



Assessment Sheet

1. Identification

1.1 Name	Enabling sustainable multimodal mobility lifestyles for all citizens in functional urban areas
1.2 Short name	MULTI4ALL
1.3 Programme priority	3. Climate-neutral societies
1.4 Programme objective	3.3 Smart green mobility
1.5 Project implementation	36 months

1.6 Project summary (imported from the application)
<p>In functional urban areas (FUAs) across the Baltic Sea Region (BSR) (metropolitan + peri-urban, 75% of population), private motorised traffic keeps being a principal polluter, damaging the climate and environment and affecting citizen's health. To reach climate neutrality goals, regions & cities need sustainable travel patterns across all population groups and for different types of journeys (inner city, peri-urban and across municipal borders). Green multimodality, providing citizens with an ample range of clean and well-connected mobility options, is an effective solution.</p> <p>However, for the mid-distance (5-50km), the existing solutions (multimodal hubs, bike infrastructure & services) leave many user groups behind, and the public authorities (PAs) lack insight into the needs of these non-usual user groups and how to best adjust infrastructure and services to be more inclusive.</p> <p>In MULTI4ALL, Public Authorities and knowledge organisations across 7 BSR countries collaborate to develop, test, & implement an effective methodology for citizen consultation, and a user-centric regional sustainable mobility planning guide. The solutions help mobility planners and developers of regional and local authorities and infrastructure & service providers in the project and throughout the BSR & Europe to better understand and plan for all users - increasing the implementation of accessible and attractive sustainable mobility for all in FUAs and decreasing emissions from the transport sector.</p>

1.7 Financial resources (all amounts in Euro)	Planned project budget
ERDF co-financing	2,278,004.95 €
Own contribution EU partners	569,501.24 €



ERDF budget	2,847,506.19 €
NO co-financing	0.00 €
Own contribution NO partners	0.00 €
NO budget	0.00 €
Total Programme co-financing	2,278,004.95 €
Total own contribution	569,501.24 €
Total budget	2,847,506.19 €

1.8 Project partnership						
No.	Organisation		Partner budget	Programme co-financing	State aid relevance	Took part earlier
1	Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg - District North	DE	634,400.00 €	507,520.00 €	No	No
	Local public authority					
2	Capital Region of Denmark	DK	326,637.50 €	261,310.00 €	No	Yes
	Regional public authority					
3	Metropolitan Area Gdansk-Gdynia-Sopot	PL	248,755.50 €	199,004.40 €	Yes	Yes
	Regional public authority					
4	Helsinki-Ussimaa Regional County	FI	239,128.40 €	191,302.72 €	No	Yes
	Regional public authority					
5	Region Sörmland	SE	298,671.00 €	238,936.80 €	No	No
	Regional public authority					
6	Elsinore Municipality	DK	52,881.40 €	42,305.12 €	No	No
	Local public authority					
7	Municipality of Wroclaw	PL	158,452.05 €	126,761.64 €	No	No
	Local public authority					
8	Kolding Design School	DK	274,407.00 €	219,525.60 €	Yes	Yes
	Higher education and research institution					
9	Nudgd AB	SE	150,126.14 €	120,100.91 €	Yes	No
	Small and medium enterprise					
10	State Regional Development Agency / VASAB Secretariat	LV	126,644.80 €	101,315.84 €	No	Yes



	International governmental organisation					
11	Technical University of Applied Sciences Wildau	DE	156,930.00 €	125,544.00 €	Yes	Yes
	Higher education and research institution					
12	Union of Harju County Municipalities	EE	180,472.40 €	144,377.92 €	No	Yes
	Regional public authority					

