The results were already reported in AIR covering 2022.</p> <p>Some progress compared to the baseline towards the target, but the target was not achieved.</p>

ID	Indicator	2022 Total	2022 Qualitative	2021 Total	2021 Qualitative	2020 Total	2020 Qualitative	2019 Total	2019 Qualitative
2.2.1	Capacity of public/private actors in energy planning and supply (authorities, agencies, enterprises, NGOs in energy, waste, forestry and agricultural sector) in the Programme area to implement measures to increase the use of sustainable renewable energy		2022 total: 2.6. The value for "Increased capability to work in transnational environment" was 2.8.		The result indicators were not monitored in 2021. Final evaluation results will be reported in 2022.		2.7 - Minor decrease, still higher than the baseline		

ID	Indicator	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative
2.2.1	Capacity of public/private actors in energy planning and supply (authorities, agencies, enterprises, NGOs in energy, waste, forestry and agricultural sector) in the Programme area to implement measures to increase the use of sustainable renewable energy		2.8: Increase, positive trend towards target value						

ID	Indicator	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
2.2.1	Capacity of public/private actors in energy planning and supply (authorities, agencies, enterprises, NGOs in energy, waste, forestry and agricultural sector) in the Programme area to implement measures to increase the use of sustainable renewable energy		

Priority axis	2 - Efficient management of natural resources
Investment priority	6g - Supporting industrial transition towards a resource-efficient economy, promoting green growth, eco-innovation and environmental performance management in the public and private sectors
Specific objective	2.3 - 'Energy efficiency': To increase energy efficiency based on enhanced capacity of public and private actors involved in energy planning

Table 1: Result indicators - 2.6g.2.3

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2023 Total	2023 Qualitative	Observations
2.3.1	Capacity of public and private actors involved in energy planning (public authorities, energy agencies, enterprises, NGOs) in the Programme area to implement measures to increase energy efficiency	Qualitative analysis of the state and gaps of capacity	Basic to medium (2,6)	2014	Medium to good (3,5), focus on better ability to attract new financial resources		2022 total: 3.0. The value for "better ability to attract new financial resources" was 2.9.	<p>This clarification refers to all result indicators under Priorities 1, 2 and 3: The result indicators did not refer to the direct Programme beneficiaries but covered the whole population of the target group in the area. Therefore, changes in institutional capacities could only partly be linked to the Programme intervention but were to a great extent dependent on other factors outside the Programme's influence.</p> <p>The last Evaluation for 2014-2020 was carried out in 2022. It presented the final values of the result indicators. The results were already reported in AIR covering 2022.</p> <p>There was progress compared to the baseline towards the target. The target was not reached.</p>

ID	Indicator	2022 Total	2022 Qualitative	2021 Total	2021 Qualitative	2020 Total	2020 Qualitative	2019 Total	2019 Qualitative
2.3.1	Capacity of public and private actors involved in energy planning (public authorities, energy agencies, enterprises, NGOs) in the Programme area to implement measures to increase energy efficiency		2022 total: 3.0. The value for "better ability to attract new financial resources" was 2.9.		The result indicators were not monitored in 2021. Final evaluation results will be reported in 2022.		3.1 - Minor increase, positive trend towards target value		

ID	Indicator	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative
2.3.1	Capacity of public and private actors involved in energy planning (public authorities, energy agencies, enterprises, NGOs) in the Programme area to implement measures to increase energy efficiency		3.0: Increase, positive trend towards target value						

ID	Indicator	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
2.3.1	Capacity of public and private actors involved in energy planning (public authorities, energy agencies, enterprises, NGOs) in the Programme area to implement measures to increase energy efficiency		

Priority axis	2 - Efficient management of natural resources
Investment priority	6g - Supporting industrial transition towards a resource-efficient economy, promoting green growth, eco-innovation and environmental performance management in the public and private sectors
Specific objective	2.4 - 'Resource-efficient blue growth': To advance sustainable and resource-efficient blue growth based on increased capacity of public authorities and practitioners within the blue economy sectors

Table 1: Result indicators - 2.6g.2.4

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2023 Total	2023 Qualitative	Observations
2.4.1	Capacity of public authorities, enterprises, and NGOs in the Programme area to implement measures to advance sustainable business opportunities for blue growth	Qualitative analysis of the state and gaps of capacity	Slightly below medium (2,8)	2014	Medium to good (3,6), focus on more efficient use of human and technical resources		2022 total: 3.1. The value for "More efficient use of human and technical resources" was 2.9.	<p>This clarification refers to all result indicators under Priorities 1, 2 and 3: The result indicators did not refer to the direct Programme beneficiaries but covered the whole population of the target group in the area. Therefore, changes in institutional capacities could only partly be linked to the Programme intervention but were to a great extent dependent on other factors outside the Programme's influence.</p> <p>The last Evaluation for 2014-2020 was carried out in 2022. It presented the final values of the result indicators. The results were already reported in AIR covering 2022.</p> <p>There was progress from the baseline towards the target. The target was not reached.</p>

ID	Indicator	2022 Total	2022 Qualitative	2021 Total	2021 Qualitative	2020 Total	2020 Qualitative	2019 Total	2019 Qualitative
2.4.1	Capacity of public authorities, enterprises, and NGOs in the Programme area to implement measures to advance sustainable business opportunities for blue growth		2022 total: 3.1. The value for "More efficient use of human and technical resources" was 2.9.		The result indicators were not monitored in 2021. Final evaluation results will be reported in 2022.		2.8 - Minor decrease, value at baseline level		

ID	Indicator	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative
2.4.1	Capacity of public authorities, enterprises, and NGOs in the Programme area to implement measures to advance sustainable business opportunities for blue growth		2.9: Slight increase, positive trend towards target value						

ID	Indicator	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
2.4.1	Capacity of public authorities, enterprises, and NGOs in the Programme area to implement measures to advance sustainable business opportunities for blue growth		

Priority axis	3 - Sustainable transport
Investment priority	7b - Enhancing regional mobility by connecting secondary and tertiary nodes to TEN-T infrastructure, including multimodal nodes

Table 2: Common and programme specific output indicators - 3.7b

(1)	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value	2023	Observations
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	248.00	213.00	CO01 = 33 enterprises receiving grants + CO04 The target was not fully achieved.
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	248.00	248.00	CO01 = 15 enterprises receiving grants + CO04
F	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	Enterprises	233.00	185.00	The target was not fully achieved.
S	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	Enterprises	233.00	233.00	
F	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	28.00	28.00	
S	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	28.00	28.00	
F	PSO03	Amount of documented planned investments to be realised with other than the Programme funding	Amount in EUR	380,000.00	110,000.00	The target value has not been reached. A couple of projects did not manage to plan investments as originally anticipated.
S	PSO03	Amount of documented planned investments to be realised with other than the Programme funding	Amount in EUR	380,000.00	380,000.00	
F	PSO04	No. of local/regional public authorities/institutions involved	authorities/institutions	74.00	71.00	
S	PSO04	No. of local/regional public authorities/institutions involved	authorities/institutions	74.00	72.00	
F	PSO05	No. of national public authorities/institutions involved	authorities/institutions	16.00	16.00	
S	PSO05	No. of national public authorities/institutions involved	authorities/institutions	16.00	16.00	

(1)	ID	Indicator	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	218.00	160.00	151.00	78.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	248.00	248.00	248.00	248.00	240.00	203.00	80.00	0.00	0.00
F	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	185.00	134.00	130.00	58.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	233.00	233.00	233.00	233.00	226.00	130.00	73.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	28.00	17.00	12.00	6.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00	26.00	17.00	12.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO03	Amount of documented planned investments to be realised with other than the Programme funding	110,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO03	Amount of documented planned investments to be realised with other than the Programme funding	380,000.00	380,000.00	380,000.00	380,000.00	380,000.00	5,000.00	3,000,000.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO04	No. of local/regional public authorities/institutions involved	67.00	51.00	39.00	24.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO04	No. of local/regional public authorities/institutions involved	72.00	72.00	72.00	74.00	72.00	57.00	45.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO05	No. of national public authorities/institutions involved	16.00	10.00	7.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO05	No. of national public authorities/institutions involved	16.00	16.00	16.00	16.00	14.00	10.00	7.00	0.00	0.00

(1) S=Cumulative value - outputs to be delivered by selected operations [forecast provided by beneficiaries], F=Cumulative value - outputs delivered by operations [actual achievement]

Priority axis	3 - Sustainable transport
Investment priority	7b - Enhancing regional mobility by connecting secondary and tertiary nodes to TEN-T infrastructure, including multimodal nodes
Specific objective	3.1 - 'Interoperability of transport modes': To increase interoperability in transporting goods and persons in north-south and east-west connections based on increased capacity of transport actors

Table 1: Result indicators - 3.7b.3.1

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2023 Total	2023 Qualitative	Observations
3.1.1	Capacity of public and private transport actors (public authorities, logistic and transport operators, ports, intergovernmental and research org.) in the Programme area to implement measures increasing interoperability between transport modes and systems	Qualitative analysis of the state and gaps of capacity	Basic to medium (2,3)	2014	Slightly below medium (2,9), focus on improved governance structures and organizational set-up		2022 total: 2.7. The value for "improved governance structures and organisational set-up" was 2.7.	<p>This clarification refers to all result indicators under Priorities 1, 2 and 3: The result indicators did not refer to the direct Programme beneficiaries but covered the whole population of the target group in the area. Therefore, changes in institutional capacities could only partly be linked to the Programme intervention but were to a great extent dependent on other factors outside the Programme's influence.</p> <p>The last Evaluation for 2014-2020 was carried out in 2022. It presented the final values of the result indicators. The results were already reported in AIR covering 2022.</p> <p>Steady progress from the baseline towards the target. The target was not fully reached.</p>

ID	Indicator	2022 Total	2022 Qualitative	2021 Total	2021 Qualitative	2020 Total	2020 Qualitative	2019 Total	2019 Qualitative
3.1.1	Capacity of public and private transport actors (public authorities, logistic and transport operators, ports, intergovernmental and research org.) in the Programme area to implement measures increasing interoperability between transport modes and systems		2022 total: 2.7. The value for "improved governance structures and organisational set-up" was 2.7.		The result indicators were not monitored in 2021. Final evaluation results will be reported in 2022.		2.6 - Minor increase, positive trend towards target value		

ID	Indicator	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative
3.1.1	Capacity of public and private transport actors (public authorities, logistic and transport operators, ports, intergovernmental and research org.) in the Programme area to implement measures increasing interoperability between transport modes and systems		2.5: Slight increase, positive trend towards target value						

ID	Indicator	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
3.1.1	Capacity of public and private transport actors (public authorities, logistic and transport operators, ports, intergovernmental and research org.) in the Programme area to implement measures increasing interoperability between transport modes and systems		

Priority axis	3 - Sustainable transport
Investment priority	7b - Enhancing regional mobility by connecting secondary and tertiary nodes to TEN-T infrastructure, including multimodal nodes
Specific objective	3.2 - 'Accessibility of remote areas and areas affected by demographic change': To improve the accessibility of the most remote areas and regions whose accessibility is affected by demographic change based on increased capacity of transport actors

Table 1: Result indicators - 3.7b.3.2

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2023 Total	2023 Qualitative	Observations
3.2.1	Capacity of public / private transport actors (public authorities, logistic and transport operators) in the Programme area to implement economically efficient solutions to improve the accessibility of remote regions/regions affected by demographic change	Qualitative analysis of the state and gaps of capacity	Slightly below medium (2,8)	2014	Slightly below good (3,8), focus on enhanced institutionalized knowledge and competence		2022 total: 3.2. The value for "Enhanced institutionalised knowledge and competence " was 3.0.	<p>This clarification refers to all result indicators under Priorities 1, 2 and 3: The result indicators did not refer to the direct Programme beneficiaries but covered the whole population of the target group in the area. Therefore, changes in institutional capacities could only partly be linked to the Programme intervention but were to a great extent dependent on other factors outside the Programme's influence.</p> <p>The last Evaluation for 2014-2020 was carried out in 2022. It presented the final values of the result indicators. The results were already reported in AIR covering 2022.</p> <p>There was a progress from the baseline towards the target. The target was not reached.</p>

ID	Indicator	2022 Total	2022 Qualitative	2021 Total	2021 Qualitative	2020 Total	2020 Qualitative	2019 Total	2019 Qualitative
3.2.1	Capacity of public / private transport actors (public authorities, logistic and transport operators) in the Programme area to implement economically efficient solutions to improve the accessibility of remote regions/regions affected by demographic change		2022 total: 3.2. The value for "Enhanced institutionalised knowledge and competence " was 3.0.		The result indicators were not monitored in 2021. Final evaluation results will be reported in 2022.		2.9 - Minor increase, slightly higher than baseline value		

ID	Indicator	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative
3.2.1	Capacity of public / private transport actors (public authorities, logistic and transport operators) in the Programme area to implement economically efficient solutions to improve the accessibility of remote regions/regions affected by demographic change		2.8: Constant. Target is far from reach.						

ID	Indicator	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
3.2.1	Capacity of public / private transport actors (public authorities, logistic and transport operators) in the Programme area to implement economically efficient solutions to improve the accessibility of remote regions/regions affected by demographic change		

Priority axis	3 - Sustainable transport
Investment priority	7c - Developing and improving environmentally-friendly (including low noise) and low-carbon transport systems, including inland waterways and maritime transport, ports, multimodal links and airport infrastructure, in order to promote sustainable regional and local mobility

Table 2: Common and programme specific output indicators - 3.7c

(1)	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value	2023	Observations
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	872.00	1,813.00	CO01 = 70 enterprises receiving grants + CO04 The target has been overachieved. This is a positive outcome.
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	872.00	917.00	CO01 = 50 enterprises receiving grants + CO04 2019: In total lower than 2018 due to a lowered value for project #R105 (-2). There is a slight deviation from the target value set for this indicator. This is a positive outcome.
F	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	Enterprises	867.00	1,743.00	The target has been overachieved. This is a positive outcome.
S	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	Enterprises	867.00	867.00	2019: In total lower than 2018 due to a lowered value for project #R105 (-2)
F	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	40.00	40.00	
S	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	40.00	40.00	
F	PSO03	Amount of documented planned investments to be realised with other than the Programme funding	Amount in EUR	1,300,000.00	2,600,000.00	The target has been overachieved. This is a positive outcome. One project overachieved its targets.
S	PSO03	Amount of documented planned investments to be realised with other than the Programme funding	Amount in EUR	1,300,000.00	1,300,000.00	
F	PSO04	No. of local/regional public authorities/institutions involved	authorities/institutions	76.00	75.00	
S	PSO04	No. of local/regional public authorities/institutions involved	authorities/institutions	76.00	76.00	
F	PSO05	No. of national public authorities/institutions involved	authorities/institutions	47.00	45.00	
S	PSO05	No. of national public authorities/institutions involved	authorities/institutions	47.00	47.00	

(1)	ID	Indicator	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	1,813.00	1,717.00	707.00	707.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	917.00	917.00	917.00	860.00	862.00	796.00	232.00	0.00	0.00
F	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	1,743.00	1,667.00	673.00	673.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO04	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving non-financial support	867.00	867.00	867.00	822.00	824.00	760.00	215.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	40.00	24.00	6.00	6.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	40.00	40.00	39.00	33.00	33.00	22.00	5.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO03	Amount of documented planned investments to be realised with other than the Programme funding	2,600,000.00	2,600,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO03	Amount of documented planned investments to be realised with other than the Programme funding	1,300,000.00	1,300,000.00	1,300,000.00	1,300,000.00	1,300,000.00	1,300,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO04	No. of local/regional public authorities/institutions involved	75.00	51.00	13.00	13.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO04	No. of local/regional public authorities/institutions involved	76.00	76.00	69.00	65.00	66.00	48.00	8.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO05	No. of national public authorities/institutions involved	45.00	23.00	14.00	14.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO05	No. of national public authorities/institutions involved	47.00	47.00	47.00	39.00	38.00	24.00	10.00	0.00	0.00

(1) S=Cumulative value - outputs to be delivered by selected operations [forecast provided by beneficiaries], F=Cumulative value - outputs delivered by operations [actual achievement]

Priority axis	3 - Sustainable transport
Investment priority	7c - Developing and improving environmentally-friendly (including low noise) and low-carbon transport systems, including inland waterways and maritime transport, ports, multimodal links and airport infrastructure, in order to promote sustainable regional and local mobility
Specific objective	3.3 - 'Maritime safety': To increase maritime safety and security based on advanced capacity of maritime actors

Table 1: Result indicators - 3.7c.3.3

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2023 Total	2023 Qualitative	Observations
3.3.1	Capacity of maritime actors (maritime admin., rescue services, authorities, shipping operators, ports, research and intergovernmental org.) in the Programme area to implement measures to increase maritime safety and security	Qualitative analysis of the state and gaps of capacity	Basic to medium (2,5)	2014	Medium to good (3,4), focus on more efficient use of human and technical resources		2022 total: 3.0. The value for "More efficient use of human and technical resources" was 3.1.	<p>This clarification refers to all result indicators under Priorities 1, 2 and 3: The result indicators did not refer to the direct Programme beneficiaries but covered the whole population of the target group in the area. Therefore, changes in institutional capacities could only partly be linked to the Programme intervention but were to a great extent dependent on other factors outside the Programme's influence. The last Evaluation for 2014-2020 was carried out in 2022. It presented the final values of the result indicators. The results were already reported in AIR covering 2022.</p> <p>There was progress from the baseline towards the target. The target was not reached.</p>

ID	Indicator	2022 Total	2022 Qualitative	2021 Total	2021 Qualitative	2020 Total	2020 Qualitative	2019 Total	2019 Qualitative
3.3.1	Capacity of maritime actors (maritime admin., rescue services, authorities, shipping operators, ports, research and intergovernmental org.) in the Programme area to implement measures to increase maritime safety and security		2022 total: 3.0. The value for "More efficient use of human and technical resources" was 3.1.		The result indicators were not monitored in 2021. Final evaluation results will be reported in 2022.		2.7 - Minor decrease, still higher than the baseline		

ID	Indicator	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative
3.3.1	Capacity of maritime actors (maritime admin., rescue services, authorities, shipping operators, ports, research and intergovernmental org.) in the Programme area to implement measures to increase maritime safety and security		2.8: Slight increase, positive trend towards target value						

ID	Indicator	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
3.3.1	Capacity of maritime actors (maritime admin., rescue services, authorities, shipping operators, ports, research and intergovernmental org.) in the Programme area to implement measures to increase maritime safety and security		

Priority axis	3 - Sustainable transport
Investment priority	7c - Developing and improving environmentally-friendly (including low noise) and low-carbon transport systems, including inland waterways and maritime transport, ports, multimodal links and airport infrastructure, in order to promote sustainable regional and local mobility
Specific objective	3.4 - 'Environmentally friendly shipping': To enhance clean shipping based on increased capacity of maritime actors

Table 1: Result indicators - 3.7c.3.4

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2023 Total	2023 Qualitative	Observations
3.4.1	Capacity of maritime actors (maritime admin., rescue services, authorities, shipping operators, ports, research and intergovernmental org.) in the Programme area to implement measures to reduce negative effects of shipping on the marine environment	Qualitative analysis of the state and gaps of capacity	Slightly below medium (2,9)	2014	Medium to good (3,7), focus on better ability to attract new financial resources		2022 total: 3.3. The value for "Better ability to attract new financial resources" was 2.9.	<p>This clarification refers to all result indicators under Priorities 1, 2 and 3: The result indicators did not refer to the direct Programme beneficiaries but covered the whole population of the target group in the area. Therefore, changes in institutional capacities could only partly be linked to the Programme intervention but were to a great extent dependent on other factors outside the Programme's influence. The last Evaluation for 2014-2020 was carried out in 2022. It presented the final values of the result indicators. The results were already reported in AIR covering 2022.</p> <p>There was progress from the baseline towards the target, but the target was not reached.</p>

ID	Indicator	2022 Total	2022 Qualitative	2021 Total	2021 Qualitative	2020 Total	2020 Qualitative	2019 Total	2019 Qualitative
3.4.1	Capacity of maritime actors (maritime admin., rescue services, authorities, shipping operators, ports, research and intergovernmental org.) in the Programme area to implement measures to reduce negative effects of shipping on the marine environment		2022 total: 3.3. The value for "Better ability to attract new financial resources" was 2.9.		The result indicators were not monitored in 2021. Final evaluation results will be reported in 2022.		3.2 - Constant, positive trend towards target value, stable since 2018		

ID	Indicator	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative
3.4.1	Capacity of maritime actors (maritime admin., rescue services, authorities, shipping operators, ports, research and intergovernmental org.) in the Programme area to implement measures to reduce negative effects of shipping on the marine environment		3.2: Slight increase, positive trend towards target value						

ID	Indicator	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
3.4.1	Capacity of maritime actors (maritime admin., rescue services, authorities, shipping operators, ports, research and intergovernmental org.) in the Programme area to implement measures to reduce negative effects of shipping on the marine environment		

Priority axis	3 - Sustainable transport
Investment priority	7c - Developing and improving environmentally-friendly (including low noise) and low-carbon transport systems, including inland waterways and maritime transport, ports, multimodal links and airport infrastructure, in order to promote sustainable regional and local mobility
Specific objective	3.5 - 'Environmentally friendly urban mobility': To enhance environmentally friendly transport systems in urban areas based on increased capacity of urban transport actors

Table 1: Result indicators - 3.7c.3.5

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2023 Total	2023 Qualitative	Observations
3.5.1	Capacity of urban transport actors (public authorities, ports, infrastructure providers and operators) in the Programme area to implement environmentally friendly transport solutions in urban areas	Qualitative analysis of the state and gaps of capacity	Basic to medium (2,7)	2014	Medium to good (3,5), focus on increased capability to work in transnational environment		2022 total: 3.1. The value for "Increased capability to work in transnational environment" was 2.8.	<p>This clarification refers to all result indicators under Priorities 1, 2 and 3: The result indicators did not refer to the direct Programme beneficiaries but covered the whole population of the target group in the area. Therefore, changes in institutional capacities could only partly be linked to the Programme intervention but were to a great extent dependent on other factors outside the Programme's influence. The last Evaluation for 2014-2020 was carried out in 2022. It presented the final values of the result indicators. The results were already reported in AIR covering 2022.</p> <p>There was progress compared to the baseline towards the target, but the target was not reached.</p>

ID	Indicator	2022 Total	2022 Qualitative	2021 Total	2021 Qualitative	2020 Total	2020 Qualitative	2019 Total	2019 Qualitative
3.5.1	Capacity of urban transport actors (public authorities, ports, infrastructure providers and operators) in the Programme area to implement environmentally friendly transport solutions in urban areas		2022 total: 3.1. The value for "Increased capability to work in transnational environment" was 2.8.		The result indicators were not monitored in 2021. Final evaluation results will be reported in 2022.		3.2 - Minor decrease, still higher than the baseline		

ID	Indicator	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative
3.5.1	Capacity of urban transport actors (public authorities, ports, infrastructure providers and operators) in the Programme area to implement environmentally friendly transport solutions in urban areas		3.2: Sizeable increase, positive trend, target is in reach.						

