



Assessment Sheet

1. Identification

1.1 Name	Campus-area Mobility Hub, Promoting Green Mobility Solutions in Baltic Sea Region
1.2 Short name	ProGreS
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>The challenge ProGreS tackles is the multifaceted impact of campus mobility. In urban areas with campuses, there's often a high volume of traffic and commuting both from personal mobility and deliveries, and universities are key players in reducing related emissions. As sources of innovation and best practices, universities can be role models for urban communities. In order to live up to this pioneering role and obligations to sustainability, the ProGreS partners with a geographical coverage from south to north will jointly develop a comprehensive solution and Toolkit for green and smart mobility of university campuses in the Baltic Sea Region and beyond.</p> <p>The specific objectives are reducing the impact of traveling to, from and at campus areas, promoting carbon-free shift of mobility, encouraging more sustainable travel choices among campus commuters with maximised accessibility and safety, exploring the possibilities of nudging as an overall approach for the solution, integrating the campus areas to local and regional urban and transport planning, contributing to sustainability and efficiency of transportation with more efficient use of spatial and monetary resources, and distributing the solution to be adapted by wider stakeholder networks.</p> <p>The long-term goal is to facilitate the change in behaviour needed for greening the mobility around university campuses, leading to significant decrease of GHG emissions and improved capability of climate neutrality and resilience.</p>

1.7 Financial resources (all amounts in Euro)	Planned project budget
ERDF co-financing	1,411,052.72 €
Own contribution EU partners	352,763.18 €



ERDF budget	1,763,815.90 €
NO co-financing	0.00 €
Own contribution NO partners	0.00 €
NO budget	0.00 €
Total Programme co-financing	1,411,052.72 €
Total own contribution	352,763.18 €
Total budget	1,763,815.90 €

1.8 Project partnership						
No.	Organisation		Partner budget	Programme co-financing	State aid relevance	Took part earlier
1	South-Eastern Finland University of Applied Sciences Ltd	FI	532,888.00 €	426,310.40 €	No	Yes
	Higher education and research institution					
2	Tallinn University of Technology	EE	636,330.00 €	509,064.00 €	Yes	Yes
	Higher education and research institution					
3	University of Skövde	SE	175,347.90 €	140,278.32 €	Yes	No
	Higher education and research institution					
4	Karlsruhe University of Applied Sciences	DE	419,250.00 €	335,400.00 €	Yes	No
	Higher education and research institution					

1.9 Associated Organisations		
No.	Organisation	Country
1	City of Kotka	FI
	Local public authority	
2	Municipality of Skövde	SE
	Local public authority	
3	Skaraborg Municipal Association	SE
	Local public authority	



4	NBS Northern Business School gGmbH	DE
	Higher education and research institution	
5	Tallinn Transport Department	EE
	Local public authority	
6	City of Karlsruhe	DE
	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	neutral	
1.12 Output		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Toolkit for green and smart campus mobility 		

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 sustainable transportation and climate protection on university campuses, aligning well with the Programme objective. However, it fails to explain why existing green mobility tools are inadequate for university settings or what added value the proposed toolkit would bring. Moreover, the engagement with the target groups beyond universities is weak, and the piloting actions lack clarity and details on the practical steps taken to test the usefulness of the solution. There are also concerns about the toolkit's long-term sustainability and uptake by the target groups after the project's finalisation. Even the participating universities do not declare commitment to adopt the toolkit beyond the project.</p>