1.9 Associated Organisations		
No.	Organisation	Country
1	Region Jönköping County	SE
	Regional public authority	
2	Copenhagenize	FR
	Small and medium enterprise	
3	Ministry of Transport and Communication of the Republic of Lithuania	LT
	National public authority	
4	University of Tartu	EE
	Higher education and research institution	
5	Public body Kaunas Regional Development Agency	LT
	Regional public authority	
6	POLIS	BE
	NGO	
7	Donkey Republic	DK
	Small and medium enterprise	
8	DSB	DK
	Large enterprise	
9	DTU Science Park	DK
	Business support organisation	
10	Hoeje-Taastrup Municipality	DK
	Local public authority	
11	Rudersdal Municipality	DK
	Local public authority	
12	Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg, Ministry for Transport and Mobility Transition	DE
	Local public authority	



13	Hamburger HOCHBAHN AG	DE
	Infrastructure and public service provider	
14	Hamburg Public Transport Association	DE
	Infrastructure and public service provider	
15	District Segeberg	DE
	Regional public authority	
16	Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg, Ministry of Urban Development and Housing	DE
	Local public authority	
17	Hamburg Metropolitan Region Office	DE
	Regional public authority	
18	Hamburg University of Technology	DE
	Higher education and research institution	
19	City of Tallinn	EE
	Local public authority	
20	City of Lohja	FI
	Local public authority	
21	City Hall of Gdańsk	PL
	Local public authority	
22	Polish Union of Active Mobility	PL
	NGO	
23	University of Gdańsk	PL
	Higher education and research institution	
24	The Swedish Transport Administration	SE
	National public authority	
25	Eskilstuna municipality	SE
	Local public authority	
26	The Swedish National Road and Transport Research Institute	SE
	Higher education and research institution	
27	Foundation for European Studies	PL
	NGO	
28	Municipality of Kobierzyce	PL
	Local public authority	

1.10 Project's contribution to the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region	
planned	PA Transport





1.11 Horizontal principles	Project's impact
Sustainable development	positive
Non-discrimination including accessibility	positive
Equality between men and women	positive

1.12 Outputs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Consultation Methodology (for public authorities for consulting non-users on their needs for more intensive use of green multimodal mobility options) The User-centric Multimodal Sustainable Mobility Planning Guide

2. Admissibility check

OUTCOME OF ADMISSIBILITY CHECK
The project passed the admissibility check.

3. Final conclusion and requirements

FINAL CONCLUSION
<p>The proposal does not demonstrate sufficient quality to be approved.</p> <p>The project addresses the challenge of insufficient green multimodal transport options in functional urban areas in the BSR. However, despite aligning with Programme objective, its shortcomings impact its overall quality. A key concern is that the project does not demonstrate added value compared to existing initiatives and lacks clear justification for its niche. While it engages local and regional authorities, it fails to involve infrastructure providers, creating doubts about how these authorities can develop user-centric mobility services independently. Additionally, its fragmented piloting activities lack a cohesive, holistic approach.</p>

REQUIREMENTS FOR APPROVAL
As the project does not demonstrate sufficient quality, no requirements are listed.



Quality assessment		
Scoring system: 5 (very good), 4 (good), 3 (sufficient), 2 (weak), 1 (insufficient)		
I. Relevance of the proposal	SCORE	2
Thematic focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the challenge tackled by the project match the selected Programme objective and the focus of the call? 		
<p>The proposal sufficiently matches the selected Programme objective and the focus of the given call.</p> <p>The challenge addressed by the project is the heavy use of private cars by people commuting to and from functional urban areas (metropolitan + peri-urban) damaging the climate and the health of citizens. This challenge, although very globally described, matches the selected Programme objective, Smart, green mobility as set out in the Programme Document (PD).</p> <p>The project failed, however, to provide specific details regarding the reasons for the limited use of green multimodal transport by the selected users, as well as regarding the challenges municipalities, companies and regions face when trying to solve this challenge and when offering alternative transport modes. Without these details, the understanding of the issue remains superficial, and the proposed solutions risk being ineffective. The project does not delve into the root causes behind the limited adoption of green multimodal transport, such as infrastructure gaps, convenience, or public perception. Additionally, it lacks a clear analysis of the barriers faced by municipalities, companies, and regions in promoting alternative transport modes. This absence of critical context leaves uncertainties about how the project intends to tackle these challenges and drive long-term behavioural change among commuters. As last, without any further justification, the project seems to have taken a limited approach concentrating solely on biking infrastructure without considering the systemic multimodal transportation options that could be made available in these functional areas.</p> <p>The application sufficiently addresses the focus of the call, i.e., the topic of climate change. Even though the project did not elaborate on which thematic aspects of the focus of the call it is specifically targeting, the climate change mitigation element is sufficiently covered by the intention of reducing private car usage in the region and the selected areas of the project partnership.</p>		
Target groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the selected target groups relevant to tackle the identified challenge, e.g. regarding geographical coverage and types of sectors involved? Are the needs of the target groups clearly described? 		
<p>The selected target groups are clearly relevant to tackling the identified challenge. However, the application does not clearly describes the needs of the target groups.</p>		