ID	Indicator	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
3.5.1	Capacity of urban transport actors (public authorities, ports, infrastructure providers and operators) in the Programme area to implement environmentally friendly transport solutions in urban areas		

Priority axis	4 - Institutional capacity for macro-regional cooperation
Investment priority	11c - Developing and coordinating macro-regional and sea-basin strategies (ETC-TN)

Table 2: Common and programme specific output indicators - 4.11c

(1)	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value	2023	Observations
F	PSO06	No of project plans for a main project including information on possible financial sources	project plans	62.00	60.00	Deviation due to two projects that did not submit a project plan.
S	PSO06	No of project plans for a main project including information on possible financial sources	project plans	62.00	62.00	
F	PSO07	No of project plans contributing to joint priorities with the partner countries	project plans	42.00	42.00	
S	PSO07	No of project plans contributing to joint priorities with the partner countries	project plans	42.00	42.00	
F	PSO08	No of transnational meetings held to facilitate implementation of the EUSBSR targets	meetings	499.00	484.00	
S	PSO08	No of transnational meetings held to facilitate implementation of the EUSBSR targets	meetings	499.00	446.00	
F	PSO09	No of transnational meetings held to facilitate joint work on common priorities with the partner countries	meetings	110.00	98.00	The target value was not fully achieved. Most likely, because of COVID restrictions, projects had fewer meetings than planned.
S	PSO09	No of transnational meetings held to facilitate joint work on common priorities with the partner countries	meetings	110.00	111.00	
F	PSO10	No of strategic policy documents supporting the implementation of the EUSBSR targets and/or common priorities with the partner countries	documents	55.00	64.00	There is a slight deviation from the target value set for this indicator. This is a positive outcome.
S	PSO10	No of strategic policy documents supporting the implementation of the EUSBSR targets and/or common priorities with the partner countries	documents	55.00	58.00	
F	PSO11	No of support measures provided to the EUSBSR	measures	90.00	109.00	There is a slight deviation from the target value set for this indicator. This is a positive outcome.
S	PSO11	No of support measures provided to the EUSBSR	measures	90.00	93.00	

(1)	ID	Indicator	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014
F	PSO06	No of project plans for a main project including information on possible financial sources	59.00	24.00	23.00	23.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO06	No of project plans for a main project including information on possible financial sources	62.00	62.00	58.00	25.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO07	No of project plans contributing to joint priorities with the partner countries	41.00	14.00	13.00	13.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO07	No of project plans contributing to joint priorities with the partner countries	38.00	38.00	38.00	12.00	12.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
F	PSO08	No of transnational meetings held to facilitate implementation of the EUSBSR targets	399.00	390.00	214.00	223.00	195.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO08	No of transnational meetings held to facilitate implementation of the EUSBSR targets	445.00	445.00	444.00	426.00	377.00	235.00	228.00	64.00	0.00
F	PSO09	No of transnational meetings held to facilitate joint work on common priorities with the partner countries	82.00	82.00	55.00	61.00	58.00	26.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO09	No of transnational meetings held to facilitate joint work on common priorities with the partner countries	111.00	111.00	111.00	109.00	109.00	76.00	70.00	25.00	0.00
F	PSO10	No of strategic policy documents supporting the implementation of the EUSBSR targets and/or common priorities with the partner countries	52.00	51.00	29.00	32.00	32.00	16.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO10	No of strategic policy documents supporting the implementation of the EUSBSR targets and/or common priorities with the partner countries	56.00	56.00	55.00	50.00	49.00	32.00	30.00	10.00	0.00
F	PSO11	No of support measures provided to the EUSBSR	104.00	104.00	56.00	69.00	59.00	29.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	PSO11	No of support measures provided to the EUSBSR	93.00	93.00	93.00	80.00	75.00	59.00	52.00	16.00	0.00

(1) S=Cumulative value - outputs to be delivered by selected operations [forecast provided by beneficiaries], F=Cumulative value - outputs delivered by operations [actual achievement]

Priority axis	4 - Institutional capacity for macro-regional cooperation
Investment priority	11c - Developing and coordinating macro-regional and sea-basin strategies (ETC-TN)
Specific objective	4.1 - 'Seed Money': To increase capacity for transnational cooperation implementing the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region and working on common policies with the partner countries

Table 1: Result indicators - 4.11c.4.1

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2023 Total	2023 Qualitative	Observations
4.1.1	Amount of funding for projects implementing the EUSBSR resulting from seed money projects	Million Euro	0.00	2014	108.00	87.22		The target value was not fully reached.
4.1.2	Number of organisations from the partner countries working on joint projects resulting from seed money projects	Number of organisations	0.00	2014	9.00	12.00		Only Norwegian partners counted. Partners from Russia and Belarus are not included.

ID	Indicator	2022 Total	2022 Qualitative	2021 Total	2021 Qualitative	2020 Total	2020 Qualitative	2019 Total	2019 Qualitative
4.1.1	Amount of funding for projects implementing the EUSBSR resulting from seed money projects	74.83		10.29		10.29		9.40	
4.1.2	Number of organisations from the partner countries working on joint projects resulting from seed money projects	12.00		17.00		17.00		17.00	

ID	Indicator	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative
4.1.1	Amount of funding for projects implementing the EUSBSR resulting from seed money projects	9.40							
4.1.2	Number of organisations from the partner countries working on joint projects resulting from seed money projects	17.00							

ID	Indicator	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
4.1.1	Amount of funding for projects implementing the EUSBSR resulting from seed money projects		
4.1.2	Number of organisations from the partner countries working on joint projects resulting from seed money projects		

Priority axis	4 - Institutional capacity for macro-regional cooperation
Investment priority	11c - Developing and coordinating macro-regional and sea-basin strategies (ETC-TN)
Specific objective	4.2 - 'Coordination of macro-regional cooperation': To increase capacity of public administrations and pan-Baltic organisations for transnational coordination in implementing the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region and facilitating the implementation of common policies with the partner countries

Table 1: Result indicators - 4.11c.4.2

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2023 Total	2023 Qualitative	Observations
4.2.1	Percentage of EUSBSR priority areas and horizontal actions reaching the identified targets	Number of EUSBSR PA and HA in relation to their total number	0.00	2014	80.00	88.24		The majority of PACs/HACs had seen good progress in their efforts. Overall, there was a positive development with the majority of PACs/HACs reaching their targets to a high or even full extent. There is a deviation from the target value set for this indicator. This is a positive outcome.
4.2.2	Percentage of EUSBSR priority areas and horizontal actions facilitating the implementation of joint priorities with the partner countries	Number of EUSBSR PA and HA in relation to their total number	50.00	2014	60.00	70.59		There is a deviation from the target value set for this indicator. This is a positive outcome. From the end of February 2022, all activities with partners from Russia were stopped.

ID	Indicator	2022 Total	2022 Qualitative	2021 Total	2021 Qualitative	2020 Total	2020 Qualitative	2019 Total	2019 Qualitative
4.2.1	Percentage of EUSBSR priority areas and horizontal actions reaching the identified targets	88.24		88.24					
4.2.2	Percentage of EUSBSR priority areas and horizontal actions facilitating the implementation of joint priorities with the partner countries	70.59		70.59					

ID	Indicator	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative
4.2.1	Percentage of EUSBSR priority areas and horizontal actions reaching the identified targets	88.00							
4.2.2	Percentage of EUSBSR priority areas and horizontal actions facilitating the implementation of joint priorities with the partner countries	79.00							

ID	Indicator	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
4.2.1	Percentage of EUSBSR priority areas and horizontal actions reaching the identified targets		
4.2.2	Percentage of EUSBSR priority areas and horizontal actions facilitating the implementation of joint priorities with the partner countries		

Priority axes for technical assistance

Priority axis	5 - Technical Assistance
---------------	--------------------------

Table 2: Common and programme specific output indicators - 5.Technical Assistance

(1)	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value	2023	Observations
F	TA01	Number of (potential) applicants advised	Number	891.00	941.00	No new calls for applications funded by 2014-2020 were launched in 2023.
S	TA01	Number of (potential) applicants advised	Number	891.00	0.00	
F	TA02	Number of applications received and assessed	Number	948.00	949.00	No new calls for applications funded by 2014-2020 were launched in 2023.
S	TA02	Number of applications received and assessed	Number	948.00	0.00	
F	TA03	Number of reports checked and paid out	Number	803.00	887.00	Reports for Priority 1-3/4.1/4.2 for 2022: +80/+36/+12. Total reports until 2022 : 882 Reports for Priority 1-3/4.1/4.2 for 2023: +2/+0/+3 Total reports for 2023: +5 Cumulative value of 2023: 882.+5=887
S	TA03	Number of reports checked and paid out	Number	803.00	0.00	
F	TA04	Number of news items published on the programme's website	Number	320.00	348.00	No update compared to the previous AIR. Includes also news about the new Programme.
S	TA04	Number of news items published on the programme's website	Number	320.00	0.00	
F	TA05	Number of own events carried out	Number	50.00	51.00	No update compared to the previous AIR. No further events for the 2014-2020 Programme.
S	TA05	Number of own events carried out	Number	50.00	0.00	
F	TA06	Number of participants at programme events	Number	3,000.00	3,840.00	No update compared to the previous AIR.
S	TA06	Number of participants at programme events	Number	3,000.00	0.00	
F	TA07	Number of other events attended by MA/JS staff	Number	523.00	650.00	No update compared to the previous AIR. 63 events were attended either online or physically in 2022. The target is overachieved mainly due to the high number of online events.
S	TA07	Number of other events attended by MA/JS staff	Number	523.00	0.00	
F	TA08	Number of employees (full-time equivalents) whose salaries are co-financed by technical assistance	Number	204.00	267.00	2023 cumulative value: 2022 value+28 There is a slight deviation from the target value set for this indicator. This it is a positive development.
S	TA08	Number of employees (full-time equivalents) whose salaries are co-financed by technical assistance	Number	204.00	0.00	

(1)	ID	Indicator	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014
F	TA01	Number of (potential) applicants advised	941.00	940.00	940.00	860.00	837.00	827.00	551.00	286.00	0.00
S	TA01	Number of (potential) applicants advised	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
F	TA02	Number of applications received and assessed	949.00	948.00	947.00	870.00	842.00	705.00	601.00	373.00	0.00
S	TA02	Number of applications received and assessed	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
F	TA03	Number of reports checked and paid out	882.00	759.00	606.00	409.00	223.00	92.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	TA03	Number of reports checked and paid out	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
F	TA04	Number of news items published on the programme's website	348.00	326.00	287.00	250.00	208.00	176.00	120.00	64.00	18.00
S	TA04	Number of news items published on the programme's website	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
F	TA05	Number of own events carried out	51.00	50.00	45.00	43.00	32.00	20.00	12.00	3.00	2.00
S	TA05	Number of own events carried out	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
F	TA06	Number of participants at programme events	3,840.00	3,540.00	2,569.00	2,424.00	1,630.00	1,079.00	633.00	241.00	163.00
S	TA06	Number of participants at programme events	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
F	TA07	Number of other events attended by MA/JS staff	650.00	587.00	461.00	368.00	270.00	194.00	133.00	60.00	13.00
S	TA07	Number of other events attended by MA/JS staff	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
F	TA08	Number of employees (full-time equivalents) whose salaries are co-financed by technical assistance	239.00	206.00	177.00	146.00	115.00	85.00	57.00	30.00	28.00
S	TA08	Number of employees (full-time equivalents) whose salaries are co-financed by technical assistance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Priority axis	5 - Technical Assistance
Specific objective	5.1 - 'Technical Assistance': To provide sufficient financing to ensure a professional and efficient programme management

Table 1: Result indicators - 5.5.1

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2023 Total	2023 Qualitative	Observations
5.1.1	Share of programme funding allocated to projects	Percentage of funds allocated to projects	0.00	2014	100.00	100.00		All funds were allocated to projects.
5.1.2	N+3 targets fulfilled	Number of annual spending targets fulfilled	0.00	2014	7.00	8.00		Due to the overcommitment, the spending exceeded the target.
5.1.3	Visitors on programme's website	Number of unique visitors	0.00	2014	350,000.00	668,608.00		No update compared to the previous AIR 132,504 unique users for 2022, adding upon the 2021 Total value. The estimated total number of visitors on the Programme's website had been growing since 2019, which is a positive outcome for the Programme's visibility.

ID	Indicator	2022 Total	2022 Qualitative	2021 Total	2021 Qualitative	2020 Total	2020 Qualitative	2019 Total	2019 Qualitative
5.1.1	Share of programme funding allocated to projects	100.00		100.00		100.00		100.00	
5.1.2	N+3 targets fulfilled	7.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	
5.1.3	Visitors on programme's website	668,608.00		536,104.00		512,539.00		420,766.00	

ID	Indicator	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative
5.1.1	Share of programme funding allocated to projects	84.30		74.00		38.50		36.90	
5.1.2	N+3 targets fulfilled	1.00		1.00					
5.1.3	Visitors on programme's website	263,440.00		194,908.00		154,905.00		88,234.00	

ID	Indicator	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
5.1.1	Share of programme funding allocated to projects		
5.1.2	N+3 targets fulfilled		
5.1.3	Visitors on programme's website	22,255.00	

3.3 Table 3: Information on the milestones and targets defined in the performance framework

Priority axis	Ind type	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Milestone for 2018 total	Final target (2023) total	2023	Observations
1	F	FI01	Certified Expenditure	Euros	20,591,661.00	102,958,307.00	108,048,909.92	
1	I	KIS01	No. of documented learning experiences of selected operations (forecast provided by beneficiaries)	learning experiences	32	141.00	141.00	
1	O	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	0	141.00	141.00	
2	F	FI01	Certified Expenditure	Euros	20,591,661.00	102,958,307.00	106,968,947.04	
2	I	KIS01	No. of documented learning experiences of selected operations (forecast provided by beneficiaries)	learning experiences	32	101.00	101.00	
2	O	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	0	101.00	101.00	
3	F	FI01	Certified Expenditure	Euros	16,087,235	80,436,178.00	77,825,698.21	
3	I	KIS01	No. of documented learning experiences of selected operations (forecast provided by beneficiaries)	learning experiences	26	68.00	68.00	
3	O	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	0	68.00	68.00	
4	F	FI01	Certified Expenditure	Euros	3,103,890	15,519,446.00	15,460,491.83	
4	O	PSO08	No of transnational meetings held to facilitate implementation of the EUSBSR targets	meetings	30	499.00	484.00	

Priority axis	Ind type	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018
1	F	FI01	Certified Expenditure	Euros	98,004,854.98	87,104,587.09	38,203,732.81	38,203,732.81	18,859,555.54
1	I	KIS01	No. of documented learning experiences of selected operations (forecast provided by beneficiaries)	learning experiences	141.00	141.00	124.00	124.00	114.00
1	O	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	141.00	76.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	F	FI01	Certified Expenditure	Euros	100,417,063.31	91,590,387.59	48,494,486.05	48,494,486.05	27,049,134.29
2	I	KIS01	No. of documented learning experiences of selected operations (forecast provided by beneficiaries)	learning experiences	101.00	101.00	94.00	94.00	82.00
2	O	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	101.00	57.00	4.00	4.00	0.00
3	F	FI01	Certified Expenditure	Euros	71,640,629.04	65,709,712.80	31,358,917.64	31,358,917.64	16,525,490.17
3	I	KIS01	No. of documented learning experiences of selected operations (forecast provided by beneficiaries)	learning experiences	68.00	68.00	61.00	61.00	59.00
3	O	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	68.00	41.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	F	FI01	Certified Expenditure	Euros	13,227,221.74	11,099,893.00	7,505,684.74	7,505,684.74	4,162,928.48
4	O	PSO08	No of transnational meetings held to facilitate implementation of the EUSBSR targets	meetings	399.00	390.00	230.00	230.00	195.00

Priority axis	Ind type	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	2017	2016	2015	2014
1	F	FI01	Certified Expenditure	Euros	5,135,329.49	0.00	0.00	0.00
1	I	KIS01	No. of documented learning experiences of selected operations (forecast provided by beneficiaries)	learning experiences	75.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1	O	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	F	FI01	Certified Expenditure	Euros	6,846,569.51	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	I	KIS01	No. of documented learning experiences of selected operations (forecast provided by beneficiaries)	learning experiences	57.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	O	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	F	FI01	Certified Expenditure	Euros	5,258,131.48	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	I	KIS01	No. of documented learning experiences of selected operations (forecast provided by beneficiaries)	learning experiences	39.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	O	PSO01	No. of documented learning experiences	learning experiences	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Priority axis	Ind type	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	2017	2016	2015	2014
4	F	FI01	Certified Expenditure	Euros	1,289,934.72	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	O	PSO08	No of transnational meetings held to facilitate implementation of the EUSBSR targets	meetings	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3.4. Financial data

Table 4: Financial information at priority axis and programme level

As set out in Table 1 of Annex II to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1011/2014 (Model for transmission of financial data) and table 16 of model for cooperation programmes under the European territorial cooperation goal

Priority axis	Fund	Calculation basis	Total funding	Co-financing rate	Total eligible cost of operations selected for support	Proportion of the total allocation covered with selected operations	Public eligible cost of operations selected for support	Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the managing authority	Proportion of the total allocation covered by eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries	Number of operations selected	Total eligible expenditure incurred by beneficiaries and paid by 31/12/2023 and certified to the Commission
1	ERDF	Total	102,958,307.00	82.00	117,773,249.18	114.39%	114,172,908.78	108,048,909.92	104.94%	58	108,048,909.92
1	ENI	Total	2,880,413.00	85.00	2,321,301.47	80.59%	2,245,746.59	1,506,622.35	52.31%	24	
2	ERDF	Total	102,958,307.00	82.00	115,471,601.02	112.15%	110,860,351.84	106,968,947.04	103.90%	47	106,968,947.04
2	ENI	Total	2,880,413.00	85.00	1,858,293.48	64.51%	1,817,636.57	1,057,824.05	36.72%	21	
3	ERDF	Total	80,436,178.00	82.00	88,123,760.77	109.56%	85,167,293.66	77,825,698.21	96.75%	35	77,825,698.21
3	ENI	Total	2,117,951.00	85.00	191,773.50	9.05%	191,773.50	90,421.15	4.27%	3	
4	ERDF	Total	15,519,446.00	85.00	17,130,716.85	110.38%	17,043,061.76	15,460,491.83	99.62%	105	15,460,491.83
4	ENI	Total	84,718.00	85.00	24,200.00	28.57%	24,200.00	11,000.00	12.98%	6	
5	ERDF	Public	21,106,452.00	75.00	23,838,085.99	112.94%	23,838,085.99	23,838,085.99	112.94%	1	
5	ENI	Public	576,083.00	75.00	413,956.63	71.86%	413,956.63	413,956.63	71.86%	1	
Total	ERDF		322,978,690.00	81.69	362,337,413.81	112.19%	351,081,702.03	332,142,132.99	102.84%	246	308,304,047.00
Total	ENI		8,539,578.00	84.33	4,809,525.08	56.32%	4,693,313.29	3,079,824.18	36.07%	55	
Grand total			331,518,268.00	81.75	367,146,938.89	110.75%	355,775,015.32	335,221,957.17	101.12%	301	308,304,047.00

Where applicable, the use of any contribution from third countries participating in the cooperation programme should be provided (for example IPA and ENI, Norway, Switzerland)

Based on the Financing Agreement concluded between the European Commission, Russia and Germany on the involvement of Russia in the Programme, payments for Russian project partners started in early 2019. The Financing Agreement made available EUR 4.4 million of ENI co-financing as well as EUR 4.4 million of Russian national co-financing for the participation of Russian project partners in the Programme. The ENI payment scheme does not allow any advance payments to projects, instead, it was agreed that advance payments for Russian partners were to be made from Russian national co-financing only. After the unprovoked military aggression of Russia against Ukraine in February 2022, the Financing Agreement was suspended, and all payments to Russian beneficiaries were stopped immediately. In total, Russian beneficiaries reported EUR 7.3 million in expenditure and EUR 0.8 million was spent on Technical Assistance. A part of the reported expenditure was not paid at all by the MA/JS due to the payment stop in February 2022. Payment requests of Russian beneficiaries, which were accepted and fully paid before the payment stop, as well as the expenditure related to the Technical Assistance, were in equal shares co-financed by the ENI funds and by the Russian national funds. As a result, EUR 3.1 million of eligible expenditures were certified and reported to the European Commission. The same amount of expenditure has been co-financed by the Russian national funds. In addition, Russian national funds were used for advance payments to projects.