The selected target groups include local and regional public authorities, as well as infrastructure and public service providers, all of whom are relevant for addressing the identified challenge. Their roles in regional and local mobility planning and infrastructure development are clearly important for improving transport solutions. The need for collaboration among these groups is also well-acknowledged in the application. However, what is less clear are the specific needs of these target groups and the obstacles they face in delivering effective transport solutions. The project does not provide concrete examples of the barriers to collaboration that hinder regional connectivity, nor does it address other challenges these groups encounter. The only specific issue the project elaborates on is the lack of knowledge regarding how to consult non-users and assess their needs.

The geographical coverage of the target groups seems to be appropriate for the proposed challenge. The project selected regional and local authorities from Denmark, Finland, Estonia and Sweden, Germany targeting large functional areas with various level of multimodal transport development levels in each of these countries.

Transnational value

- Does the application clearly explain the need for transnational cooperation to address the identified challenge?

The application sufficiently explains the need for transnational cooperation to address the identified challenge.

The challenge described in the application, specifically the widespread use of private cars by commuters in functional urban areas, may not initially seem to hold high transnational value. Despite of the problem being global, the difficulties usually occur at the local level. However, the project's argument for bringing together areas with different strengths and weaknesses to jointly develop scalable solutions regionally, makes it highly relevant for the Baltic Sea region. By fostering collaboration, regions with less developed green multimodal transport systems can gain valuable insights and engage in peer learning to find the most optimal solutions tailored to their local circumstances. In doing so, they contribute to an improved and more sustainable transport network across the entire region, supporting shared environmental and mobility goals.

Project objective

- Is the planned project objective in line with the needs of the target groups?

The planned project objective is sufficiently in line with the needs of the target groups.

It is sufficiently explained how the project aims to address the needs of the selected target groups. The project aims to "contribute to climate neutrality, reduce pollution, and promote healthier lifestyles by encouraging more people to shift from private motorised transport to green travel options, even for longer distance journeys." To achieve this, the project focuses on meeting the needs of public authorities, infrastructure planners, and public service providers by offering tools to better understand the needs of



non-users. It places particular emphasis on addressing the challenges these users face with existing cycling infrastructure.

Just like the challenge, also the project objective is ambitious—targeting pollution reduction and lifestyle improvement. The further description, however, suggests that the project would largely focus on cycling. The project does not explain the reasoning for narrowing the focus to this specific aspect. Also, while cycling is certainly important for green mobility as well as for healthy lifestyle promotion, it does not equally fit all of the user groups (e.g. elderly, people with disabilities etc.) By reducing the focus to cycling, the project overlooks the need for a more systemic approach to reducing private car usage and searching for different alternatives that would fit the local communities. As last, reducing the broader issue of multimodality to cycling and overlooking other modes of green transport does not seem to be based on consulting with the user groups and assessing their needs, which is the idea underlying the project.

Contribution to the policies and strategies

- Does the project plan to contribute to the implementation of the Action Plan of the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR)?
- Does the project plan to contribute to achieving specific goals or implementing actions of other strategic documents relevant to the Programme area?

The proposal sufficiently contributes to policies and strategies relevant to the Programme area.