In addition, Norwegian national funding amounting to EUR 5.3 million was available to finance the participation of Norwegian organisations in Interreg Baltic Sea Region projects and the Norwegian share of the TA budget. By the end of 2023 a total amount of EUR 4.5 million Norwegian funds was paid to projects and TA.

Table 5: Breakdown of the cumulative financial data by category of intervention

As set out in Table 2 of Annex II to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1011/2014 (Model for transmission of financial data) and tables 6-9 of Model for cooperation programmes

Priority axis	Fund	Intervention field	Form of finance	Territorial dimension	Territorial delivery mechanism	Thematic objective dimension	ESF secondary theme	Economic dimension	Location dimension	Total eligible cost of operations selected for support	Public eligible cost of operations selected for support	The total eligible expenditure declared by eneficiaries to the managing authority	Number of operations selected
1	ERDF	058	01	04	07	01		20	DE600	4,177,013.60	4,140,878.60	3,764,263.48	1
1	ERDF	059	01	04	07	01		20	EE001	2,746,724.40	2,714,848.27	2,644,314.55	1
1	ERDF	060	01	04	07	01		07	DK050	3,160,804.89	3,019,633.16	3,061,571.81	2
1	ERDF	060	01	04	07	01		09	FI1D6	3,884,306.14	3,668,242.37	3,445,734.87	2
1	ERDF	060	01	04	07	01		20	DE600	3,620,242.40	3,526,562.14	3,094,186.34	1
1	ERDF	060	01	04	07	01		24	DE600	1,981,448.40	1,944,732.14	1,883,444.44	1
1	ERDF	062	01	04	07	01		06	EE008	1,777,200.00	1,741,620.00	1,761,637.15	1
1	ERDF	062	01	04	07	01		07	PL418	2,211,666.00	2,211,666.00	1,893,756.95	1
1	ERDF	062	01	04	07	01		24	PL415	2,027,000.00	2,027,000.00	1,946,134.19	1
1	ERDF	063	01	04	07	01		01	FI193	2,597,651.56	2,524,815.56	2,413,719.52	2
1	ERDF	063	01	04	07	01		22	FI1C1	2,362,704.17	2,362,704.17	2,209,467.27	1
1	ERDF	063	01	04	07	01		22	SE232	1,966,685.50	1,791,530.50	1,818,619.69	1
1	ERDF	063	01	04	07	01		24	DK022	1,768,500.00	1,768,500.00	1,434,833.20	1
1	ERDF	063	01	04	07	01		24	SE312	2,290,596.80	2,172,944.12	2,084,720.97	1
1	ERDF	064	01	04	07	01		03	EE001	2,055,268.35	1,946,417.37	2,003,844.76	1
1	ERDF	064	01	04	07	01		24	FI1C2	2,125,316.50	2,081,630.50	2,064,549.51	1
1	ERDF	064	01	04	07	01		24	PL518	1,616,429.60	1,616,429.60	1,183,008.88	1
1	ERDF	065	01	04	07	01		22	FI195	2,266,645.00	2,230,189.00	2,129,185.21	1
1	ERDF	065	01	04	07	01		22	FI1B1	2,313,180.00	2,244,723.75	1,814,821.54	1
1	ERDF	066	01	04	07	01		04	FI1D5	2,458,870.00	2,386,148.75	2,207,419.43	1
1	ERDF	066	01	04	07	01		17	DK042	2,105,850.00	2,013,905.00	1,906,027.44	1
1	ERDF	067	01	04	07	01		17	DE600	2,715,020.00	2,622,959.39	2,659,546.50	2
1	ERDF	067	01	04	07	01		24	DE803	3,846,761.42	3,818,301.01	3,493,854.76	2
1	ERDF	067	01	04	07	01		24	FI197	2,749,979.69	2,749,979.69	2,090,734.38	1
1	ERDF	069	01	04	07	01		01	FI1D6	1,793,224.00	1,777,554.61	1,689,055.98	1
1	ERDF	069	01	04	07	01		03	FI194	1,857,838.25	1,735,879.25	1,678,545.84	1
1	ERDF	069	01	04	07	01		03	LV009	1,520,013.00	1,477,516.50	1,475,960.57	1
1	ERDF	069	01	04	07	01		22	DEE01	2,702,018.96	2,481,576.38	2,556,319.67	2
1	ERDF	071	01	04	07	01		22	DK050	2,368,032.00	2,359,312.50	2,287,325.48	1
1	ERDF	073	01	04	07	01		21	DEF0B	5,878,733.76	5,567,852.56	5,315,207.55	2
1	ERDF	077	01	04	07	01		23	DE212	2,849,797.09	2,802,847.27	2,710,238.22	1
1	ERDF	077	01	04	07	01		23	DE300	4,268,572.91	4,089,398.16	4,031,163.67	2
1	ERDF	077	01	04	07	01		23	EE001	2,613,350.00	2,517,740.00	2,357,481.67	1
1	ERDF	082	01	04	07	01		13	EE001	4,222,028.88	3,873,431.32	3,938,700.43	2
1	ERDF	082	01	04	07	01		13	LT00A	2,121,050.00	2,089,767.50	2,071,829.10	1
1	ERDF	082	01	04	07	01		20	DEF01	2,705,984.62	2,651,504.80	2,313,079.95	1
1	ERDF	082	01	04	07	01		24	PL127	2,410,504.12	2,154,115.37	2,397,198.62	1
1	ERDF	106	01	04	07	01		24	EE001	1,885,215.00	1,771,190.00	1,727,199.42	1
1	ERDF	119	01	04	07	01		18	FI195	1,881,346.62	1,881,346.62	1,832,690.27	2
1	ERDF	119	01	04	07	01		18	SE331	1,000,000.00	973,474.37	939,126.50	1
1	ERDF	119	01	04	07	01		19	DE600	3,947,025.00	3,947,025.00	3,354,854.03	2
1	ERDF	119	01	04	07	01		20	FI1C1	2,361,307.85	2,361,307.85	2,252,006.09	1
1	ERDF	119	01	04	07	01		21	DE803	1,898,640.20	1,829,687.70	1,794,121.59	1
1	ERDF	119	01	04	07	01		21	DK011	2,256,030.00	2,202,305.00	2,247,175.34	1
1	ERDF	119	01	04	07	01		22	DEF02	1,856,045.00	1,856,045.00	1,689,011.83	1
1	ERDF	119	01	04	07	01		24	PL343	2,550,627.50	2,445,669.93	2,381,221.26	2
1	ENI	060	01	04	07	01		09	FI1D6	136,230.20	130,980.20	99,622.10	2
1	ENI	060	01	04	07	01		24	DE600	69,616.33	69,616.33	24,256.68	1
1	ENI	062	01	04	07	01		24	PL415	60,000.00	60,000.00	27,144.95	1
1	ENI	063	01	04	07	01		22	FI1C1	252,542.50	252,542.50	250,652.76	1
1	ENI	063	01	04	07	01		22	SE232	135,013.13	123,911.16	117,555.49	1
1	ENI	063	01	04	07	01		24	DK022	200,000.00	181,250.00	92,152.61	1

Priority axis	Fund	Intervention field	Form of finance	Territorial dimension	Territorial delivery mechanism	Thematic objective dimension	ESF secondary theme	Economic dimension	Location dimension	Total eligible cost of operations selected for support	Public eligible cost of operations selected for support	The total eligible expenditure declared by eneficiaries to the managing authority	Number of operations selected
1	ENI	063	01	04	07	01		24	SE312	92,388.50	78,530.22	68,500.56	1
1	ENI	064	01	04	07	01		03	EE001	53,223.00	53,223.00	38,406.68	1
1	ENI	064	01	04	07	01		24	FI1C2	138,206.25	138,206.25	59,098.01	1
1	ENI	065	01	04	07	01		22	FI1B1	54,569.80	54,569.80	38,638.72	1
1	ENI	067	01	04	07	01		17	DE600	129,050.00	117,492.50	102,099.57	2
1	ENI	069	01	04	07	01		03	FI194	104,375.00	104,375.00	57,180.58	1
1	ENI	069	01	04	07	01		22	DEE01	49,875.00	42,393.75	48,454.88	1
1	ENI	071	01	04	07	01		22	DK050	52,794.00	52,794.00	52,451.22	1
1	ENI	073	01	04	07	01		21	DEF0B	47,486.00	47,486.00	31,745.39	1
1	ENI	077	01	04	07	01		23	DE212	115,000.00	115,000.00	60,999.97	1
1	ENI	082	01	04	07	01		13	EE001	15,000.00	15,000.00	0.00	1
1	ENI	119	01	04	07	01		18	SE331	106,031.75	106,031.75	37,314.34	1
1	ENI	119	01	04	07	01		19	DE600	76,500.00	76,500.00	17,946.84	1
1	ENI	119	01	04	07	01		20	FI1C1	86,600.00	86,600.00	76,003.37	1
1	ENI	119	01	04	07	01		21	DE803	272,772.50	265,216.62	190,355.27	1
1	ENI	119	01	04	07	01		21	DK011	74,027.51	74,027.51	16,042.36	1
2	ERDF	011	01	04	07	06		01	SE331	2,550,100.15	2,489,687.46	2,152,150.15	1
2	ERDF	011	01	04	07	06		10	LT002	2,314,980.52	2,272,752.52	2,151,389.61	1
2	ERDF	012	01	04	07	06		10	DE300	3,948,961.29	3,718,229.61	3,679,047.88	1
2	ERDF	012	01	04	07	06		10	DE804	2,712,342.75	2,693,492.90	2,472,938.03	1
2	ERDF	012	01	04	07	06		10	DEF02	3,835,523.80	3,645,355.67	3,588,577.97	2
2	ERDF	013	01	04	07	06		10	DE600	5,846,735.47	5,846,735.47	5,284,062.95	3
2	ERDF	013	01	04	07	06		10	PL633	4,229,383.65	3,926,876.93	3,915,313.41	2
2	ERDF	014	01	04	07	06		10	DE502	3,480,996.48	3,402,294.98	3,246,126.24	1
2	ERDF	014	01	04	07	06		10	EE008	930,313.00	890,533.74	775,616.42	1
2	ERDF	019	01	04	07	06		11	FI1B1	3,284,027.21	3,002,869.43	2,952,942.74	1
2	ERDF	019	01	04	07	06		22	PL633	5,298,610.93	5,267,264.38	5,101,549.86	2
2	ERDF	021	01	04	07	06		01	SE232	3,885,280.00	3,771,545.11	3,379,577.48	2
2	ERDF	021	01	04	07	06		11	DE803	2,495,184.45	2,366,717.57	2,437,074.09	1
2	ERDF	021	01	04	07	06		22	DE801	1,448,032.32	1,354,609.04	1,386,246.30	1
2	ERDF	022	01	04	07	06		11	DK021	820,831.00	774,526.00	726,407.69	1
2	ERDF	022	01	04	07	06		11	FI1B1	3,726,448.36	3,689,621.11	3,658,688.52	1
2	ERDF	022	01	04	07	06		11	FI1C1	994,730.59	994,730.59	968,172.16	1
2	ERDF	022	01	04	07	06		11	FI1C2	3,027,536.10	2,975,488.45	2,914,772.15	1
2	ERDF	062	01	04	07	06		02	SE123	4,651,205.44	4,386,372.86	4,200,057.56	1
2	ERDF	062	01	04	07	06		24	DEF02	3,920,429.55	3,491,566.08	3,586,278.15	2
2	ERDF	065	01	04	07	06		10	DK032	3,099,982.26	2,947,456.66	3,031,993.32	1
2	ERDF	069	01	04	07	06		01	SE121	5,096,104.01	4,571,656.23	4,597,429.11	1
2	ERDF	084	01	04	07	06		11	FI1B1	2,456,238.43	2,407,613.97	2,189,160.19	1
2	ERDF	084	01	04	07	06		11	SE224	2,628,904.80	2,609,926.05	2,459,847.63	1
2	ERDF	087	01	04	07	06		11	EE001	3,018,360.25	3,006,452.75	2,737,142.15	1
2	ERDF	091	01	04	07	06		02	SE110	3,151,779.61	3,061,587.97	3,085,718.83	1
2	ERDF	094	01	04	07	06		23	DEF0C	2,322,372.80	2,296,665.30	2,139,554.81	1
2	ERDF	119	01	04	07	06		02	SE110	1,966,057.80	1,925,820.30	1,850,764.10	1
2	ERDF	119	01	04	07	06		10	SE312	2,432,258.00	2,394,458.00	2,363,869.33	1
2	ERDF	119	01	04	07	06		11	FI1B1	2,987,530.07	2,915,016.13	2,929,030.72	2
2	ERDF	119	01	04	07	06		11	FI1C1	4,622,034.70	4,445,027.48	4,522,767.06	1
2	ERDF	119	01	04	07	06		11	SE121	2,706,517.02	2,555,760.80	2,458,583.94	1
2	ERDF	119	01	04	07	06		12	DE600	3,226,670.32	3,201,682.36	2,942,276.71	1
2	ERDF	119	01	04	07	06		18	LV006	909,950.00	872,950.00	813,302.92	1
2	ERDF	119	01	04	07	06		22	LV006	3,131,811.97	2,915,442.30	2,795,986.87	2
2	ERDF	119	01	04	07	06		22	SE110	3,541,797.08	3,331,940.90	3,325,803.85	1
2	ERDF	119	01	04	07	06		22	SE224	3,772,348.00	3,512,201.00	3,222,272.66	1
2	ERDF	119	01	04	07	06		24	FI1B1	999,230.84	927,423.74	926,453.48	1
2	ENI	011	01	04	07	06		10	LT002	54,693.75	54,693.75	34,886.94	1
2	ENI	013	01	04	07	06		10	DE600	324,618.80	324,618.80	97,221.20	3
2	ENI	013	01	04	07	06		10	PL633	120,863.50	102,733.97	89,371.66	2
2	ENI	014	01	04	07	06		10	DE502	60,580.00	60,580.00	51,438.89	1
2	ENI	014	01	04	07	06		10	EE008	58,095.00	58,095.00	41,354.12	1
2	ENI	019	01	04	07	06		11	FI1B1	59,167.31	59,167.31	44,051.82	1

Priority axis	Fund	Intervention field	Form of finance	Territorial dimension	Territorial delivery mechanism	Thematic objective dimension	ESF secondary theme	Economic dimension	Location dimension	Total eligible cost of operations selected for support	Public eligible cost of operations selected for support	The total eligible expenditure declared by eneficiaries to the managing authority	Number of operations selected
2	ENI	021	01	04	07	06		01	SE232	62,405.00	57,530.00	28,688.02	1
2	ENI	021	01	04	07	06		11	DE803	44,998.21	44,998.21	28,934.52	1
2	ENI	021	01	04	07	06		22	DE801	134,025.00	134,025.00	41,951.34	1
2	ENI	022	01	04	07	06		11	FI1C1	69,354.89	69,354.89	47,818.18	1
2	ENI	084	01	04	07	06		11	FI1B1	214,438.88	214,438.88	108,934.08	1
2	ENI	084	01	04	07	06		11	SE224	51,905.00	51,905.00	24,129.30	1
2	ENI	094	01	04	07	06		23	DEF0C	149,712.50	149,712.50	149,712.52	1
2	ENI	119	01	04	07	06		02	SE110	27,600.00	23,460.00	9,319.72	1
2	ENI	119	01	04	07	06		11	SE121	219,494.26	219,494.26	107,448.37	1
2	ENI	119	01	04	07	06		18	LV006	89,661.25	82,909.56	48,034.23	1
2	ENI	119	01	04	07	06		22	LV006	89,880.13	83,119.44	89,879.89	1
2	ENI	119	01	04	07	06		24	FI1B1	26,800.00	26,800.00	14,649.25	1
3	ERDF	026	01	04	07	07		12	FI1B1	3,306,682.06	3,291,844.98	2,900,584.17	1
3	ERDF	036	01	04	07	07		12	DE404	3,219,063.00	3,134,656.75	2,875,187.30	1
3	ERDF	036	01	04	07	07		12	DE600	3,392,219.58	3,179,959.03	3,229,936.54	1
3	ERDF	036	01	04	07	07		12	FI1B1	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00	964,312.54	1
3	ERDF	036	01	04	07	07		12	SE221	3,583,361.00	3,557,186.00	3,359,823.45	1
3	ERDF	040	01	04	07	07		12	FI1C1	4,183,648.50	3,896,961.00	3,862,999.72	1
3	ERDF	040	01	04	07	07		22	DE600	2,457,550.00	2,335,355.00	2,016,951.99	1
3	ERDF	042	01	04	07	07		12	DE600	5,414,202.00	5,268,645.50	4,993,883.29	2
3	ERDF	043	01	04	07	07		12	DE600	3,137,781.49	3,042,225.49	2,936,232.02	1
3	ERDF	043	01	04	07	07		12	DE803	3,703,695.00	3,632,518.75	3,518,667.32	1
3	ERDF	043	01	04	07	07		12	FI1B1	1,957,971.00	1,937,196.00	1,917,784.15	1
3	ERDF	043	01	04	07	07		12	SE212	833,260.30	808,913.79	753,533.10	1
3	ERDF	043	01	04	07	07		18	DE600	1,954,854.98	1,920,941.48	1,849,650.38	1
3	ERDF	044	01	04	07	07		12	DE803	4,960,899.00	4,679,958.30	1,981,456.21	1
3	ERDF	044	01	04	07	07		12	DE80B	3,688,887.50	3,445,117.50	3,204,382.07	2
3	ERDF	044	01	04	07	07		12	EE001	1,697,332.00	1,697,332.00	1,387,452.62	1
3	ERDF	044	01	04	07	07		12	FI1B1	3,666,577.00	3,636,061.37	3,222,001.07	2
3	ERDF	044	01	04	07	07		12	FI1C1	4,859,438.34	4,404,881.08	4,232,159.80	2
3	ERDF	044	01	04	07	07		12	LT003	2,871,999.04	2,620,565.85	2,605,008.23	1
3	ERDF	083	01	04	07	07		12	FI1C1	2,883,325.25	2,804,497.25	2,728,780.53	1
3	ERDF	088	01	04	07	07		12	SE123	3,540,283.65	3,540,283.65	3,042,132.65	1
3	ERDF	088	01	04	07	07		18	FI1C1	2,071,000.75	2,002,725.75	1,796,434.44	1
3	ERDF	088	01	04	07	07		24	SE221	2,266,914.98	2,204,406.14	2,196,949.62	1
3	ERDF	119	01	04	07	07		12	DE600	3,591,116.40	3,427,737.93	3,439,851.18	1
3	ERDF	119	01	04	07	07		12	DE804	1,947,104.90	1,947,104.90	1,850,206.46	1
3	ERDF	119	01	04	07	07		12	DEF0B	3,559,884.65	3,475,428.40	3,192,473.49	1
3	ERDF	119	01	04	07	07		12	FI1C1	3,403,904.50	3,376,730.30	3,041,346.97	2
3	ERDF	119	01	04	07	07		18	FI1C1	988,607.59	988,607.59	935,516.58	1
3	ERDF	119	01	04	07	07		22	FI1C4	3,982,196.31	3,909,451.88	3,790,000.32	2
3	ENI	043	01	04	07	07		12	DE803	50,000.00	50,000.00	19,079.86	1
3	ENI	119	01	04	07	07		12	DE804	91,023.50	91,023.50	35,978.65	1
3	ENI	119	01	04	07	07		12	FI1C1	50,750.00	50,750.00	35,362.64	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		01	FI1B1	50,000.00	47,525.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		03	DE802	50,000.00	47,600.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		05	DK032	50,000.00	50,000.00	4,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		07	EE008	100,000.00	97,450.00	100,000.00	2
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		07	FI1D4	34,000.00	34,000.00	34,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		07	LT003	50,000.00	46,865.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		07	LT009	50,000.00	45,800.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		10	DE801	50,000.00	46,550.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		10	EE001	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		10	SE232	50,000.00	46,175.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		11	DE803	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		11	EE008	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		11	LV006	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		11	PL621	47,000.00	47,000.00	47,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		11	PL634	50,000.00	48,725.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		11	SE110	100,000.00	98,125.00	100,000.00	2