The application clearly describes how the project plans to contribute to the implementation of the Action Plan of the EUSBSR. It contributes to the Policy Area PA Transport, Action 2: Development of measures towards climate-neutral and zero-pollution transport through improved use of multimodal transportation systems and 3: Facilitate innovative technologies & solutions in the Baltic Sea region. The project also seems to contribute to PA Innovation Action 1 Challenge-driven innovation and Action 3 Co-creative innovation by "creating solutions that actively involve end-users in the development of sustainable transport and put end-users first when developing sustainable mobility infrastructure and services". The plan of involving the end-users in the project activities would make the project contribute to this action. However, this approach is somewhat contradicted by project's limited initial understanding of the end-users' needs when planning the project and its solutions. The project also plans to contribute to PA Spatial Planning, Action 1: strengthening territorial cohesion in the BSR through land-based spatial planning.

The project plans to contribute to achieving specific goals or implementing actions of other strategic documents relevant to the Programme area. The project plans to contribute to the following strategic documents:

- EU Green Deal
- EU Urban Mobility Framework's goals
- Territorial Agenda 2030 objectives for a Just & Green Europe, Functional Regions and a Healthy Environment

Additional value

- Is it clearly explained how the project plans to build on the outcomes of other projects?



- Does the application demonstrate additional value to implemented and running projects, in particular to the projects of Interreg Baltic Sea Region?
- Is cooperation with other projects planned?

The proposal does not clearly demonstrate additional value to current or already completed projects relevant to the Baltic Sea region.

The application does not clearly explain how outcomes from other projects have been taken into account. While several projects are mentioned—such as Cities.Multimodal (which developed a Planner's Handbook), BATS (focused on year-round active mobility and cycling), and BAB (which has a regional approach to improving cycling across the Baltics)—there is no clear explanation of what gaps the current project has identified in these existing solutions, or how its planned solution addresses those gaps. Considering the number of thematically related projects implemented, the project could have presented a better situation analysis, as well as a deeper understanding of the specific needs of the target groups and end-users.

Although the project mentions learning from and identifying synergies with these initiatives, it remains unclear how the target groups will specifically benefit from the additional consultation methods proposed by the project.

Furthermore, while three other Interreg BSR projects are referenced, the broad range of multimodal transport solutions developed during the 2014-2020 period by Interreg BSR projects seem to have been overlooked. For instance, HupMobile developed an Urban Mobility Stakeholders Engagement Toolkit, which closely resembles the solution proposed by MULTI4ALL. Additionally, projects like MARA, MAMBA, SUMBA, and SUMBA+, which provided comprehensive solutions for urban and peri-urban mobility planning—including extensive work on cycling—do not appear to have been considered.

As a result, the application does not clearly demonstrate how it adds value beyond the implemented and ongoing projects funded by Interreg BSR or other programs and initiatives.

The project plans to cooperate with other projects.

II. Partnership	SCORE	4
------------------------	--------------	----------

Partnership

- Does the partnership have the necessary competence to implement the planned activities and to achieve the planned objective?
- Are the selected target groups involved as partners?
- Are the roles of all partners in project implementation clearly explained?
- Is the involvement of the partners planned in accordance with the requirements of the Programme?
- Are the involvement and responsibilities of the partners in the project planned in a balanced way?
- Are the roles of the associated organisations clearly explained?
- Do the partners have sufficient human and financial capacity?



The partnership seems to have good potential to realise the planned activities and to achieve the planned objective.

The partnership seems to possess relevant competences for implementing the planned project.

The partnership consists of 12 partners from 8 countries.

The partnership includes three local public authorities, five regional public authorities, two higher education and research institutions as knowledge partners, along with one SME and an international governmental organisation. The partners seem to have good competences for implementing the planned project.

While the project's primary target groups—local and regional authorities—are well represented, another important target group of infrastructure and public service providers is missing from the core partnership. However, it is represented by two associated organisations. Given the project's rather more narrow focus on biking, the exclusion of this target group might be somewhat justified. However, considering the broader challenge of enhancing green multimodal transport as identified by the project itself, their essential role should have been acknowledged, and their representation included.

The roles and tasks of all partners in the project implementation are sufficiently explained. For example, the project included information on the involvement of the partners in the various groups of activities.

The involvement of the partners is planned in accordance with the requirements of the Programme.

There are altogether 29 associated organisations in addition to the core partnership of the project. The involvement and responsibilities of the partners in the project are planned in a balanced way. For example, there does not seem to be imbalances in the roles of the partners (e.g. involvement of the partners from different countries in the implementation of activities).

The roles and tasks of associated organisations are sufficiently explained. Their involvement seems to bring additional value to the proposal.

It seems that there are no evident risks in relation to the project partners (private partners in particular).

III. Work plan

SCORE

3

Preparing, piloting and evaluating, transferring solutions

- Do the planned solutions address the identified specific challenge?
- Is there a clear approach on how the project plans to develop or adapt solutions?
- Does the project plan pilots to validate the usefulness of the solutions?
- Does the project evaluate and adjust solutions?
- Does the application present a realistic plan how to communicate and transfer the ready solutions?
- Does the project encourage active and continuous use of the solutions after the project end?



**The overall quality of the work plan presented in the application is sufficient.**

It seems that the planned solutions partly address the identified challenge of increasing the use of green multimodal transportation means in functional urban areas.

The project plans to develop two solutions: a public consultation methodology and a user-centric multimodal mobility planning guide. These solutions are meant to equip public authorities with tools to analyse the mobility needs of the "non-users" (of cycling infrastructure & services and multimodal hubs) and provide tools to respond to these needs. The planned tools seem partly adequate. The main focus of both tools is on biking and multimodal mobility hubs, which only seem to cover parts of the green multimodal transport challenge initially identified by the project. (As mentioned already earlier, the application has not provided justification for the choice of focusing on this particular aspect of mobility.)

There is a clear approach as to how the project plans to develop the solutions. In WP1 the project plans to organise working groups to develop the contents of the consultation and the planning guide for two specific areas – biking and multimodal mobility hubs. These working groups are organised based on the specific interest of each of the participating local or regional authority. It is mentioned that the knowledge beyond the specific working groups will be shared with all partners during peer reviews and meetings. The project also describes the general concept and the content of the two outputs.

The project lacks a comprehensive plan for piloting the solutions to validate their effectiveness. It appears that real-life testing is only planned for the consultation guide, while the planning guide itself will not be fully tested. Instead, only certain pre-defined elements of the recommended actions will be trialled by the participating cities. Additionally, there are unresolved questions regarding how the results of the public consultations will be incorporated into the actual improvements of biking infrastructure or multimodal mobility hubs. Although the piloting activities of the two solutions are planned in sequence, the fact that the project has pre-defined costs and specific solutions to be piloted for the The User-centric Multimodal Sustainable Mobility Planning Guide raises concerns how the project allows the public consultations to influence the selection of these solutions. Hence, the combined use of these two tools as a cohesive, integrated process is not demonstrated.

The project plans to evaluate and adjust solutions. The project dedicated a Group of Activity for the evaluation and feedback collection on the tools from the piloting cities. These actions seem adequate for finalising the planned solutions.

The project outlines plans to communicate its solutions and generally describes uptake plans in the partner countries. For communication, the project proposes to organise webinars to share the results and disseminate experiences and knowledge gained through the developed tools. VASAB is expected to act as a multiplier, helping to reach a broad range of public and regional authorities.

The details regarding the transfer activities are somewhat vague. The project mentions organising national seminars in local languages with the aim of generating eight uptake plans, and it provides examples of potential use cases. However, the practical steps for achieving these uptake plans are not clearly outlined. While it can be assumed that the participation of partner regions and cities reflects the target groups'



commitment to adopting the tools, more concrete information on how they plan to use and integrate these tools into their existing procedures would have been helpful.