Priority axis	Fund	Intervention field	Form of finance	Territorial dimension	Territorial delivery mechanism	Thematic objective dimension	ESF secondary theme	Economic dimension	Location dimension	Total eligible cost of operations selected for support	Public eligible cost of operations selected for support	The total eligible expenditure declared by eneficiaries to the managing authority	Number of operations selected
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		12	DE600	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		12	EE001	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		12	FI1C1	100,000.00	98,410.00	100,000.00	2
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		12	FI1C3	50,000.00	48,800.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		18	DE300	300,000.00	300,000.00	256,387.54	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		18	DEF02	657,017.09	657,017.09	468,002.71	3
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		18	DK011	1,703,925.21	1,703,925.21	1,444,219.77	5
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		18	DK022	608,550.00	608,550.00	556,875.59	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		18	EE001	300,000.00	300,000.00	289,256.85	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		18	EE008	50,000.00	44,656.25	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		18	FI197	386,641.00	386,641.00	356,494.07	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		18	FI1B1	465,294.00	465,294.00	307,868.80	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		18	FI1C1	1,893,952.45	1,889,412.36	1,786,590.81	6
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		18	FI1C5	300,000.00	300,000.00	224,876.50	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		18	LT002	299,350.00	299,350.00	271,390.14	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		18	LV006	1,953,304.73	1,949,209.73	1,662,473.78	8
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		18	PL633	250,000.00	250,000.00	248,254.75	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		18	SE110	5,186,348.37	5,186,348.37	4,807,466.52	17
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		19	FI1C4	50,000.00	45,725.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		19	LV008	50,000.00	47,675.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		20	DE300	50,000.00	47,450.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		20	DK011	35,600.00	35,600.00	35,600.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		20	FI1B1	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		20	FI1C1	146,500.00	144,100.00	146,500.00	3
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		20	SE232	38,334.00	38,334.00	38,334.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		21	FI196	50,000.00	46,250.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		21	SE232	50,000.00	48,275.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		22	DE600	100,000.00	100,000.00	100,000.00	2
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		22	DE801	50,000.00	44,414.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		22	DEF0B	50,000.00	48,500.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		22	DK011	50,000.00	47,750.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		22	EE001	100,000.00	97,150.00	100,000.00	2
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		22	FI1B1	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		22	FI1C1	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		22	FI1C3	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		22	SE121	48,000.00	43,500.00	48,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		22	SE123	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		23	DE802	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		23	DEF03	40,600.00	38,395.00	40,600.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		23	FI1B1	50,000.00	49,250.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		23	PL613	50,000.00	45,200.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		24	DE803	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		24	DE805	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		24	DEF02	50,000.00	48,014.75	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		24	FI196	50,000.00	49,250.00	50,000.00	1
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		24	LT00A	91,000.00	89,500.00	91,000.00	2
4	ERDF	119	01	04	07	11		24	SE331	45,300.00	45,300.00	45,300.00	1
4	ENI	119	01	04	07	11		07	FI1D4	8,000.00	8,000.00	8,000.00	1
4	ENI	119	01	04	07	11		11	PL621	1,500.00	1,500.00	0.00	1
4	ENI	119	01	04	07	11		20	DK011	6,000.00	6,000.00	0.00	1
4	ENI	119	01	04	07	11		22	SE121	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00	1
4	ENI	119	01	04	07	11		23	DEF03	4,700.00	4,700.00	0.00	1
4	ENI	119	01	04	07	11		24	LT00A	3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	1
5	ERDF	121	01	04	07			24	DEF02	23,838,085.99	23,838,085.99	23,838,085.99	1
5	ENI	121	01	04	07			24	DEF02	413,956.63	413,956.63	413,956.63	1

Table 6: Cumulative cost of all or part of an operation implemented outside the Union part of the programme area

1. Operation (2)	2. The amount of ERDF support(1) envisaged to be used for all or part of an operation implemented outside the Union part of the programme area based on selected operations	3. Share of the total financial allocation to all or part of an operation located outside the Union part of the programme area (%) (column 2/total amount allocated to the support from the ERDF at programme level *100)	4. Eligible expenditure of ERDF support incurred in all or part of an operation implemented outside the Union part of the programme area declared by the beneficiary to the managing authority	5. Share of the total financial allocation to all or part of an operation located outside the Union part of the programme area (%) (column 4/total amount allocated to the support from the ERDF at programme level *100)
All or part of an operation outside the Union part of the programme area	6,398,475.28	2.43%	9,673,540.33	3.67%

(1) ERDF support is the Commission decision on the respective cooperation programme.

(2) In accordance with and subject to ceilings set out Article 20 of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013.

4. SYNTHESIS OF THE EVALUATIONS

Evaluations were carried out **according to the Evaluation Plan**. The **specific questions** subject to the evaluations **were refined for each evaluation**.

Operational evaluations were conducted **internally, each year from 2015 to 2021** to assess the management structures at Programme and project level, the financial performance, and the Programme delivery (only in 2020). The MA/JS took the outcomes of these evaluations into account and improved its procedures upon need. No major problems were detected.

Monitoring the result indicators:

The monitoring of the result indicators for Programme priorities 1-3 was **carried out in 2018, 2020 and 2022**. It was based on the views of independent experts from several Programme countries on the different thematic topics that the Programme specific objectives covered. The main objective of the Programme was to strengthen integrated territorial development and cooperation for a more innovative, better accessible, and sustainable Baltic Sea Region. Considering the financial volume, territory covered and specificity of transnational cooperation the Programme's intervention aimed at developing a leverage effect on regional development by investing in the institutional capacities of the Programme's target groups under each specific objective. Thus, the qualitative result indicators in priorities 1-3 depicted changes in the institutional capacity of the target groups defined for each specific objective. **The result indicators did not refer to the direct Programme beneficiaries but covered the whole population of the target group in the area. Therefore, changes in institutional capacities could only partly be linked to the Programme intervention but were to a great extent dependent on other factors outside the Programme's influence.**

In 2018 the result indicators showed an overall positive development of the institutional capacities in the region, but in 2020 half of the SOs showed a decreasing institutional capacity. Although the overall picture of the institutional capacity in 2022 showed positive changes compared to the 2020 results, the pace of the increase was too slow to reach the targeted values set for 2023. The picture was different for different SOs. Four SOs reached more than 50% of the target set to 2023: SO 1.1 (Research and innovation infrastructure), SO 2.1 (Clear waters), SO 3.1 (Interoperability of transport modes) and SO 3.3 (Maritime safety). No progress (0%) in comparison to the 2014 baseline was made in SO 1.3 "Non-technological innovation". The progress of the rest of the SOs (8 out of 12) towards reaching the goal remained within 18-50%. The evaluators concluded that the development of capacities had reached a certain maximum in 2018 and was afterwards hampered by structural and systemic factors. COVID-19 pandemic caused further challenges. The conclusion was that further increase in capacities would not be easy to be achieved with a continuation of existing support mechanisms, i.e. more funding or more projects, but that it would require systemic and structural changes in existing policies.

Impact evaluations

Two **impact evaluations** were conducted during the Programme period: **a mid-term evaluation in 2018 and a final evaluation in 2022**. Both impact evaluations were theory-based testing the Programme Theory of Change. The methods and tools for data collection included: a document review, analysis of data from the projects' online reporting system, surveys, questionnaires, in-depth interviews and case studies. The various stakeholders of the Programme were addressed, including beneficiaries (lead partners and project partners), the members of the Monitoring Committee, stakeholders of the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region and MA/JS staff members. The two impact evaluations were conceived as complementary.

In addition to the impact of Programme specific objectives, the mid-term evaluation included an evaluation of the involvement of different types of partners, the Programme contribution and support to the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region, the communication strategy and the performance of the MA/JS. The overall result of the evaluation was that the Programme worked very well and that the implementation was well on track. This was mainly thanks to the efficiently organised management structure and the high-performing MA/JS. There was a high level of awareness about the Programme at the project, country and expert level and a valuable outreach via different means. In future measurable communication indicators, better use of external experts and even more targeted communication was seen useful. The evaluation concluded that there was a substantial influence of the Programme on the maintenance and ongoing development of EUSBSR governance structures. More commitment of the Member States to the EUSBSR was seen needed to avoid too strong dependency on Programme funding.

Lessons learned and recommendations from the mid-term evaluation were followed up in the final evaluation. Through the final evaluation, a better understanding of the mechanisms of institutional capacity building, in particular, the role of pilot actions was aimed at. In addition, the influence of the type of territory for the projects, the impact of project platforms and the shift to online cooperation were evaluated.

Institutional capacity building: The majority of the beneficiaries taking part in the evaluation surveys acknowledged that the projects increased their institutional capacity, by generating institutionalised knowledge and competence, increasing their capacity to work in a transnational environment, improving efficiency of using human and technical resources and improving governance structures and organisational set-up. To a lesser extent, the projects also increased the beneficiaries' ability to attract new financial resources. Pilot actions and networking activities were mentioned as the most successful activities in supporting the learning process to develop institutional capacities.

Impact of type of territory: Project partners perceived the involvement of organisations from economically weaker rural areas in projects as more difficult than it was for organisations from stronger, urban areas. Weaker administrative capacity and experience on project topics as well as limited networks were seen as hindrances to engaging partners from rural areas. The projects that successfully included partners from rural areas implemented pilot activities addressing specific needs and challenges on the local level (e.g. mobility and public services).

Project platforms: The project platforms were a new type of project in the 2014–2020 Programme to capitalise on the results and products of existing projects beyond Interreg Baltic Sea Region. According to the evaluators, the main added value in bringing together projects from different funding sources (BONUS, Horizon etc.) was the sharing of knowledge and expertise. The outcomes of the project platforms, like policy recommendations, were based on a synthesis of results from different projects and thus had a broad knowledge base. The evaluation found that public authorities had an important role in project platforms. They were responsible for the elaboration of policy recommendations as well as organised discussions and networking with target groups and other stakeholders. The evaluation found all nine project platforms successful in influencing policy changes.

The shift to online cooperation had a notable negative impact on the development of relations among project partners as well as the development of networks with other projects, stakeholders, and target audiences. Some types of activities such as piloting, brainstorming or active thematic discussions, did not work sufficiently in online mode. On the other hand, it was noted that online communication among partners allowed more flexibility in arranging project partners' meetings or ad hoc discussions in smaller working groups. In addition, outreach via online events was much bigger, but the real engagement of target groups was harder in the online mode. In conclusion, the evaluation suggested that a balance between online and in-

person meetings, activities and events should be kept in the projects in the future.

The evaluations suggested that more focus could be placed on ensuring the practical usefulness of the outputs and results for the target groups and on assessing the efforts and resources needed to transfer the results into practice. An Increased focus should still be placed also on the transfer, uptake and capitalisation of project results. In this respect, extension projects and project platforms had proved useful and were also recommended for future programme. Among others, it was concluded that project platforms made it possible to make a synthesis of the results of previous projects making a bigger picture visible and thus e.g. policy recommendations more profound and effective. The final impact evaluation served the fine-tuning of the approaches in the Programme 2021-2027.

Lessons learned

The MA/JS and the Programme countries based the new Programme for 2021-2027 very much on the lessons learned from the period 2014-2020. The increase of institutional capacities to tackle the challenges in the region was still seen as the core added value of the Programme. The 2021-2027 Programme was designed to be demand-driven supporting in particular public authorities in meeting the needs of their target groups (e.g. companies and communities). The focus of the Programme intervention was on solutions developed in the projects addressing the challenges in the region. Project partners needed to carry out pilot actions to test these solutions together with their target groups. The Programme would continue and intensify the capitalisation activities among others through project platforms. The result and output indicators of the 2021-2027 Programme measure the Programme achievements directly on the level of target groups of the projects. This would make the evaluation of the Programme achievements easier than in the previous period. The new Programme continued its support to the PACs and the close cooperation with the coordinators of the EUSBSR. It was expected that most of the Programme projects will contribute to the implementation of the EUSBSR.

Name	Fund	From month	From year	To month	To year	Type of evaluation	Thematic objective	Topic	Findings
Final Programme impact evaluation	ERDF ENI	4	2022	12	2022	Impact	01 06 07	<p>Evaluation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - process of institutional capacity building under Programme priorities 1-3 - influence of the type of territory on projects - impact of project platforms - impact of online cooperation in projects and - Monitoring and update of result indicators: impact of projects towards specific objectives 	<p>The overall picture of the institutional capacity showed positive changes compared to 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most important factors to increase the institutional capacity were partners' expertise and experience, partners' diversity, their networks with the target groups and their level of engagement. - The main hindrances were engaging and involving some target groups (e.g., SME) in the activities and their insufficient capacity to internalise the changes/ maintain results. - Different target groups require customised approach. - There was a need for interventions to be less concentrated in urban, more developed areas and to focus more on the involvement of actors. However, not all the topics addressed by the Programme are suited to be addressed in all different types of territories. - Public authorities played in the project platforms bigger role than they usually do in regular projects. - Online cooperation, due to the pandemic, reduced cohesion, limited the possibilities for cooperation and negatively influenced the development of networks with other projects or stakeholders. However, online dissemination events helped projects reach new and

									broader audiences.
Internal Operational Evaluation	ERDF ENI	1	2017	12	2017	Process	01 06 07 11	<p>For the year 2017, evaluation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - management structures at programme and project levels - financial performance - programme delivery <p>The operational evaluation, in particular, covered the assessment of the 2nd call regular projects in priorities 1-3 and</p> <p>contracting of selected projects, advice to applicants and assessment of applications for EUSBSR</p> <p>coordination support in priority 4, BAMOS online monitoring system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Based on the division of lead partners and partners among the Programme countries, and the overall number of applications with sufficient quality, it could be concluded that support to applicants in the 2nd call was sufficient. - The assessment went smoothly. - The contracting of the 2nd call regular projects went quite smoothly. - The monitoring process of on-going projects went smoothly. There were no weak points of the process and all reports were paid in time. - BAMOS systems worked in general properly. The system was regarded as secure and user-friendly. The help on the system was adequate - MA/JS managed the operational programme in accordance with the principle of sound financial Management. However, the Programme spending lacked behind the original plans. The main reason was that the original spending plan was based on one-step-application procedures for projects instead of running regular calls with a two-step approach.
Internal Operational Evaluation	ERDF ENI	1	2016	12	2016	Process	01 06 07	<p>For the year 2016, evaluation of:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Based on the division of lead partners and partners among the Programme countries, and the overall number of applications with sufficient quality, it could be

								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - management structures at programme and project levels - financial performance - programme delivery <p>In particular, the operational evaluation concerned the first call for projects.</p>	<p>concluded that support to applicants was sufficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Both the admissibility check and assessment were assessed as adequate. The resources used for the assessment were high, but the process was well manageable for the staff.
Mid-term evaluation of Interreg Baltic Sea Region Programme impact	ERDF ENI	3	2018	12	2018	Impact	01 06 07 11	<p>Evaluation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - involvement of different types of partners - contribution to EUSBSR - effectiveness of programme support for EUSBSR coordination - communication strategy - performance of the MA/JS and - Monitoring and update of result indicators: impact of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The main benefits of participating in Interreg Baltic Sea Region were generating and adopting new knowledge. The benefits that Interreg Baltic Sea Region project partners mostly highlight are learning from other regions/countries, new contacts and access to networks, learning in a specific thematic field and learning with practical examples and applications. - Projects were progressing adequately towards results and expected achievements. - Private for-profit partners brought certain benefits to a project, including, for instance, the transfer of project results into practice, a wider distribution of project results and practical 'on-the-ground' knowledge. - In Baltic Sea Region Programme 2014-2020, compared to the Programme 2007-2013, the share of public authorities project partners dropped.

								<p>projects towards specific objectives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Given the thematic alignment and character of IBSR projects, most IBSR projects contributed to the implementation of EUSBSR in one or more thematic areas. - The Programme was widely effective or even very effective in achieving its general communication objectives. - The Monitoring Committee members were generally very satisfied with the work of the MA/JS and regarded it as very professional and competent.
Internal Operational Evaluation	ERDF ENI	1	2020	12	2020	Process	01 06 07 11	<p>For the year 2020, evaluation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - management structures at programme and project levels - financial performance - programme delivery <p>In particular, the operational evaluation was carried out for 2nd call seed money projects' application, selection and contracting procedures as well as for the project prolongation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Given the high quality of the seed money applications, it seemed that the efforts made by the MA/JS to support the seed money applicants had been adequate. The assessment procedure was evaluated as adequate as well. - The prolongation procedure (due to Covid-19 pandemic) was a simple and quick change procedure. The MA/JS received a lot of positive feedback from projects. - Positive conclusion on management structures. - Analysing finalised projects' results, most of the outputs belonged to the output type 'reports', the output types 'digital platforms' and 'Handbooks/Guidelines/Manuals'. - the vast majority of finalised projects were successful in reaching their target groups.

								procedure which the MA/JS introduced to react to the Covid-19 pandemic.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The learning experiences in projects demonstrated high transnational relevance. The learning process often took place through the joint development of new tools and methods and through the implementation of practical activities, such as piloting and testing activities.
Internal Operational Evaluation	ERDF ENI	1	2019	3	2019	Process	01 06 07 11	<p>For the year 2018, evaluation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - management structures at programme and project levels - financial performance - programme delivery - BAMOS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For the third call of regular projects, the efforts of the MA/JS to give detailed consultations to all applicants were somewhat too high for such an open call. The admissibility and assessment processes went smoothly. The main reasons for prolonged contracting time were severe conditions put on several projects during project approval as well as the time needed to collect all necessary documents as original versions. - The monitoring of the 1st and 2nd call projects went smoothly. - The BAMOS system was regarded as secure and user-friendly. The most important ways of supporting users were the helpdesk (via email), the user manual/handbook, and training sessions provided by MA/JS. - The MA/JS reported to the MC and the European Commission in time and provided additional information on Programme implementation. - MA/JS managed the operational programme in accordance with the principle of sound financial Management. However, the Programme spending was behind the original plans. The main reason was that the original spending plan was based on one-step-application procedures for projects instead of running regular calls

									with a two-step approach.
Mid-term evaluation of Interreg Baltic Sea Region Programme impact	ERDF ENI	3	2018	12	2018	Impact	01 06 07 11	<p>Evaluation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - involvement of different types of partners - contribution to EUSBSR - effectiveness of programme support for EUSBSR coordination - communication strategy - performance of the MA/JS and - Monitoring and update of result indicators: impact of projects towards specific objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The main benefits of participating in Interreg Baltic Sea Region were generating and adopting new knowledge. The benefits that Interreg Baltic Sea Region project partners mostly highlight are learning from other regions/countries, new contacts and access to networks, learning in a specific thematic field and learning with practical examples and applications. - Projects were progressing adequately towards results and expected achievements. - Private for-profit partners brought certain benefits to a project, including, for instance, the transfer of project results into practice, a wider distribution of project results and practical 'on-the-ground' knowledge. - In Baltic Sea Region Programme 2014-2020, compared to the Programme 2007-2013, the share of public authorities project partners dropped. - Given the thematic alignment and character of IBSR projects, most IBSR projects contributed to the implementation of EUSBSR in one or more thematic areas. - The Programme was widely effective or even very effective in achieving its general communication objectives. - The Monitoring Committee members were generally

									very satisfied with the work of the MA/JS and regarded it as very professional and competent.
Monitoring of the state of institutional capacity in the Interreg Baltic Sea Region (2020)	ERDF ENI	3	2020	11	2020	Impact	01 06 07 11	Monitoring and update of result indicators: impact of projects towards specific objectives.	<p>- Institutional capacity in the region was overall good. Out of the five types of capacity assessed, organisations' capability to work in a transnational environment had improved the most.</p> <p>- Although the general situation was satisfactory to good, further progress was hindered by inequalities between countries and types of territories, such as between capital cities and peripheral areas. Capacity development had reached a ceiling and was now hampered by structural factors.</p> <p>- Some challenging factors were detected in establishing knowledge transfer between public and private sectors, developing cross-sectoral approaches, attracting private funding for larger initiatives and spreading benefits equally across the territory.</p> <p>- Knowledge and organisational structures existed but were not fully utilised. In particular, knowledge did not always reach practitioners.</p>
Internal Operational Evaluation	ERDF ENI	1	2019	12	2019	Process	01 06 07 11	<p>For the year 2019, evaluation of:</p> <p>- management structures at programme and project levels</p>	<p>- In the final reporting of first call regular projects and their payments there were delays. The main reason for the delays was the coordination of the reporting and its FLC at project level.</p> <p>- In the Seed Money final reports, clarification with the MA/JS was mainly linked to the quality of the outputs</p>

								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - financial performance - programme delivery <p>In particular, the operational evaluation was carried out for monitoring of final reports of regular projects, seed money projects final reports, EUSBSR support projects reports, BAMOS online monitoring system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For EUSBSR support projects late submission of reports seemed to have further increased in 2019. - The BAMOS system was regarded as secure and user-friendly. The most important ways of supporting users were the helpdesk (via email), the user manual/handbook, and training sessions provided by MA/JS. - No major findings and related suggestions for improvements for management structures at the project level.
Internal Operational Evaluation	ERDF ENI	1	2015	12	2015	Process	01 06 07 11	<p>For the year 2015, evaluation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - management structures at programme and project levels - financial performance - programme delivery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All the required procedures related to the support of applicants and the assessment of applications were in place, functioning properly, and according to the legal framework. - The approval rate among those projects that received consultation at the full application stage was higher than among those that did not receive consultation. - In priority 4, more individual support and guidance of applicants could be implemented due to the smaller number of applicants.

5. ISSUES AFFECTING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE PROGRAMME AND MEASURES TAKEN

(a) Issues which affect the performance of the programme and the measures taken

There were two main challenges affecting the Programme performance: Covid-19 pandemic and the suspension of the Financing Agreement with Russian Federation due to the military aggression of the Russian Federation on Ukraine.

The Covid-19 pandemic affecting the work in the projects as well as for the Programme bodies was the main challenge during the years 2020 and 2021. Projects faced problems in organising planned events, implementing pilots and investments as well as with contacts with their target groups. In 2020, to mitigate the impacts of the lockdown and other consequences of the Covid-19 pandemic to the planned project activities, the MA/JS offered all running projects a prolongation of their duration by 6 months. In addition, more flexibility with other types of changes (e.g. budget re-allocation that exceeds budget flexibility, revision of the work plan, prolonged deadlines to submit main outputs) was given to projects. The projects found solutions to replace travels and face-to-face meetings in their activities. The work of the MA/JS was organised mainly as telework. Monitoring Committee meetings were organised online and the decision making was done mainly through written procedures. The arrangements did not hamper the Programme implementation.

In 2022, the main issue that affected the Programme implementation was the suspension of Russian participation in the Programme. Due to the military aggression of the Russian Federation on Ukraine, the Commission suspended the Financing Agreement with the Russian Federation, on 4 March 2022, with immediate effect. At this stage of the Programme implementation, four projects with Russian participation were ongoing. These projects were informed that the implementation on the Russian side had been suspended. The implementation on the EU side continued till the end of the project implementation, 31 March 2022. These projects managed to achieve the planned results, except for the final activities planned on the Russian side. The MA/JS also stopped all payments to Russian partners from all the projects concerned (finalised but not yet paid and ongoing in 2022). The MA/JS kept the Monitoring Committee informed about the steps taken regarding the suspension of Russian participation in the Programme, in writing and in online meetings in April and November 2022. The MA/JS was in continuous contact with the European Commission regarding this issue as well as with the EU Members States managing external cooperation programmes with Russian participation. The Audit Authority was duly informed as well.

(b) OPTIONAL FOR LIGHT REPORTS, otherwise it will be included in point 9.1. An assessment of whether progress made towards targets is sufficient to ensure their fulfilment, indicating any remedial actions taken or planned, where appropriate.

--

6. CITIZEN'S SUMMARY (ARTICLE 50(9) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013)

A citizen's summary of the contents of the annual and the final implementation reports shall be made public and uploaded as a separate file in the form of annex to the annual and the final implementation report

You can upload/find the Citizen's summary under General > Documents

7. REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS (ARTICLE 46 OF REGULATION (EU) No 1303/2013)

8. PROGRESS IN PREPARATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF MAJOR PROJECTS AND JOINT ACTION PLANS (ARTICLE 101(H) AND ARTICLE 111(3) OF REGULATION (EU) No 1303/2013 AND ARTICLE 14(3)(B) OF REGULATION (EU) No 1299/2013)

8.1. Major projects

Table 7: Major projects

Project	CCI	Status of MP	Total investments	Total eligible costs	Planned notification/submission date	Date of tacit agreement/ approval by Commission	Planned start of implementation	Planned completion date	Priority Axis/ Investment priorities	Current state of realisation — financial progress (% of expenditure certified to Commission compared to total eligible cost)	Current state of realisation — physical progress Main implementation stage of the project	Main outputs	Date of signature of first works contract (1)	Observations
---------	-----	--------------	-------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	---	---------------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------------	--	---	--------------	---	--------------

(1) In the case of operations implemented under PPP structures the signing of the PPP contract between the public body and the private sector body (Article 102(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013).

Significant problems encountered in implementing major projects and measures taken to overcome them

Any change planned in the list of major projects in the cooperation programme

8.2. Joint action plans

Progress in the implementation of different stages of joint action plans

--

Table 8: Joint action plans (JAP)

Title of the JAP	CCI	Stage of implementation of JAP	Total eligible costs	Total public support	OP contribution to JAP	Priority axis	Type of JAP	[Planned] submission to the Commission	[Planned] start of implementation	[Planned] completion	Main outputs and results	Total eligible expenditure certified to the Commission	Observations
------------------	-----	--------------------------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------------	---------------	-------------	--	-----------------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	--	--------------

Significant problems encountered and measures taken to overcome them

--

9. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME (ARTICLE 50(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013 AND ARTICLE 14(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1299/2013)

9.1 Information in Part A and achieving the objectives of the programme (Article 50(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013)

Priority axis	1 - Capacity for innovation
<p>Within the framework of Priority 1, the Programme contributed to enhancing research and innovation infrastructures, advancing smart specialisation, and promoting non-technological innovation across the Baltic Sea Region. The wide variety of topics addressed by the projects in that period reflected the Programme ambition to experiment with three aspects of the Baltic Sea Region innovation framework showing the highest potential for the transnational added value.</p> <p>In the specific objective 1.1: Research and Innovation Infrastructures the Programme financed 14 regular and two extension stage projects. Projects under this objective tackled a range of issues, including limited SME and incubator capacities, fragmented and poorly connected research and innovation (R&I) systems, and insufficient frameworks for asset management in research infrastructures. These projects built capacity and enabled the market uptake of innovations by creating stronger links between R&I institutions, SMEs, and other stakeholders.</p> <p>To address these issues, the programme focused on several key actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improving governance: promoting joint actions at the transnational level to improve the governance of research and innovation infrastructures, leading to the sustainability of resources, optimal sharing, data exchange, and translating research into business activities.• Increasing efficiency and resource management: enhancing the ability of infrastructure facilities to manage their resources efficiently and deliver results by combining resources and capacities from different regions and countries.• Attracting external users and financing: strengthening the infrastructures' ability to attract external users and secure external financing, while coordinating efforts with other research and innovation infrastructures.• Private sector engagement: reinforcing the role of the private sector, particularly SMEs, by involving them in testing, piloting, and validation activities. This also includes engaging enterprises early in the planning and identification stages as know-how providers. <p>For example, the BalticTRAM project demonstrated how effective collaboration could solve practical challenges faced by enterprises. By connecting SMEs with universities, research centres, and large-scale research infrastructures, the project supported product development in diverse areas such as sustainable construction materials, enhanced medical testing kits, durable electronics, and longer-lasting batteries. The tailored assistance provided to 15 SMEs highlighted the potential of research infrastructures to address specific market needs.</p> <p>Another example of a project that well reflects the spirit of the Programme achievements in the objective is the TEST-4-SME project. It successfully reduced barriers to innovation for electronics SMEs in the Baltic Sea region by providing better, faster, and more accessible testing services. The project established a network of 19 testing laboratories, equipped them with necessary knowledge and procedures, and trained laboratory staff to support SMEs. This network helped 138 SMEs with conformance testing and</p>	

certification, leading to more efficient product development and easier entry into global market.

In the specific objective 1.2: Smart Specialisation the Programme facilitated the application of smart specialisation strategies that aligned regional strengths with emerging global trends. Eight regular and four extension stage projects as well as one project platform

The Programme achieved notable success in the specific objective on smart specialisation through two main contributions:

- Building alliances and exploring growth opportunities: helping to form alliances between different research and innovation milieus with leading competencies. These alliances created unique, smart combinations that explored untapped growth opportunities in areas such as the bioeconomy, circular economy, and digital transformation.
- Building capacity and understanding: helping authorities understand how to work with smart specialisation strategies, measure their effectiveness, and build the capacities of those responsible for their implementation. The Programme also explored the links between smart specialisation strategies on national and regional levels in the countries where these existed.

To support this work, the Programme established close cooperation with the Joint Research Centre (JRC) of the European Commission, responsible for smart specialisation. The JRC provided valuable insights, methodologies, and tools to help regions develop and implement their smart specialisation strategies effectively. This collaboration ensured that the Programme's efforts were aligned with the latest research and best practices in smart specialisation.

For example, the **EmpInno** project significantly improved the Regional Innovation Strategies for Smart Specialisation (RIS3) in twelve medium-sized regions around the Baltic Sea. This led to specific achievements such as: developing new business models tailored to regional industries, promoting partnerships between industry and academia, resulting in innovative products and services.

The **EmpInno Monitor S3** project built on the success of the EmpInno project developed and tested innovative monitoring elements to improve the monitoring systems of the smart specialisation strategies (RIS3) in seven partner regions. The project equipped public authorities with improved RIS3 monitoring systems, allowing them to better assess and design innovation policy tools.

The **BSR S3 Ecosystem** project platform aligned smart specialisation strategies across the Baltic Sea Region by synthesising knowledge from ten Interreg projects. It facilitated the sharing of best practices and activated research, academic communities, industry, and public entities. The project helped over 200 stakeholders, including ministries and development agencies, learn how to promote diversity, inclusion, and green transition pathways, particularly in the circular bioeconomy. Additionally, it developed a methodology for analysing value chains and piloted them.

In the specific objective 1.3: Non-Technological innovation the Programme made significant progress in recognising and promoting the potential of non-technological innovation in the Baltic Sea Region . Historically, innovation support mechanisms in the Baltic Sea Region have focused on technological advancements, often overlooking non-technological innovations. To address this gap, the Programme created a more inclusive innovation environment that integrates both technological and non-technological aspects.

Key achievements of 23 regular projects and 6 extension stage projects included innovation in business models, social innovation, eco-innovation, and creative industries, thereby enabling technologically lagging regions to boost their innovation capacity. The Programme often addressed societal challenges while linking them with creating business opportunities, balancing social impact with economic growth.

One example of this approach is the **BaltSe@nioR 2.0** project which advanced the creation of senior-friendly public spaces in the Baltic Sea Region. By collaborating with municipalities, universities, businesses, and NGOs, the project developed smart furniture and innovative business models tailored for seniors. Key accomplishments included a comprehensive cross-national survey to understand seniors' needs, the development of smart furniture prototypes, and the transformation of public spaces, such as museums and city halls, in five countries to be more age-friendly.

Another example is **BaltCityPrevention** project which introduced eHealth technologies, improved cooperation between public health authorities and businesses, and tested innovative methods like focus groups, motivational interviewing, and health games. Key achievements include the development of an intervention model and toolboxes to help health professionals better plan, implement, and evaluate health promotion interventions. The project also facilitated collaboration with small and medium-sized enterprises to introduce new digital technologies and generate innovative ideas for health promotion.

Through several initiatives, the Programme provided robust support to the creative industries. For example, the **Creative Ports** project significantly improved collaboration and internationalisation within the Cultural and Creative Industries (CCI) in the Baltic Sea Region. This was achieved through an acceleration program for game developers designed to enhance their skills and market reach, and "CCI Matchmaking" events, which brought together creative professionals from different countries to establish long-term partnerships.

The Programme's innovation priority contributed to three complementary pillars of regional innovation. Firstly, it promoted the proper use of existing infrastructure. Secondly, it recognised the importance of non-technological innovation in addressing the challenges faced by Baltic Sea Region society. Thirdly, it provided practical guidance for interpreting the emerging smart specialisation strategies. All these efforts were aimed at and resulted in the creation of business opportunities and the development of specific products.

Priority axis	2 - Efficient management of natural resources
---------------	---

During the 2014–2020 period, Priority 2, Efficient Management of Natural Resources, addressed two core dimensions vital for the Baltic Sea Region. First, it focused on the Baltic Sea as a shared resource, emphasising the environmental status of the sea basin while exploring the economic potential linked to its sustainable use. This approach encompassed actions to improve water quality, manage marine resources responsibly, and foster innovation within the blue economy, ensuring a balance between environmental protection and economic growth.

Second, the Programme recognised the need to build capacity for utilising renewable energy, aligning with the region's natural assets, such as bio-based resources and wind energy. This was complemented by targeted measures to improve energy efficiency, addressing challenges from outdated infrastructure to energy-intensive practices. Together, these aspects reflected a holistic response to the region's territorial

needs, integrating environmental and economic priorities.

The Programme's achievements under specific objective 2.1: Clear Waters were based on implementation of 16 regular and four extension stage projects as well as two platforms. They included increasing the efficiency of water management to reduce nutrient inflows and hazardous substance discharges to the Baltic Sea and regional waters. The Programme made significant contributions to improving water quality, also in approaches to reduction of pharmaceuticals. Additionally, it supported a transnational policy-oriented dialogue among Baltic Sea region authorities from different sectors to address these challenges and promote sustainable water management practices.

Financed within the specific objective 2.1, **BSR Water** project platform, made significant advancements in water management across the Baltic Sea Region by establishing the Baltic Smart Water Hub. This emblematic project exemplifies how good practices from individual projects can shape the policy framework. The platform contributed to regional policy changes by developing recommendations for nutrient recycling, stormwater management, and micropollutant treatment in wastewater. These recommendations informed the Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (HELCOM) and the EUSBSR policy areas Nutri and Hazards. As a result, the palette of solutions contributed to the creation of the new Baltic Sea Regional Nutrient Recycling Strategy and the revision of the HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan, both adopted at the HELCOM Ministerial Meeting.

Another example of the Programme's achievements in advancing the specific objective 2.1 is the **CWPharma** project, which tackled pharmaceutical residues in water bodies and improved water management practices. It mapped pharmaceutical sales and active ingredient concentrations and piloted advanced wastewater treatments in several Baltic Sea Region countries. These efforts informed a model estimating emissions and coastal concentrations of pharmaceuticals in the Baltic Sea and resulted in an Action Plan prioritising policy measures to reduce missions into the Baltic Sea.

The Programme contribution to the specific objective 2.2: Renewable Energy revolved around several key areas, including developing strategic planning perspectives for energy areas, advancing the integration of offshore wind energy grids, enhancing the production and use of forest bioenergy, promoting community-driven renewable energy initiatives as well as developing bio-based value chains for renewable energy. The Programme's contribution to Specific Objective 2.2: Renewable Energy was characterised by a strong focus on the utilisation of a place-based approach, valuing the use of resources specific to particular territories. This emphasis was evident in five regular projects and one extension stage project implemented.

One of the examples of this approach is the project **Baltic InteGrid**, which established a foundation for a coordinated Baltic Sea offshore electricity grid, addressing a major challenge in advancing renewable energy in the region. The project proposed a vision for large, transnational meshed grids to connect multiple wind parks across countries by utilising the Baltic Sea's favourable conditions for offshore wind power. This concept, tested through pre-feasibility studies, demonstrated significant benefits in reducing energy losses and improving energy security.

Another perspective can be show-cased by the Interreg project **Co2mmunity** empowered local communities across the Baltic Sea region to take an active role in renewable energy production. Through its Renewable Energy Co-operative Partnerships the project fostered collaboration among citizens, municipalities, businesses, and academia to implement community-driven energy projects. These efforts enhanced institutional capacities and bridged the knowledge gaps, enabling initiatives like solar panels for housing cooperatives and jointly purchased heat pumps. By promoting participatory decision-making and

local benefit-sharing, Co2mmunity strengthened social acceptance of renewable energy and demonstrated how citizens can directly contribute to the energy transition.

The Programme's efforts to address energy challenges in the Baltic Sea Region were complemented by achievements under Specific Objective 2.3: Energy Efficiency. It increased energy efficiency through enhanced capacity of public and private actors involved in energy planning. Projects focused on climate, green energy efficiency technologies, and practical actions for energy efficiency in Baltic cities. They advanced smart city planning including lighting solutions, developed effective financing tools for energy efficiency in buildings, and promoted low-temperature district heating.

The **AREA 21** project exemplified these achievements by involving local and regional public authorities, energy providers, public property owners, and citizens from six countries. It improved cooperative planning processes using ICT-based tools to visualise energy consumption and scale up good practices in energy saving to the district level. The project established Energy Improvement Districts and empowered energy consumers through the use of ICT tools to monitor energy and water consumption, resulting in significant energy savings and CO2 emission reductions.

The Programme's contribution to the specific objective 2.4: Resource-Efficient Blue Growth resulted in practical advancements for sustainable and resource-efficient blue growth. It enhanced the capacity of public authorities and practitioners in the blue economy sectors.

Significant efforts were made to reduce pressures on marine ecosystems while supporting economic and employment growth from the sea and coasts. Additionally, the Programme built the capacity of stakeholders to mediate between conflicting interests in the use of marine resources. These achievements were demonstrated through six regular projects, two extension stage projects, and one project platform implemented under objective 2.4.

The **Baltic LINES** project addressed inconsistent maritime spatial planning in the Baltic Sea region by creating BASEMAPS, the first online database for transnational Maritime Spatial Planning data. This database assisted spatial planning authorities with decision-making by providing up-to-date information on existing and planned infrastructures. The project also developed future scenarios for shipping and energy sectors and compiled spatial requirements, which were integrated into the Maritime Spatial Planning Challenge virtual simulation game. This game helped planners from the Baltic Sea region improve coherence of shipping routes and energy corridors.

The **Baltic Blue Biotechnology ALLIANCE** project exemplifies sustainable resource use combined with business opportunities. It built a network of Research-Technology-Innovation mentors to match services, facilities, and experts from different countries around the Baltic Sea, turning smart biotechnology ideas into market-ready products. The project saw successes such as the development of a natural sunscreen extract from kelp, algae-based facial moisturisers, and bone regeneration products from mollusc shells. Additionally, it created a comprehensive service offer to support blue tech companies.

Priority 2 of the Programme shaped a transformative vision for the Baltic Sea Region by integrating environmental protection, innovation, and economic development. It achieved tangible improvements in water management, renewable energy, energy efficiency, and blue growth, utilizing a variety of tools ranging from aligning policy frameworks to direct community engagement in shaping initiatives.

Priority axis	3 - Sustainable transport
---------------	---------------------------

Priority 3 of the Programme: Sustainable Transport tackled transport challenges in the Baltic Sea region through a comprehensive approach. The Programme addressed specific objectives, including enhancing integration across transport systems, improving accessibility of remote areas, advancing maritime safety, promoting environmentally friendly shipping, and supporting greener urban mobility solutions.

In the specific objective 3.1 Interoperability of Transport Modes, the Programme supported the removal of "non-infrastructure" bottlenecks within transport corridors and eased administrative and technical obstacles to transport. The projects enhanced integration across transport systems by boosting the capacity of logistics providers, port authorities, and operators to improve north-south and east-west connectivity. Work across borders fostered harmonisation between sea, rail and road transport systems, reducing operational bottlenecks and improving efficiency. These efforts supported sustainable and multimodal transport actions in the Scandinavian-Adriatic Corridor, connected regions through the North Sea Baltic Connector and capitalised on TEN-T core network corridors.