Additionally, the project does not clearly outline in the work plan, how the solutions are intended to be used by the cities to maximise impact. For instance, it is unclear whether the solutions should be formally integrated into existing mobility planning guidelines or if they are meant to serve as a voluntary addition to current procedures. This lack of clarity makes it difficult to align the present uptake plans with the original vision for implementation.

Without a clear understanding of how these solutions are expected to function within the cities' frameworks, assessing how realistic or achievable the uptake plans are becomes challenging. Additionally, the project does not clearly explain how it intends to involve its associated organisations in transferring the solutions, which could be ideal candidates for early adoption, considering their interest in the project's outcomes. While the project has considered how to transfer its results, the description of how these steps will be practically and realistically implemented remains vague.

The planned timeline seems realistic to prepare, pilot, evaluate, adjust, communicate and transfer solutions.

The project seems to encourage active and continuous use of the solutions after the project end. The project plans intense awareness-raising activities with the communication plans. However, the information regarding the adoption of the tools by the project partners and, e.g., associated organisations could have been better elaborated to demonstrate how the tools become part of everyday decision-making processes for the participating authorities.

Target groups

- Is the involvement of the target groups well planned in each work package?

The involvement of the target groups is sufficiently planned in the work plan.

The involvement of target groups in the preparation, piloting, evaluation, and transfer of solutions is generally well planned, particularly regarding local and regional public authorities. The project effectively engages these groups in its activities. However, the involvement of infrastructure and public service providers is less evident. The plans to involve the Hamburg Public Transport Association and Hamburger HOCHBAHN AG are somewhat referenced in the work plan. The project also mentions working together with public service providers in Sweden and Denmark but these descriptions remain vague.

While local and regional public authorities will gain new tools and knowledge on user-centric mobility planning, the project's essential collaboration with transport service providers remains underdeveloped. This missing collaboration could limit the effectiveness of the solutions, as key elements like infrastructure improvements and service integration require direct input from these providers in all the participating



countries. Without their active participation, the long-term implementation and scalability of the project's outcomes may be compromised.

Transnational cooperation

- Does the project plan to implement activities and outputs in a transnational setting?

The project sufficiently plans to implement activities and outputs in a transnational setting.

The preparation, piloting, evaluation, and transfer of the solutions are sufficiently planned at a transnational level. For example, the project includes joint workshops for the preparation of solutions. However, during the piloting phase, the participating cities conduct their activities individually, with experience-sharing through peer learning events. This approach is appropriate given the local nature of the infrastructure improvements.

A tandem piloting approach, where cities collaborate more closely in preparation and implementation, could have further enhanced the project. Joint piloting would promote more profound knowledge exchange and ensure that the solutions are more adaptable across diverse local contexts, reinforcing the transnational value of the project.

Output and result indicators

- Does the project contribute to the output and result indicators defined by the Programme?
- Are the targets set by the project realistic?

The project contributes to the following output and result indicators defined by the Programme.

The project plans a contribution to the following indicators:

RCO 84 – Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects 2

RCO 116 – Jointly developed solutions 2

RCO 87 - Organisations cooperating across borders 40

RCR 104 - Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations 2

PSR 1 - Organisations with increased institutional capacity due to their participation in cooperation activities across borders 73

The set targets seem partly to be realistic.

The contribution to RCO 84 and RCO 116, considering the unclear piloting aspect of the user-centric guide, might need revision. Since the piloting of this tool does not seem to follow the requirements of the Programme, it has to be clarified if it counts as a solution. Furthermore, the contribution to PSR1 seems to be overestimated and requires clarification should the project get selected for funding.