All this was achieved thanks to the collective efforts of 11 regular projects, four extension projects and one project platform. The efforts under Specific Objective 3.1 can be well exemplified by the **EMMA** project. This project involved waterway administrations, business support organisations, ports, shipping companies, logistics businesses, and research organisations from five countries around the Baltic Sea. They jointly raised the profile of inland waterway transportation on political agendas. The EMMA project provided better information for operating inland waterway transport, including an ice study for the Nordic countries and a prototype map-based web application for logistics planning. New inland waterway transport services were tested and proved viable, such as the barge container service from Gothenburg to Vänersborg in Sweden. The project also achieved political recognition for inland waterway transport, with national and regional authorities incorporating project recommendations into their strategies.

The efforts under Specific Objective 3.1 can also be exemplified by the **NSB CoRe** project. This project brought together spatial and transport planners and other experts from local, regional, and national authorities across six countries to develop a joint vision for improving integration and accessibility in the eastern and southern parts of the Baltic Sea region. The project addressed the challenges of lower connectivity and accessibility in these areas, particularly in cross-border regions and inter-urban growth corridors. It developed a transnational spatial vision for regional development, logistics, and mobility along the North Sea Baltic corridor, stretching from Germany to Sweden. The vision aimed to enhance connectivity and accessibility, reduce disparities between the eastern and western coasts, and create a network of interconnected metropolises, regional centres, and rural areas with efficient transport systems.

The Programme's efforts to ensure cohesive development of the Baltic Sea Region were complemented by the specific objective 3.2 Accessibility of Remote Areas. Targeting demographic challenges and geographical isolation, the Programme, within objective 3.2, funded initiatives to improve sustainable connectivity for remote regions. These included applying cost-effective and innovative solutions to enhance local accessibility while ensuring environmental and economic sustainability.

Altogether, the Programme financed three regular projects in that objective. These efforts can be well exemplified by the **MAMBA** project. This project introduced innovative mobility solutions to make public transport, welfare services, and goods delivery more convenient and accessible in rural areas across the Baltic Sea region. It integrated existing mobility infrastructure with new solutions like Mobility as a Service systems, transport on demand, car sharing, and ride-sharing applications in six countries. The project established nine Mobility Centres to provide information and services, promoting the integration of different mobility solutions and pooling resources. These centres supported interdepartmental and

interinstitutional cooperation, generating new concepts in transport planning.

The Programme's achievements under Objective 3.3: Maritime Safety increased maritime safety and security through five regular projects, one platform project, and one extension stage project. The projects improved operational plans and procedures for maritime search and rescue in hazardous substance incidents, enhanced oil spill response capabilities, and strengthened navigation safety through sea traffic management.

A notable emphasis was placed on collaborative efforts, recognising the Baltic Sea as a common resource that requires joint safety strategies. The projects fostered cooperation among state maritime resources, evaluated the ranging mode for the Baltic Sea, and tested new technologies to ensure a coordinated and effective response to maritime safety challenges. For example, the **ChemSAR** project provided national rescue authorities and services around the Baltic Sea with operational plans and common procedures to harmonise maritime search and rescue operations in incidents involving hazardous and noxious substances. The partners developed the first Standard Operational Procedures for search and rescue operations in the Baltic Sea region. These procedures were tested in exercises and a live rescue drill, enabling a more coordinated response to such incidents. These were, in turn, compiled into a handbook, now used by rescue organisations in the Baltic Sea region.

The efforts were complemented by the **DiveSMART-Baltic** project. This initiative mapped the competences of divers in nine countries around the Baltic Sea and equipped rescue centres and services with harmonised operational procedures for underwater search and rescue missions. The project developed an online database of diving resources, conducted joint training exercises, and established standard operational procedures to improve coordination and response times. The successful implementation of these procedures significantly enhanced maritime safety in the region, ensuring quicker and more effective responses to emergencies, ultimately saving more lives.

Complementary to the already listed achievements in the previous objectives of Priority 3, specific objective 3.4: Environmentally Friendly Shipping aimed to enhance clean shipping based on the increased capacity of maritime actors. This objective dealt with issues such as sustainable development of cruise port locations, measuring and modelling the environmental impact of low-emission shipping, developing the LNG value chain for clean shipping, and reducing the risk of invasive species introduction by shipping. Additionally, it focused on bringing eco-efficiency to maritime industry processes through digitalisation. These efforts were implemented through five regular projects, two extension stage projects, and one project platform.

An example project illustrating the achievements under Objective 3.4: Environmentally Friendly Shipping is **ECOPRODIGI** project. The ECOPRODIGI project enhanced eco-efficiency in the maritime industry by introducing digital solutions. It developed digital tools to optimise vessel performance, cargo stowage, and shipyard processes. By mapping existing eco-inefficiencies, piloting digital technologies, and implementing training programmes, ECOPRODIGI successfully reduced resource use and environmental impact. The project also influenced policy by providing recommendations to support industry digitalisation, making shipping operations more sustainable and eco-efficient.

Specific objective 3.5 Environmentally Friendly Urban Mobility completed the other four objectives by specifically adding the urban dimension to the broader efforts to improve transport in the Baltic Sea Region. This objective enhanced environmentally friendly transport systems in urban areas by increasing the capacity of urban transport actors. Urban transport projects promoted greener mobility options, such as integrated public transport networks and sustainable logistics. These initiatives supported urban actors in

designing environmentally friendly solutions tailored to local needs.

The projects addressed various topics, including fostering e-mobility solutions, transitioning urban transport systems towards low-carbon mobility, and implementing eco-friendly autonomous last-mile public transportation. Additionally, projects focused on sustainable commuting and silver age mobility.

These efforts were implemented through six regular projects and two extension stage projects.

One notable example of this objective is the **Sohjoa Baltic** project. This initiative increased knowledge on autonomous public transport in eight countries, brought piloting experience of self-driving electric minibuses to six countries, and promoted environmentally friendly transport solutions in the region. The project made public transport more attractive and accessible, especially for the first and last mile of journeys. By implementing large-scale pilots in cities like Helsinki, Kongsberg, and Tallinn, the project demonstrated the viability of automated driverless electric minibuses. The project successfully raised awareness, provided practical experience, and contributed to regional efforts to tackle climate change through innovative urban mobility solutions.

Another example for Objective 3.5 is the **GreenSAM** project, which helped involve senior citizens in developing green transportation solutions. The project addressed the lack of structured knowledge about seniors' mobility needs and the hidden barriers they face. It developed a toolbox of good practices to increase seniors' participation in decision-making for green urban mobility, used by cities like Hamburg, Aarhus, Gdansk, Tartu, and Riga.

The Programme's efforts under Priority 3 effectively addressed transport challenges in the Baltic Sea region, delivering practical improvements across transport systems and urban mobility and improving environmental sustainability and accessibility for different types of territories and demographic groups.

Priority axis	4 - Institutional capacity for macro-regional cooperation
---------------	---

Specific objective 4.1 ‘Seed Money’: To increase capacity for transnational cooperation implementing the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region and working on common policies with the partner countries

Seed money projects within the first specific objective “Seed Money” increased the capacity of public authorities, research institutions, NGOs, and business support organizations to initiate complex projects with macro-regional strategic impact. In total, 59 project plans were developed out of the 62 planned. At least half of these project plans were realised in larger projects with secured funding, amounting to more than 87 million euros, thereby supporting the implementation of the EUSBSR action plan. The target value for the amount of funding generated by seed money projects to implement the EUSBSR was achieved at 80% of the planned level (EUR 108 million). The three main funding instruments successfully utilised by the partners were Interreg (e.g. Baltic Sea Region, Central Baltic), Horizon Europe, and the LIFE programmes. Additionally, partnerships continued to seek funding based on established collaborations during the 2021-2027 funding period

Seed money projects also fostered cooperation with partner countries such as Russia, Belarus, and Norway, exceeding the target value by 30%. While cooperation with Norwegian partners continued effectively through joint projects, contact with Russian and Belarusian organisations was halted due to the

aggressive war by Russia against Ukraine.

Specific objective 4.2 ‘Coordination of macro-regional cooperation’: To increase capacity of public institutions and pan-Baltic organisations for transnational coordination in implementing the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region and facilitating the implementation of common policies with the partner countries

Projects within the second specific objective “Coordination of macro-regional cooperation” increased the capacity of public administrations and pan-Baltic organisations to implement and follow up on the targets of the EUSBSR. The greatest effect in capacity building was observed in the ability of the Policy Area and Horizontal Action Coordinators to progress towards diverse targets of the EUSBSR areas. The target value of 80% of Priority Areas and Horizontal Actions reaching the identified targets planned for the Programme was overachieved. Additionally, the EUSBSR coordinators facilitated the implementation of joint priorities with partner countries, exceeding the target value by 17%. Notable is the collaboration with Norwegian organisations at the level of Policy Areas and Horizontal Actions as well as on the operational level in joint projects.

Priority axis	5 - Technical Assistance
---------------	--------------------------

The TA budget used equals EUR 25.2 million and covered all Programme management costs, including costs for the MA/JS and contribution to the Audit Authority for the period 2014-2023.

All three result indicators for TA showed the achievement of targets and were according to plan. The baseline indicators at Programme start were zero and the targets set for 2023 100%. Already until the end of 2018 we reached 75-85% in two of the indicators, i.e. in “numbers of visitors on the programme's website” and in “share of programme funding allocated to projects”. At the end, the commitment of programme funds (ERDF) reached a level of 111%. In addition, the third aim of “meeting the N+3 target” was never at risk during all the years.

9.2. Specific actions taken to promote equality between men and women and to promote non-discrimination, in particular accessibility for persons with disabilities, and the arrangements implemented to ensure the integration of the gender perspective in the cooperation programme and operations (Article 50(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 and Article 14(4), subparagraph 2, (d) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

An assessment of the implementation of specific actions to take into account the principles set out in Article 7 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 on promotion of equality between men and women and non-discrimination, including, where relevant, depending on the content and objectives of the cooperation programme, an overview of specific actions taken to promote equality between men and women and to promote non-discrimination, including accessibility for persons with disabilities, and the arrangements implemented to ensure the integration of the gender perspective in the cooperation programme and operations

Following the Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 all projects were requested to promote equality between men and women as well as equal opportunities and non-discrimination. The applicants were guided to either integrate these horizontal principles in their activities, or at least, to consider the project's influence on these principles. All applications submitted were assessed for their planned actions and impacts on fostering equality between men and women as well as equal opportunities and on the prevention of discrimination, including accessibility for disabled people. The contribution to these horizontal principles was regarded as a positive factor that the Monitoring Committee could take into account in the project selection for funding. The projects reported on their contribution to these horizontal principles in their mid-term and final reports.

The majority of the projects were neutral regarding their impact on equal opportunities and non-discrimination. Many projects declared to have taken an active approach to follow the principles in the operational work in the project. Equal opportunities and non-discrimination were considered when setting up steering groups, planning project events and communication.

Due to the place-based approach of the Programme the specific actions of the projects to counteract discrimination focused on disadvantaged rural areas. Several projects searched for solutions to the mobility challenges of disadvantaged groups in rural areas. For instance, MAMBA project contributed to overcome inequalities related to the living conditions in remote areas affected by demographic change through its various piloting activities and Mobility Centers that all aimed at better accessibility of services. Some of the most affected groups by the decline in mobility and service provision in rural areas are the most vulnerable (e.g. elderly, youth, single parents, unemployed) and were to profit most from the MAMBA solutions. Vulnerable groups in society were the key end-user groups of the demand-responsive transport solutions of RESPONSE project as well. SEMPRES project worked for social empowerment in rural areas. The micro projects of SEMPRES Accelerators empowered, for example, single parents, migrants, long-term unemployed or people with disabilities, to become entrepreneurs, develop their own social services and build new capacities.

Gender equality was actively promoted by projects, for instance, in entrepreneurship. Female entrepreneurship was one priority area of the IRIS project, as women represent a large pool of entrepreneurial potential and are still underrepresented in incubators. Among others, the project established a TechGirls movement contributing to increasing the balance between men and women in the tech industry. INBETS BSR developed innovative business transfer models and acknowledged the unused potential of women as successors of SMEs. With its action plan "Female entrepreneurship" it trained the staff working at the business support organisations to make the owners of companies aware of this and realise the potential.

9.3.Sustainable development (Article 50(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 and Article 14(4), subparagraph 2, (e) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

An assessment of the implementation of actions to take into account the principles set out in Article 8 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 on sustainable development, including, where relevant, depending on the content and objectives of the cooperation programme, an overview of the actions taken to promote sustainable development in accordance with that Article

Sustainable development of the region was an integral part of the Programme, and it was covered by all thematic Programme priorities. All applications submitted were assessed for their planned actions and impacts on sustainable development. Promoting sustainable development was regarded as a positive factor that the MC could consider in the project selection for funding.

Most of the projects (118 of 140) reported an active contribution to sustainable development. On operational level many projects referred to the increased use of digital tools and practices to reduce travel.

In many priority 1 projects, the focus was on the environmental impact of products as well as on bio-economy and circular economy. For example, Eco Design Circle and ECOLABNET increased the competences of enterprises in eco-innovation. Piloting a real circular procurement was a central part of the Circular PP project. Further examples are the BIS project, which promoted industrial symbiosis, and BSR Food, which established short food supply chains. For some projects, social sustainability was the focus. SEMPRE Accelerators made a positive contribution through eight social start-ups. BalticSe@nior 2.0 project developed and tested an interactive tool for designing a business that supports not only financial benefit but foremost social aspects. In the UrbCultural Planning project, sustainability was the key idea for the regeneration of urban neighbourhoods.

The sustainable development in priority 2 projects focused first of all on the environmental quality of Baltic Sea waters. Projects raised awareness and developed recommendations to reduce the entering of hazardous substances, pharmaceuticals or microplastics into the waters (e.g. NonHaZCity, CWPharma, FanpLESStic-sea). IWAMA project optimized nutrient removal and energy-efficient operation of waste water treatment plans, while BEST project focused on better efficiency of industrial water treatment. Further projects, like Baltic Slurry Acidi and Manure Standards, found solutions for nitrogen loss from agriculture. Blue growth projects advanced products and planning from a sustainable development point of view (e.g. Alliance, Land-sea act).

Priority 2 included also projects working on renewable energy and energy saving. BEA-APP and AREA 21 projects tackled planning challenges in the transformation towards a low-carbon energy system. Co2mmunity advanced renewable community energy projects, while Effect4Buildings developed financing tools for implementing energy efficiency in buildings. Further projects advanced off-shore wind energy (Baltic InteGrid) and biomass use for energy (e.g. BalticBiomass4Value).

Projects under priority 3, looked at sustainability in transport from different perspectives: modes of transport, transport in rural or urban areas as well as maritime transport. For instance, NSB CoRe project promoted the modal shift from road to rail, while EMMA project supported the shift from road to inland waterways. With its mobility solutions MAMBA project contributed to improving the resilience of rural regions. Among others, Cities.multimodal planned, implemented and evaluated measures to reduce car traffic in urban areas and supported citizens in changing their mobility behaviour. BSR Electric showcased applications for electric mobility in urban environments. The project platform CSHIPP combined the knowledge of several projects in policy guidance for clean shipping in the Baltic Sea Region.

9.4. Reporting on support used for climate change objectives (Article 50(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013)

Calculated amount of support to be used for climate change objectives based on the cumulative financial data by category of intervention in Table 7

Priority axis	Amount of support to be used for climate change objectives (EUR)	Proportion of total allocation to the operational programme (%)
1	8,279,617.67	9.53%
2	35,400,693.43	40.75%
3	20,589,461.04	30.39%
Total	64,269,772.14	23.71%

Of the Programme priorities, Priority 2, “Efficient management of natural resources”, had the biggest contribution to the climate change objectives. Water management was a central topic in this priority. For instance, the WAMBAF project developed a tool to better maintain the forest drainage systems, while the DESIRE project helped in the management and rewetting of peatlands. NOAH project contributed to the mitigation of climate change risks with its support tool for reducing untreated wastewater spillages during flood events in urban areas. A major contribution to the climate change objectives was provided by the projects on energy topics. The projects increased energy efficiency in the public infrastructure or existing housing stock through demonstration projects and other support measures (e.g. AREA21 and LowTEMP). Furthermore, many projects advanced the use of biomass (e.g. Baltic Forbio and BalticBiomass4Value) or other renewable energy sources, in particularly paving the way for wind energy (Baltic InteGrid, BEA-APP).

Priority 3, “Sustainable transport”, had a considerable contribution to the climate change objectives as well. The majority of the projects looked for solutions for more climate-friendly transport and mobility. Several projects developed solutions for better multimodal transport to reduce road transport along the transport corridors (e.g. Scandria@2Act and COMBINE). The EMMA project contributed to the shifting of transport from road to inland waterways. The EnviSuM project focused on exhaust gases from ships and air quality in port locations. The project platform CSHIPPP combined the knowledge of several projects for policy guidance for clean shipping in the Baltic Sea Region. Furthermore, Several projects promoted clean urban transport (e.g. cities.multimodal and SUMBA). Another major group of projects were the ones developing intelligent transport systems (e.g. Sohjoa Baltic and RESPONSE).

Within priority 1 projects supported, among others, environmentally-friendly production (EcoDesign Circle and InnoFruit). The Circular PP project promoted a circular procurement approach to stimulate new business models. Furthermore, the Smart-up BSR project strengthened regional research and innovation strategies in coping with climate change and implementing emerging technologies. Another example of contribution to the climate change objectives in this priority is the ECOLABNET project that established a transnational network of research, development and innovation service providers and intermediary organisations to support eco-innovation in manufacturing small and medium-sized enterprises.

9.5 Role of partners in the implementation of the cooperation programme (Article 50(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 and Article 14(4), subparagraph 1, (c) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

Assessment of the implementation of actions to take into account the role of partners referred to in Article 5 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013, including involvement of the partners in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the cooperation programme

The Monitoring Committee (MC) of the Programme was composed of representatives of both national and regional levels from the participating countries. The MC was responsible for the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the Programme, e.g. deciding on implementation steps, the announcement of calls, selection of projects, monitoring the Programme's progress, approving annual implementation reports towards the European Commission and annual work plans for the MA/JS as well as providing expert input to Programme evaluations.

In addition, national sub-committees have been established by all participating countries to ensure broader involvement of regional and local levels as well as civil society through economic, research and social partners and non-governmental organisations. In total, there are more than 100 members of national subcommittees. Through these sub-committees, a wide range of additional partners are closely involved in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the Programme. Mainly through the sub-committee members, the participating countries take part in communication activities and support applicants and beneficiaries from their national territory. As these sub-committees operate in the national languages of each country, they lower the threshold for institutions that usually do not operate internationally to get involved and contribute to the Programme. Subcommittee meetings usually precede MC meetings to discuss national positions on all information and decision items on the agenda. In addition to the meetings, mailings and newsletters are sent to the subcommittees on a regular basis. An even wider involvement of partners at the national level was implemented during the preparation of a new funding period, especially for setting priorities in terms of Programme content.

Another type of involvement in the Programme implementation and monitoring that the participating countries are responsible for is the national first-level control and second-level audit, as well as all corresponding tasks.

Policy Area Coordinators (PACs) are responsible for the operational implementation of the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region. They represent the national or regional government of a member state, an expert organisation or an intergovernmental or non-governmental body. The Programme actively engaged PACs during the project initiation and development phases. This included PACs' active role in supporting and selecting seed money projects as well as connecting PACs with project idea developers and providing opportunities for PACs to explain the EUSBSR aspirations. During project implementation, the Programme emphasised linking ongoing projects to the EUSBSR policy areas. PACs could contribute to shaping solutions and policy messages, ensuring their practicality and relevance. The engagement in partnership with the EUSBSR enhances the effectiveness of both project initiatives and the macro-regional strategy.

10. OBLIGATORY INFORMATION AND ASSESSMENT ACCORDING TO ARTICLE 14(4), SUBPARAGRAPH 1 (A) AND (B), OF REGULATION (EU) No 1299/2013

10.1 Progress in implementation of the evaluation plan and the follow-up given to the findings of evaluations

Evaluations were carried out **according to the Evaluation Plan**.

Operational evaluations were conducted **internally, each year from 2015 to 2021** to assess the management structures at Programme and project level, the financial performance, and the Programme delivery (only in 2020). The MA/JS took the outcomes of these evaluations into account and improved its procedures upon need. No major problems were detected.

The monitoring of the result indicators for Programme priorities 1-3 was carried out in 2018, 2020 and 2022. It was based on the views of independent experts from several Programme countries on the different thematic topics that the Programme specific objectives covered. The qualitative result indicators in priorities 1-3 depicted changes in the institutional capacity of the target groups defined for each specific objective. *The result indicators did not refer to the direct Programme beneficiaries but covered the whole population of the target group in the area. Therefore, changes in institutional capacities could only partly be linked to the Programme intervention but were to a great extent dependent on other factors outside the Programme's influence.* The evaluators concluded that the development of capacities had reached a certain maximum in 2018 and was afterwards hampered by structural and systemic factors. COVID-19 pandemic caused further challenges. The conclusion was that further increase in capacities would not be easy to be achieved with a continuation of existing support mechanisms, i.e. more funding or more projects, but that it would require systemic and structural changes in existing policies.

Two **impact evaluations** were conducted during the Programme period in line with the Evaluation plan: **a mid-term evaluation in 2018 and a final evaluation in 2022**. The two impact evaluations were conceived as complementary.

The overall result of the **mid-term evaluation** was that the Programme worked very well and that the implementation was well on track. There was a high level of awareness about the Programme at the project, country and expert level and a valuable outreach via different means. In future measurable communication indicators, better use of external experts and even more targeted communication was seen as useful. The evaluation concluded that the Programme had a considerable influence on the maintenance and ongoing development of EUSBSR governance structures. More commitment of the Member States to the EUSBSR was seen needed to avoid too strong dependency on Programme funding.

Lessons learned and recommendations from the mid-term evaluation were followed up in the final evaluation. Through the **final evaluation**, a better understanding of the mechanisms of institutional capacity building, in particular, the role of pilot actions was aimed at. In addition, the influence of the type of territory for the projects, the impact of project platforms and the shift to online cooperation were evaluated.

The evaluation surveys showed that the projects increased their institutional capacity, by generating institutionalised knowledge and competence, increasing their capacity to work in a transnational environment, improving efficiency of using human and technical resources and improving governance structures and organisational set-up. Pilot actions and networking activities were the most successful activities in supporting the learning process to develop institutional capacities. Regarding the impact of type of territory, project partners perceived the involvement of organisations from economically weaker

rural areas in projects as more difficult than it was for organisations from stronger, urban areas. Weaker administrative capacity and experience on project topics as well as limited networks were seen as hindrances to engaging partners from rural areas. According to the evaluators, the main added value of project platforms in bringing together projects from different funding sources was the sharing of knowledge and expertise. The outcomes of the project platforms, like policy recommendations, were based on a synthesis of results from different projects and thus had a broad knowledge base. The evaluation found all nine project platforms successful in influencing policy changes. The shift to online cooperation had had a notable negative impact on the development of relations among project partners as well as the development of networks with other projects, stakeholders, and target audiences. On the other hand, it was noted that online communication among partners allowed more flexibility in arranging project partners' meetings or ad hoc discussions in smaller working groups. In addition, outreach via online events was much bigger, but the real engagement of target groups was harder in the online mode. In conclusion, the evaluation suggested that a balance between online and in-person meetings, activities and events should be kept in the projects in the future.

Both impact evaluations suggested that more focus could be placed on ensuring the practical usefulness of the outputs and results for the target groups and on assessing the efforts and resources needed to transfer the results into practice. An increased focus should still be placed also on the transfer, uptake and capitalisation of project results. In this respect, extension projects and project platforms had proved useful and were also recommended for future. Among others, it was concluded that project platforms made it possible to make a synthesis of the results of previous projects making a bigger picture visible and thus e.g. policy recommendations more profound and effective. The final impact evaluation served the fine-tuning of the approaches in the Programme 2021-2027.

Lessons learned: The MA/JS and the Programme countries based the new Programme for 2021-2027 very much on the lessons learned from the period 2014-2020. The increase of institutional capacities to tackle the challenges in the region was still seen as the core added value of the Programme. The 2021-2027 Programme was designed to be demand-driven supporting in particular public authorities in meeting the needs of their target groups (e.g. companies and communities). The focus of the Programme intervention was on solutions developed in the projects addressing the challenges in the region. Project partners would need to carry out pilot actions to test these solutions together with their target groups. The Programme would continue and intensify the capitalisation activities, among others, through project platforms. The result and output indicators of the 2021-2027 Programme would measure the Programme achievements directly on the level of target groups of the projects. The new Programme continued its support to the PACs and the close cooperation with the coordinators of the EUSBSR. It was expected that most of the Programme projects will contribute to the implementation of the EUSBSR.

Status	Name	Fund	Year of finalizing evaluation	Type of evaluation	Thematic objective	Topic	Findings (in case of execution)	Follow up (in case of execution)
Executed	Internal Operational Evaluation	ERDF ENI	2020	Process	01 06 07 11	<p>For the year 2020, evaluation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - management structures at programme and project levels - financial performance - programme delivery <p>In particular, the operational evaluation was carried out for 2nd call seed money projects' application, selection and contracting procedures as well as for the project prolongation procedure which the MA/JS introduced to react to the Covid-19 pandemic.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Given the high quality of the seed money applications, it seemed that the efforts made by the MA/JS to support the seed money applicants had been adequate. The assessment procedure was evaluated as adequate as well. - The prolongation procedure (due to Covid-19 pandemic) was a simple and quick change procedure. The MA/JS received a lot of positive feedback from projects. - Positive conclusion on management structures. - Analysing finalised projects' results, most of the outputs belonged to the output type 'reports', the output types 'digital platforms' and 'Handbooks/Guidelines/Manuals'. - the vast majority of finalised projects were successful in reaching their target groups. - The learning experiences in projects demonstrated high transnational relevance. The learning process often took place through the joint development of new tools and methods and through the implementation of practical activities, such as piloting and 	<p>Example of follow-up :</p> <p>Based on the finding that the implementation of practical activities, piloting and testing have a major positive role in leading to learning experiences in the project, the Programme 2021-2027 put further stress on these elements.</p>

							testing activities.	
Executed	Monitoring of the state of institutional capacity in the Interreg Baltic Sea Region (2020)	ERDF ENI	2020	Impact	01 06 07 11	Monitoring and update of result indicators: impact of projects towards specific objectives.	<p>- Institutional capacity in the region was overall good. Out of the five types of capacity assessed, organisations' capability to work in a transnational environment had improved the most.</p> <p>- Although the general situation was satisfactory to good, further progress was hindered by inequalities between countries and types of territories, such as between capital cities and peripheral areas. Capacity development had reached a ceiling and was now hampered by structural factors.</p> <p>- Some challenging factors were detected in establishing knowledge transfer between public and private sectors, developing cross-sectoral approaches, attracting private funding for larger initiatives and spreading benefits equally across the territory.</p> <p>- Knowledge and organisational structures existed but were not fully utilised. In particular, knowledge did not always reach practitioners.</p>	<p>The factors influencing the development of the indicator values were carefully considered in the 2021-27 Programme design. Some factors are out of Programme's control,</p> <p>but the 2021-27 Programme addresses the problem with its focus on practical piloting and on target groups involvement.</p>
Executed	Internal Operational Evaluation	ERDF ENI	2019	Process	01 06 07 11	<p>For the year 2019, evaluation of:</p> <p>- management structures at programme and project</p>	<p>- In the final reporting of first call regular projects and their payments there were delays. The main reason for the delays was the coordination of the reporting and its FLC</p>	<p>Example of follow-up :</p> <p>In 2021-2027 BAMOS continue to be the online reporting tool that the</p>

						<p>levels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - financial performance - programme delivery <p>In particular, the operational evaluation was carried out for monitoring of final reports of regular projects, seed money projects final reports, EUSBSR support projects reports, BAMOS online monitoring system.</p>	<p>at project level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the Seed Money final reports, clarification with the MA/JS was mainly linked to the quality of the outputs - For EUSBSR support projects late submission of reports seemed to have further increased in 2019. - The BAMOS system was regarded as secure and user-friendly. The most important ways of supporting users were the helpdesk (via email), the user manual/handbook, and training sessions provided by MA/JS. - no major findings and related suggestions for improvements for management structures at the project level. 	<p>Programme uses. Further investments have been made to improve it even more and to tailor it to the new Programme set-up and workplan structure.</p>
Executed	Internal Operational Evaluation	ERDF ENI	2019	Process	01 06 07 11	<p>For the year 2018, evaluation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - management structures at programme and project levels - financial performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For the third call of regular projects, the efforts of the MA/JS to give detailed consultations to all applicants were somewhat too high for such an open call. The admissibility and assessment processes went smoothly. The main reasons for prolonged contracting time were severe conditions put on several projects during project approval as well as the time needed to collect all necessary documents as original versions. 	<p>Example of follow-up :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The programme continues to guide applicants and provide individual, detailed consultations to them also in the period 2021-2027. - Given the positive

						<p>- programme delivery</p> <p>- BAMOS</p>	<p>- The monitoring of the 1st and 2nd call projects went smoothly.</p> <p>- The BAMOS system was regarded as secure and user-friendly. The most important ways of supporting users were the helpdesk (via email), the user manual/handbook, and training sessions provided by MA/JS.</p> <p>- The MA/JS reported to the MC and the European Commission in time and provided additional information on Programme implementation.</p> <p>- MA/JS managed the operational programme in accordance with the principle of sound financial Management. However, the Programme spending was behind the original plans. The main reason was that the original spending plan was based on one-step-application procedures for projects instead of running regular calls with a two-step approach.</p>	<p>experience with BAMOS, also in 2021-2027 it continues to be the online reporting tool that the Programme uses. Further investments have been made to improve it even more and to tailor it to the new Programme set-up and workplan structure.</p>
Executed	Mid-term evaluation of Interreg Baltic Sea Region Programme impact	ERDF ENI	2018	Impact	01 06 07 11	<p>Evaluation of:</p> <p>- involvement of different types of partners</p> <p>- contribution to</p>	<p>- The main benefits of participating in Interreg Baltic Sea Region were generating and adopting new knowledge. The benefits that Interreg Baltic Sea Region project partners mostly highlight are learning from other regions/countries, new contacts and access to networks, learning in a specific thematic field and learning with practical</p>	<p>Findings were considered for programming the 2021-2027 Programme. In particular :</p> <p>- the learning process through transnational exchange and increased</p>

					<p>EUSBSR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - effectiveness of programme support for EUSBSR coordination - communication strategy - performance of the MA/JS and - Monitoring and update of result indicators: impact of projects towards specific objectives 	<p>examples and applications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Projects were progressing adequately towards results and expected achievements. - Private for-profit partners brought certain benefits to a project, including, for instance, the transfer of project results into practice, a wider distribution of project results and practical ‘on-the-ground’ knowledge. - In Baltic Sea Region Programme 2014-2020, compared to the Programme 2007-2013, the share of public authorities project partners dropped. - Given the thematic alignment and character of IBSR projects, most IBSR projects contributed to the implementation of EUSBSR in one or more thematic areas. - The Programme was widely effective or even very effective in achieving its general communication objectives. - The Monitoring Committee members were generally very satisfied with the work of the MA/JS and regarded it as very professional and competent. 	<p>institutional capacities are considered the main results to which projects under the Programme lead to (by new knowledge, new procedures and tools, new skills, workflows, and organisational structures) and this is the main contribution that the Programme aims at bringing to the region also in the 2021-2027 period;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in the 2021-2027 Programme a stronger focus is put on the transfer of project results into practice and on piloting testing activities to lead to this; - a stronger focus on public authorities was set in the 2021-27 Programme ; - in 2021-2027 the projects’ alignment with the EUSBSR is even more structured and the EUSBSR governance is more involved in providing projects advice and guidance.
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---

								Projects' contribution to the EUSBSR actions is included in the application form.
Executed	Internal Operational Evaluation	ERDF ENI	2017	Process	01 06 07 11	<p>For the year 2017, evaluation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - management structures at programme and project levels - financial performance - programme delivery <p>The operational evaluation, in particular, covered the assessment of the 2nd call regular projects in priorities 1-3 and contracting of selected projects, advice to applicants and assessment of applications for EUSBSR coordination support in priority 4, BAMOS online monitoring system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Based on the division of lead partners and partners among the Programme countries, and the overall number of applications with sufficient quality, it could be concluded that support to applicants in the 2nd call was sufficient. - The assessment went smoothly. - The contracting of the 2nd call regular projects went quite smoothly. - The monitoring process of on-going projects went smoothly. There were no weak points of the process and all reports were paid in time. - BAMOS systems worked in general properly. The system was regarded as secure and user-friendly. The help on the system was adequate - MA/JS managed the operational programme in accordance with the principle of sound financial Management. However, the Programme spending lacked behind the original plans. The main reason was that the 	The positively evaluated procedures were continued during the 2014-2020 period.

							original spending plan was based on one-step-application procedures for projects instead of running regular calls with a two-step approach.	
Executed	Internal Operational Evaluation	ERDF ENI	2016	Process	01 06 07	<p>For the year 2016, evaluation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - management structures at programme and project levels - financial performance - programme delivery <p>In particular, the operational evaluation concerned the first call for projects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Based on the division of lead partners and partners among the Programme countries, and the overall number of applications with sufficient quality, it could be concluded that support to applicants was sufficient. - Both the admissibility check and assessment were assessed as adequate. The resources used for the assessment were high, but the process was well manageable for the staff. 	The positively evaluated procedures were continued during the 2014-2020 period.
Executed	Internal Operational Evaluation	ERDF ENI	2015	Process	01 06 07 11	<p>For the year 2015, evaluation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - management structures at programme and project levels - financial performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All the required procedures related to the support of applicants and the assessment of applications were in place, functioning properly, and according to the legal framework. - The approval rate among those projects that received consultation at the full application stage was higher than among those that did not receive consultation. 	The positively evaluated procedures were continued during the 2014-2020 period.

						- programme delivery	- In priority 4, more individual support and guidance of applicants could be implemented due to the smaller number of applicants.	
Executed	Final Programme impact evaluation	ERDF ENI	2022	Impact	01 06 07	<p>Evaluation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - process of institutional capacity building under Programme priorities 1-3 - influence of the type of territory on projects - impact of project platforms - impact of online cooperation in projects and - Monitoring and update of result indicators: impact of projects towards specific objectives 	<p>The overall picture of the institutional capacity showed positive changes compared to 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most important factors to increase the institutional capacity were partners' expertise and experience, partners' diversity, their networks with the target groups and their level of engagement. - The main hindrances were engaging and involving some target groups (e.g., SME) in the activities and their insufficient capacity to internalise the changes/ maintain results. - Different target groups require customised approach. - There was a need for interventions to be less concentrated in urban, more developed areas and to focus more on the involvement of actors. However, not all the topics addressed by the Programme are suited to be addressed in all different types of territories. - Public authorities played in the project platforms bigger role than they usually do in 	<p>The evaluation was concluded once the 2021-2027 Programme was already agreed and started its implementation. The findings of the evaluation could, therefore, not be used for the Programming. Nevertheless, some considerations followed up on the findings. For instance :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - findings concerning factors influencing institutional capacities are considered when guiding applicants and in the assessment of the applications (partnership, target groups involvement) ; - the 2021-2027 Programme indicators on solutions uptake by organisations and on increased institutional capacities can help projects in better planning so that

							<p>regular projects.</p> <p>- Online cooperation, due to the pandemic, reduced cohesion, limited the possibilities for cooperation and negatively influenced the development of networks with other projects or stakeholders. However, online dissemination events helped projects reach new and broader audiences.</p>	<p>their results will be finally used by the target groups;</p> <p>- stronger focus, also through communication, is put on public authorities involvement;</p> <p>- online means of cooperation are continued, in addition to the live-mode (both in the projects and in the Programme-projects communication)</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

10.2 The results of the information and publicity measures of the Funds carried out under the communication strategy

Attracting applicants

The Programme promoted funding opportunities to attract applicants in all open calls. The Programme opening conference took place in 2014 in Warsaw, Poland. On-spot info seminars, lead applicant seminars, project development seminars and direct consultations were complemented by online activities, such as LinkedIn partner search group and promotion via website, newsletter, LinkedIn and Twitter.

To further support the applicants, the Programme held a joint applicant seminar of the Interreg CENTRAL EUROPE in Katowice, Poland, in 2015. Specific development seminars were held in 2017 and 2018 for the project platforms.

The participating countries supported applicants with websites, documents, and information activities, e.g., via a national contact point.

Support to projects

The Programme actively supported projects along their implementation stages by, e.g.:

- Providing 140 project logos (regular projects; extension stage projects; project platforms)
- Providing templates for office documents, posters, plaques and billboards as well as 140 individual project postcards
- Organising communication seminars (2016; 2017; 2019; 2020) combined with training, e.g. on target group segmentation; modern conferencing formats; storytelling, video interviews or target group involvement
- Providing guidance documents (e.g. on design; target group involvement) and tutorials (e.g. on storytelling)
- Providing continuous support on visibility requirements

In addition, the participating countries supported project implementation with communication activities at national level, e.g., with information events or via a

national contact point.

Making achievements visible

The Programme primarily used the project library (www.interreg-baltic.eu/projects) to compile and disseminate Programme achievements on the level of individual projects. The pages were upgraded with highlights in the middle of implementation. Once regular/extension stage projects and project platforms were completed, their corresponding pages were updated with a new teaser and a new project summary. Final conclusions were added to the pages, providing a comprehensive overview of project achievements, impacts, follow-ups and spin-off activities. A list of outputs and their descriptions were uploaded to the project library, too. The Programme furthermore added to the library multimedia products provided by projects, such as website links, videos, social media streams. All in all, by the end of the Programme, the project library hosted 176 projects featuring regular/extension stage projects, projects, project platforms and seed money projects, and included as many as 376 outputs. The Programme decided to keep the project library in the new programming period to ensure continuity and easy access to project results.

In addition, every year, around 30 articles were published on the website, with around half of them featuring a project story, usually in reportage style. A new format of proof points, compiled for seven fields of activity, concisely explained the contribution of the Programme (via one or several projects) to solve specific challenges in selected fields. They were published on the Programme website and in print publications.

The Programme actively used several communication channels, including the website, social media and newsletters (circulated approx. every 2 months), to communicate project achievements, e.g.:

- Individual postcards for regular/extension stage projects, project platforms disseminated at events (2016-2022)
- A country-based social media campaign in national languages, promoting project achievements in respective countries (2020)
- A social media campaign based on compelling banners, promoting achievements of completed projects (2021-2022)
- Dissemination of postcards of first finalised projects among 533 individuals/organisations: MC, EUSBSR stakeholders, European Commission, European Parliament, Committee of Regions, region's representations in Brussels (2020)

- Campaign among city mayors on Interreg benefits for cities and communities (2021)
- “Interreg voices” videos with beneficiaries & decision makers on Interreg achievements (10 videos) (starting 2019)
- Contributions to campaigns/initiatives like #InterregAndMe, RegioStars, Project Slam, Interreg Cooperation Day, podcast “This is Interreg” (project cities.multimodal featured in 2019)
- Two photo competitions among projects (2019; 2020)

Project and Programme results were disseminated at several meetings, examples of major ones:

- Each Annual Forum of the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region
- BSSSC Annual Conferences (e.g. 2015; 2016; 2017, 2019; 2020, 2021)
- European Week of Regions and Cities in Brussels (e.g. joint exhibition and session in 2018, exhibitions in 2019 and 2020)

In addition, the Programme attended other pan-Baltic and EU-wide events to present the Programme and project achievements.

The event highlight was the Programme Conference held in Lübeck, Germany, in April 2019. with approx. 300 participants, run under the motto “Let’s talk about achievements”. In multiple sessions, participants dived deep into project achievements to discover #MadeWithInterreg impacts and synergies. The hands-on concept actively engaged half of the participants in sessions, strengthening the ties within the Interreg family: partners, beneficiaries and country representatives.

The Programme undertook several joint actions with other TN programmes in order to communicate the added value of TN cooperation. Examples of joint actions:

- “Ten things to know about TN cooperation” booklet (2018), later complemented by IBSR with „Things to know about transnational cooperation in the Baltic Sea region”
- A joint exhibition stand #MadeWithInterreg at the European Week of Regions and Cities by 12 Interreg transnational programmes, dedicated to benefits of transnational cooperation. The Programme was also among the co-organisers of the workshop "Idea lab on the future of transnational cooperation" (2018)
- A joint article in DG Regio Panorama magazine (2019) – IBSR in lead
- #InterregTalks campaign with MEPs & CoR members on the added value of TN Interreg (IBSR held an interview with German MEP Niklas Nienass) (2020)
- A joint storymap featuring Interreg TN programmes & their achievements (2020) – IBSR in lead

Facilitating good administration

In order to keep the MC informed about project achievements, MC regularly received project snapshots with recent developments in projects. Moreover, both highlights by mid-term and final conclusions listing main achievements, highlights and spin activities were compiled and shared with MC.

To harmonise visibility support among MA/JS officers when receiving requests from projects, a guidance document was compiled with frequently occurring questions and answers.

11. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION WHICH MAY BE ADDED DEPENDING ON THE CONTENT AND OBJECTIVES OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME (ARTICLE 14(4), SUBPARAGRAPH 2 (A), (B), (C) AND (F), OF REGULATION (EU) No 1299/2013)

11.1. Progress in the implementation of the integrated approach to territorial development, including integrated territorial investments, sustainable urban development, and community led local development under the cooperation programme

The Programme applied an integrated approach to territorial development by building on the territorial assets of the region. Project proposals should, as far as possible, address territorial challenges and consider relevant territorial development policies as well as regional conditions of envisaged actions. They should also consider their implications and impacts on other sectors in the given territories. Specific objectives ‘1.3 Non-technological innovation’ and 3.2 - ‘Accessibility of remote areas and areas affected by demographic change’ were particularly open for integrated, cross-sectoral approaches to territorial development.

Project applications were assessed for their relevance in terms of their contribution to policies or strategies relevant to the Programme area. Furthermore, project partnerships were assessed on their cross-sectoral approach and whether organisations from relevant sectors are involved and whether the partnership allowed for a multidisciplinary approach.

The final Programme evaluation included the question of the influence of the type of territories on projects. The evaluation concluded that the location of the project partners had an influence on the topics and activities in the projects. Further, the evaluation showed that projects that successfully included partners from rural areas implemented pilot activities addressing specific needs and challenges on the local level (e.g. mobility and public services).

In addition, the Programme continued its support of the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (see section 11.3 for details).

Community-led development, integrated actions for sustainable urban development and integrated territorial investments were not applicable to the Programme.

11.2 Progress in implementation of actions to reinforce the capacity of authorities and beneficiaries to administer and to use the ERDF

In the Programme, actions to reinforce the capacity of authorities and beneficiaries to administer and use the ERDF are implemented in Priority 4 linked to the support to the macro-regional strategy for the Baltic Sea Region; therefore, reference is made to sections 3.1, 9.1, and to section 11.3.

11.3 Contribution to macro-regional and sea basin strategies (where appropriate)

As stipulated by the Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013, recital 19, article 8(3)(d) on the "Content, adoption and amendment of cooperation programmes" and article 14(4) 2nd subparagraph (c) "Implementation reports", this programme contributes to MRS(s) and/or SBS:

The Programme significantly contributed to the EUSBSR by co-financing flagships and other projects supporting the Strategy. In total, 145 projects brought over EUR 155 million ERDF to the implementation of the EUSBSR action plan, along various stages: project generation, project implementation and development of solutions, as well as results' capitalisation for policy development.

The major contribution came from co-financing regular projects that delivered solutions and further outcomes to the Strategy's policy areas. Out of 105 regular projects approved under thematic priorities 1-3, 59 were labelled as (parts of) EUSBSR flagships. Of these, 18 continued with an extension stage of 1-2 years with a stronger focus on implementation. Overall, the projects contributed to progress in all but one EUSBSR policy areas and at least two horizontal actions. For example, the projects developed solutions for nutrient management at wastewater facilities and farms in line with actions of policy areas Bioeconomy and Nutri. The projects also supported the implementation of smart specialisation strategies in line with actions of policy area Innovation.

Furthermore, the Programme supported the implementation of the EUSBSR action plan through project platforms, which linked the results of EU-funded projects to policy development in various thematic areas. Coordinators from ten EUSBSR policy areas played an active role in these platforms, triggering important policy changes. For example, BSR WATER and SuMaNu platforms with the coordinators of the policy areas Nutri, Bioeconomy and Hazards helped develop the new Baltic Sea Regional Nutrient Recycling Strategy of the Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission. The Blue Platform together with the coordinators of the policy areas Bioeconomy and Innovation developed the roadmap that drives the development of the blue bioeconomy in the region beyond 2021.

The Programme also supported the generation of projects relevant to the EUSBSR. In total, 59 plans for new projects were developed, and at least half of them were realised in larger projects with secured funding, amounting to over EUR 87 million. The three main funding instruments successfully utilised were Interreg (e.g., Baltic Sea Region, Central Baltic), Horizon Europe, and the LIFE programmes. Partnerships continued to seek funding based on established collaborations during the 2021-2027 funding period.

Highlights of the achievements and outputs of these projects and platforms are published in the Programme's project library: <https://interreg-baltic.eu/projects/>.

Beyond content contributions, the Programme supported the governance structures, communication, and capacity-building of the Strategy. Over EUR 12 million ERDF was committed to the specific objective "Coordination of macro-regional cooperation," with a major contribution of EUR 9.1 million to

supporting PAC and HAC coordination activities. With the Programme support, all PACs and HACs initiated relevant activities, supported the implementation of PA and HA actions, activated PA and HA steering groups, mobilised and engaged stakeholders. The Programme also co-funded seven EUSBSR Annual Forums from 2016-2022, with over EUR 1.7 million ERDF. These Forums served as a meeting place for EUSBSR organisations and stakeholders, stimulating policy discussions and disseminating results. Finally, the Programme co-funded communication and capacity-building activities with EUR 1.2 million ERDF.

- ⚙ EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR)
- ☐ EU Strategy for the Danube Region (EUSDR)
- ☐ EU Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region (EUSAIR)
- ☐ EU Strategy for the Alpine Region (EUSALP)
- ☐ Atlantic Sea Basin Strategy (ATLSBS)

Objective(s), policy area(s) and horizontal action(s) that the programme is relevant to:

	Objectives
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 - Save the Sea
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 - Connect the Region
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 - Increase Prosperity
	Policy areas
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.1 - Bioeconomy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.2 - Culture
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.3 - Education
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.4 - Energy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.5 - Hazards
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.6 - Health
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.7 - Innovation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.8 - Nutri
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.9 - Safe
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.10 - Secure
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.11 - Ship
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.12 - Tourism
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.13 - Transport
	Horizontal actions
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.1 - Capacity
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.2 - Climate
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.3 - Neighbours
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.4 - Spatial planning

Actions or mechanisms used to better link the programme with the EUSBSR

A. Are macro-regional coordinators (mainly National Coordinators, Policy Area Coordinators, Horizontal Action Coordinators, or members of the Steering Committees/Coordination Groups) participating in the Monitoring Committee of the programme?

Yes ☐ No ☒

B. In selection criteria, have extra points been attributed to specific measures supporting the EUSBSR?

Yes ☒ No ☐

a) Are targeted calls for proposals planned in relation to EUSBSR

Yes ☒ No ☐

b) How many macro-regional projects/actions are already supported by the programme? (Number)

	193
--	-----

c) Were extra points/bonus given to a project/action with high macro-regional significance or impact? If yes, please elaborate (1 specific sentence)

The Programme encouraged particularly flagship projects of the Action Plan thematically relevant to the Programme to apply. If several applications were demonstrating the same level of quality according to the quality assessment criteria of the Programme, priority was given to the flagship project.

d) Other actions (e.g. planned strategic projects). Please elaborate (1 specific sentence)

The Programme encouraged project platforms to establish cooperation with the relevant coordinators of the policy areas of the EUSBSR and link platform activities and outcomes to policy processes in the region in the framework of the Strategy. All platforms supported the implementation of the EUSBSR Action Plan.
--

C. Has the programme invested EU funds in the EUSBSR?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Approximate or exact amount in Euro invested in the EUSBSR:

ERDF	167,314,401.78
CF	
ESF	
EAFRD	
EMFF	
ENI	2,085,391.84
any other funds	4,877,713.63
name of "any other funds"	Norwegian Funds (EUR 2,792,321.80) and Russian Funds (EUR 2,085,391.84)

D. Obtained results in relation to the EUSBSR (n.a. for 2016)

The Programme's projects contributed to the implementation of all EUSBSR policy areas except for one (tourism). The biggest contribution was to PA Innovation with 18 flagship projects and 2 platforms. Highlights of the achievements and outputs of the projects are published in the project library <https://interreg-baltic.eu/projects/> Project platforms were implemented under 10 PAs. The final evaluation of the Programme concluded that all project platforms were successful in influencing a policy change, e.g. their recommendations were considered in elaborating new policy documents. The involvement of the PA coordinators was one of the success factors for project platforms to succeed in policy building. At least 30 out of 1st and 2nd call seed money projects had received funding for their main projects amounting to EUR 87 million. The Programme funding for the coordination and communication of the EUSBSR was essential to PACs' work and to engage stakeholders and communicate EUSBSR.

E. Does the programme address the EUSBSR sub-objectives (with corresponding to specific targets and indicators) as stated in the "EUSBSR Action Plan"? (Please specify the target and the indicator)

The Programme expected that the projects that had been selected as flagships of the different policy areas contribute to the sub-objectives of the EUSBSR. The linking of single projects to the targets and indicators of the EUSBSR is however done by the PA coordinators.

11.4 Progress in the implementation of actions in the field of social innovation

From 2014 to 2020, Interreg Baltic Sea Region Programme made significant strides in social innovation, focusing on meeting social needs more effectively than existing solutions. This involved new social practices that emerged from areas such as working conditions, education, community development, and health, with the overarching goal of strengthening civil society. Social innovation was embedded across different topics of the Programme and is exemplified by a sample of projects representing various specific objectives.

Under Objective 1.3, the Programme addressed social innovation with projects like **BaltCityPrevention**, **BaltSe@nioR**, **SEMPRE**, **EmPaci**, **Healthy Boost**, and **UrbCulturalPlanning**.

For example, **BaltCityPrevention** enhanced municipal prevention work through innovative approaches to lifestyle-related diseases, leading to healthier urban environments and reduced healthcare costs. Complementary project **Healthy Boost** worked on improved health promotion activities in small and medium-sized municipalities through the concept of urban labs.

BaltSe@nioR developed smart furniture and interior design solutions tailored to seniors, directly involving them in the design and testing phases. This initiative improved the quality of life for seniors and promoted collaboration between researchers, designers, and businesses, resulting in practical solutions that met real needs.

SEMPRE empowered marginalised groups by enhancing social services through participatory methods. By involving service users in the development and delivery of services, **SEMPRE** promoted a sense of ownership and empowerment, leading to greater social inclusion.

UrbCulturalPlanning integrated cultural activities into urban planning processes, creating more vibrant, inclusive, and sustainable cities. By engaging artists, cultural practitioners, and local communities, the project nurtured social cohesion and creativity, making urban areas more attractive and livable.

Under Objective 2.2, the **Co2mmunity** project promoted energy-efficient and climate-friendly practices in local communities. By engaging residents, local businesses, and authorities in reducing carbon emissions and improving energy efficiency, **Co2mmunity** cultivated a collective responsibility towards sustainability.

The **MAMBA** project under Objective 3.2 addressed mobility challenges in remote and rural areas. Demand-responsive transport and mobility as a Service improved access to essential services, enhancing the quality of life for residents in isolated regions. Community engagement was key, with local stakeholders

actively involved in planning and implementation.

Objective 3.5 focused on environmentally friendly urban mobility, exemplified by the **GreenSAM** project. GreenSAM targeted senior citizens, involving them in developing green transportation solutions. By addressing mobility needs and overcoming psychological barriers, the project increased the acceptance of eco-friendly mobility options among the elderly, promoting sustainable urban transport and enhancing social inclusion.

Throughout the 2014-2020 period, the Interreg Baltic Sea Region Programme demonstrated a strong commitment to social innovation by engaging diverse target groups, including seniors, marginalized communities, and residents of remote areas. These initiatives not only improved health services, mobility solutions, and urban planning but also promoted a sense of community and collective responsibility.

13. SMART, SUSTAINABLE AND INCLUSIVE GROWTH

Information and assessment of the programme contribution to achieving the Union strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.

In line with the Union strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, the overall objective of the Programme was to strengthen the integrated territorial development and cooperation for a more innovative, better accessible and sustainable Baltic Sea Region. As a more direct reference framework for the Programme strategy, a wide range of Baltic Sea region specific strategies were used, in particular the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region, which was translating core objectives of the Union strategy to the macro-regional level.

The added value of the Programme in delivering towards the Union and the regional strategies was related to the transnational benefits of the supported actions and investments. The Programme responded to opportunities and risks which cannot (sufficiently) be dealt with by single countries but require a joint response by partners from several countries from the Baltic Sea Region. Furthermore, in line with the Union priority of inclusive growth, the Programme contributed to territorial cohesion and to a higher degree of territorial integration in the Baltic Sea Region. In line with the Territorial Agenda 2020 of the EU, the Programme followed a place-based approach, i.e. its projects were implemented in both sectoral and territorial contexts.

Considering the financial volume, territory covered, and specificity of transnational cooperation, the Programme could not finance large-scale investments. Instead, the Programme's intervention aimed to develop a leverage effect on regional development by investing in the institutional capacities of the Programme's target groups (as defined in the Cooperation Programme for each specific objective). Improved institutional capacity in the Programme context was understood as: 1) enhanced institutionalised knowledge and competence; 2) improved governance structures and organisational set-up; 3) more efficient use of human and technical resources (databases, technical solutions, small infrastructure, etc.); 4) better ability to attract new financial resources; and 5) increased capability to work in a transnational environment.

The three interrelated Union priorities, smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, were addressed across the Programme priorities.

The institutional capacity building through transnational cooperation in projects in Programme priority 1 contributed to all three priorities: smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. Projects improved the capacity of research and innovation structures and their users in the region, such as the capacity of incubators and SMEs to improve their performance and services as well as better coordination and management of infrastructures for more equal distribution and better interconnection. These projects enabled the market uptake of innovations by creating stronger links between R&I institutions, SMEs, and other stakeholders. Under the smart specialisation objective, the projects facilitated the application of smart specialisation strategies that aligned regional strengths with emerging global trends and untapped potential, among others, in the bioeconomy and circular economy, including digital transformation. They improved policy tools to implement smart specialisation strategies and innovation.

For non-technological innovation, the Programme made significant progress in recognising and promoting the potential of non-technological innovation in

the Baltic Sea region. Historically, innovation support mechanisms in the Baltic Sea Region have focused on technological advancements, often overlooking non-technological innovations. To address this gap, the Programme created a more inclusive innovation environment that integrated both technological and non-technological aspects. The success factor for non-technological innovation projects was the ability to “hit the right needs” for target groups. Key achievements of the projects included innovation in business models, social innovation, eco-innovation, and creative industries, thereby enabling technologically lagging regions to boost their innovation capacity. The Programme often addressed societal challenges while linking them with creating business opportunities, balancing social impact with economic growth.

Some projects incorporated elements of resilience building in line with the Union priority of inclusive growth. This concerned, in particular, sustaining businesses in difficulties and looking for successors. Additionally, the Programme explored how to model smart specialisation approaches to achieve macro-regional growth and sustain the economy in the long term. In parallel, some projects identified possibilities of local sourcing of goods as a way to strengthen economies and societies. These attempts showcased the feasibility of resilience building in a transnational context that was picked up in the follow-up Programme 2021-2027.

Circular economy gained prominence during the Programme implementation. Several projects across different Programme objectives addressed it. Project partnerships supported regional stakeholders in promoting circularity. They helped translate national and regional smart specialisation strategies into practical approaches for the regions. Additionally, the Programme promoted public procurement as a means to create demand for circular products and services, and offered support to businesses to create such offers. In parallel, some projects advanced circularity in their sectors e.g. reusing specific waste, or offering solutions supporting circularity in transport. These first attempts showed opportunities as well as some limitations of circularity that are further explored in the Programme 2021-2027.

Sustainable growth was in the focus of priority 2. The Baltic Sea and the other waters in the region are core resources for any development in the region. Securing their environmental quality and sustainable use was a central topic in the Programme. The Programme supported local and regional authorities in building up competences to prevent water pollution in urban and rural areas, develop agri-environmental measures for farms as well as administrative procedures on oil spill response. Pilot investments showcased how the application of new technologies supported water protection. Authorities and businesses worked together to decrease discharges of hazardous substances, including pharmaceuticals, into the sea, manage underwater munitions, and remove marine litter. In urban areas, small businesses and households were taught to avoid hazardous substances in their daily consumption.

Furthermore, priority 2 projects prominently addressed energy efficiency and renewable energy production. The Programme recognised the need to build capacity for utilising renewable energy, aligning with the region’s natural assets, such as bio-based resources and wind energy. This was complemented by targeted measures to improve energy efficiency, addressing challenges from outdated infrastructure to energy-intensive practices. Together, these aspects reflected a holistic response to the region's territorial needs, integrating environmental and economic priorities. The projects supported public authorities, businesses and communities in testing and applying solutions for renewable energy production, energy efficiency in cities as well as distributing these

concepts to the local and regional levels.

In many cases, the Union priorities for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth appeared in combination. This was true in particular for the blue growth topics, which were explicitly linking the objective to use marine resources as impetus for development of entrepreneurship and the creation of new businesses and jobs while preventing overexploitation of maritime resources and securing the long-term sustainability of the ecosystem services. The projects supported biotechnology, aquaculture, fishery and tourism businesses in developing new products from marine resources, with a view to advancing value chains in the region. The Programme also helped regional and national authorities to do better maritime spatial planning, and to investigate how to jointly use the sea space and coastal areas by several sectors. In addition, under priority 3 projects worked with the shipping sector and developed solutions to make shipping more sustainable and cleaner.

Programme Priority 3 contributed to sustainable growth through better resource efficiency in transport and greening of mobility. With the help of diverse partnerships, projects achieved changes in transport practices and provided solutions for clean fuels in transport, multimodal transport and digitalisation. Targeting demographic challenges and geographical isolation projects improved sustainable connectivity for remote regions. These included applying cost-effective and innovative solutions to enhance local accessibility while ensuring environmental and economic sustainability. In urban areas, projects helped cities adopt their infrastructure to more environmentally friendly solutions. They created multimodal transport systems and facilitated a change in the transport habits of citizens. These projects also promoted e-mobility solutions and facilitated the provision of clean fuels.

In the maritime sector, projects effectively contributed to providing new state-of-the-art digital and technological solutions for navigation and for improving response capacity in case of accidents. The projects helped further bridge the gap between the need for environmental protection and the pursuit of business performance. They supported cooperation and communication between regulators and the shipping industry. Projects also introduced new tools and explored new green solutions for shipping in the Baltic Sea region and other international markets.

14. ISSUES AFFECTING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE PROGRAMME AND MEASURES TAKEN — PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK (ARTICLE 50(2) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013)

Where the assessment of progress made with regard to the milestones and targets set out in the performance framework demonstrates that certain milestones and targets have not been achieved, Member States should outline the underlying reasons for failure to achieve these milestones in the report of 2019 (for milestones) and in the final implementation report (for targets).

The Programme reached the targets as set out in the performance framework.

ANNEX I. LIST OF ALL OPERATIONS PHASED FROM 2014-2020 INTO 2021-2027

Priorit y	Fund	Operation reference	Operation title	Date (and number) of tacit agreement/approval by commission (if major project)	Phased operation under article 118	Phased operation under article 118a	Total cost of operation (in EUR) - Total (for both phases, final or estimated)	Total cost of operation (in EUR) - For the second phase (final or estimated))	Total certified expenditure for the first phase (in EUR)	Public contribution for the first phase (in EUR)	Planned/final completion date of the second phase (year, quarter)	2021-2027 Programme under which the operation will be/was completed
--------------	------	------------------------	--------------------	---	---	---	---	--	---	--	--	--

ANNEX II. LIST OF NON-FUNCTIONING OPERATIONS

Priorit y	Fund	Operation reference	Operation title	Name of the beneficiary / recipient	Total cost of the operation (in EUR)	Total Certified Expenditure (in EUR)	Public contribution (in EUR)
--------------	------	------------------------	--------------------	--	---	---	---------------------------------

ANNEX III. LIST OF OPERATIONS AFFECTED BY ONGOING NATIONAL INVESTIGATIONS / SUSPENDED BY A LEGAL PROCEEDING OR BY AN ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL HAVING SUSPENSORY EFFECT

Priorit y	Fund	Operation reference	Operation title	Name of the beneficiary / recipient	Total Certified Expenditure affected (in EUR)	Public contribution affected (in EUR)	Operation affected by ongoing national investigations	Operation suspended by a legal proceeding or by an administrative appeal having suspensory effect
--------------	------	------------------------	--------------------	---	---	---	---	--

DOCUMENTS

Document title	Document type	Document date	Local reference	Commission reference	Files	Sent date	Sent By
IBSR 2014-2020 - citizens summary for the Final Implementation Report	Citizens' summary	30-Dec-2022			IBSR 2014-2020 - citizens summary for the Final Implementation Report	05-Feb-2025	n005onfb

LATEST VALIDATION RESULTS

[illegible]

Severity	Code	Message
Warning	2.54.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered for "F" (implemented) is 237.44% of the annual total value entered for "S" (forecast from selected) for priority axis: 2, investment priority: 6b, indicator: CO04, year: 2023. Please check.
Warning	2.54.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered for "F" (implemented) is 242.31% of the annual total value entered for "S" (forecast from selected) for priority axis: 2, investment priority: 6g, indicator: PSO04, year: 2022. Please check.
Warning	2.54.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered for "F" (implemented) is 242.31% of the annual total value entered for "S" (forecast from selected) for priority axis: 2, investment priority: 6g, indicator: PSO04, year: 2023. Please check.