IV. Durability	SCORE	2
<p>Durability of the outputs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the use of the developed solutions well planned by partners and other organisations in different countries, also beyond the project end? • Does the developed durability concept include institutional and financial support to keep the outputs functional after the project end? 		
<p>The use of the developed solutions in different countries, also after the project end, is weakly planned in the application.</p> <p>It appears that the target groups will only partially adopt the solution in their daily work after the implementation phase. As noted in several sections, despite the project's strong communication efforts, key aspects of the work plan raise doubts about the durability of the results. For instance, the weak engagement of infrastructure and service providers makes it hard to assess how realistically regional and public authorities can independently develop user-centric mobility services using the tools. Moreover, the project has not clearly outlined how the tools will be integrated into existing processes. Additionally, the project fails to explain how it will practically collaborate with associated organisations to ensure these tools are adopted.</p> <p>The durability concept is weakly described. It does not include institutional and financial support to keep the outputs functional after the project end.</p> <p>The planned outputs will be kept available, and according to the project, they will not require any update. Nevertheless, the responsibilities of the partners in maintaining the results have not been indicated in the durability sections.</p>		
V. Budget	SCORE	3
<p>Budget adequacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the budget appropriate in relation to the planned activities, outputs, results, and involvement of partners? 		
<p>The planned budget seems to be sufficiently in line with the planned activities, outputs, results and involvement of partners.</p> <p>The planned partner budgets seem adequate considering their involvement and responsibilities in the project.</p> <p>Project partners 01/DE, 02/DK, 05/SE and 08/DK planned higher budgets in the project than the overall statistics on LP and project partner budgets. This is partly justified by the items planned in CAT4 External expertise and services and CAT5 Equipment.</p> <p>The planned shares of management and work packages seem adequate considering their importance for the planned outputs/solutions and results</p>		





The planned total budget seems partly adequate considering the planned outputs and results.

The challenge described in the application focuses on the solutions developed, such as the consultation methodology and the User-centric Multimodal Sustainable Mobility Planning Guide. However, the need for these specific solutions is not clearly demonstrated, and the focus on the multimodal aspect appears limited, with much of the work plan centred on cycling. Co-financed projects in Interreg BSR 2014-2020 have already addressed similar topics, and the unique contribution of this project is not fully explained.

Additionally, while the target groups are identified, the application does not clearly show how they would apply these outputs in their daily work or the potential uptake and use of the solutions. The work plan also lacks details on the logical and subsequential piloting of the solutions (e.g. how the results of the public consultations are building into the infrastructure changes included in the practical guide), which makes it difficult to assess the practical value of the consultation methodology and planning guide. Consequently, the adequacy assessment of the project application, based on the realistic, durable and transnational solution and output with added value, leads to the conclusion that the project offers low value for money.

Eligibility

- Are the cost category specifications (external services, equipment, infrastructure and work) precise, clear and justified?
- Are there any indications of ineligible costs in the work plan and/or ineligible project partner structures?
- Have the relevant rules for productive investments/infrastructure been followed?
- Have the State aid rules been followed?

The relevant eligibility rules seem to be partly followed.

The cost categories specifications (external services, equipment, infrastructure and works) are partly precise, clear and justified. There are items planned in the CAT4 External expertise and services which would need further clarification like "local activities support", "Pilot activity support" and several items in CAT5 Equipment are defined on a very general level without needed specification. Further PP08/DK and PP11/DE planned a budget for the controller, although there are no items as real costs planned in the CAT4 External expertise and services and CAT5 Equipment. The planned expenditure in these categories are eligible from the financial point of view.

There are no indications of ineligible costs in the work plan/activities. There are no indications of ineligible project partner structures (e.g. umbrella partnership, hidden partner organisations).

Productive or infrastructure investments are not planned in the project.

The State aid rules relevant to the application stage have been followed.

The basis for the State aid assessment is the ex-ante assessment of State aid risks associated with the types of project partners and their activities. Furthermore, the MA/JS carried out a partner and plausibility check in accordance with the rules of the Programme Manual.



As part of this procedure, the MA/JS looked at the State aid relevance of project partners no. 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 10 and 12 with a low risk of implementing State aid relevant activities to ensure that these partners indeed comply with the State aid rules.

The MA/JS did not carry out plausibility checks for project partners no. 08 and 11 with medium to high risk for implementing State aid relevant activities as they did not request it in the application.

The MA/JS concluded that

- The project partners listed as State aid relevant in section 1.8 of the Assessment sheet carry out State aid relevant activities.