REQUIREMENTS FOR APPROVAL



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

<h3>Quality assessment</h3> <p>Scoring system: 5 (very good), 4 (good), 3 (sufficient), 2 (weak), 1 (insufficient)</p>		
I. Relevance of the proposal	SCORE	2
<p>Thematic focus</p> <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 weakly matches the selected Programme objective and the focus of the given call.</p> <p>The challenge addressed seems to evolve around sustainable modes of transportation and climate protection at university campuses. Although, in general terms, sustainable transportation and climate protection are fitting the focus of the selected Programme objective 3.3, the application has numerous shortcomings that make it a weak match overall. For example, the description mentions general and broad problems like congestion, air pollution, and traffic accidents but does not provide specific data or examples related to these issues on university campuses. This lack of detailed analysis makes it difficult to understand these challenges' severity and unique aspects in the campus context. Further, the role of various stakeholders, such as students, faculty, administration, and the surrounding community, is not thoroughly explored. Effective green mobility initiatives require collaboration from all these groups; their specific roles and potential contributions do not seem addressed.</p> <p>Additionally, the description states that no single solution suits all campuses. Still, it does not provide examples of tailored solutions or explain how campuses with different characteristics and needs will develop and implement customised strategies. These points make the approach selected by the project seem vague and less actionable.</p> <p>The application weakly addresses the focus of the call, i.e., climate change.</p> <p>As mentioned above, even though the project generally addresses the topics of climate protection through improved green campus mobility, the descriptions have many shortcomings and remain general and vague overall. The application does not clearly describe its contribution to the thematic challenges specified in the announcement note for Priority 3. (i.e adopting and implementing better integrated and more systemic approaches to planning processes in sectors key to mitigating climate change; mainstreaming a climate-conscious perspective through participatory and inclusive approaches; implementing effective strategies to combat climate change by improving the generation, distribution, utilisation and storage of energy; promoting circular practices as a means to address climate change, e.g. supporting businesses and communities in taking up circular approaches.)</p>		





Target groups

- 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?

The selected target groups are sufficiently relevant to tackling the identified challenge. However, the application does not describe the needs of the target groups.

The selected target groups include higher education and research institutions as well as local public authorities and regional public authorities. The project could have involved NGOs or interest groups representing students to ensure that any solution developed in the project matches the needs of the primary users.

The target groups' geographical coverage seems appropriate for the proposed challenge. The project has four universities from four countries (Finland, Sweden, Estonia, and Germany, although a university outside the Programme area whose relevant contribution to the challenges of the BSR in this project are not further explained). Still, the project does not justify the selected geographical coverage in the description of the target groups. In addition, the connected descriptions are not completely logical and sometimes even contradictory.

The defined field of responsibility and/or economic sector of the selected target groups seems partly relevant to tackling the identified challenge. The project targets mobility at campuses. In this respect, higher education and research institutions are essential target groups. Adding local authorities seems relevant, too, as campuses operate in municipalities; therefore, a collaboration between the two levels seems relevant. The role of the regional authorities is slightly less evident from the description.

The described needs of the target groups do not seem to be relevant to the identified challenge. The project does not specify the target groups' specific needs concerning the challenge. The project only provided generic descriptions of the role universities could play in improving green mobility solutions. Still, there is no information on what specific aspects of this generic problem the project should address.

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 outlined in the application, focused on the lack of green mobility solutions on university campuses, does present certain local complexities, such as traffic patterns, public transportation infrastructure, and climate policies. However, the project's sufficient transnational value lies in addressing these issues through shared experiences and collaborative innovation across borders. While the specific challenges may be localised, the exchange of knowledge, development of best practices, and joint efforts



to create scalable solutions can provide benefits. Thus, transnational cooperation offers the potential to foster more comprehensive and adaptable approaches to green mobility on university campuses.

Project objective

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

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

The objective of the project is to promote sustainable mobility at university campuses in the Baltic Sea Region and beyond by developing and piloting a comprehensive solution and toolkit for green and smart mobility. The project weakly explains how the project aims to address the needs of the selected target groups. Considering that the needs of the target groups beyond the general need of becoming more green in campus mobility are not provided, it is impossible to conclude how well the project objective responds to those needs. Furthermore, the objectives do not focus on specific solutions to campus-specific problems but on overall and general ideas on how the project could achieve sustainable mobility in and off-site campuses. These objectives remain very vague and generic and suggest that the project aims have not been defined clearly and realistically by 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 sufficiently describes how the project plans to contribute to the implementation of the Action Plan of the EUSBSR. It intends to contribute to the Policy Area Transport through Action 3: Facilitate innovative technologies & solutions in the Baltic Sea region.

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:

- European Green Deal
- Smart Specialisation Strategy (KymRIS 2.0) of Kymenlaakso Region
- A variety of other local strategies and frameworks

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 demonstrate additional value to current or already completed projects relevant to the Baltic Sea region.

The application does not clearly explain how the outcomes of other projects have been taken into consideration. The project references five initiatives funded by ERDF or national funds and plans to use their outcomes to develop the Toolkit. However, it fails to cite ongoing or previously implemented green mobility projects financed by Interreg BSR, such as SUMBA, SUMBA+, HUPMOBILE, and SUMP for BSR. These projects have already developed valuable planning tools and best practices for green mobility. By not incorporating insights and resources from these established Interreg BSR projects, the application does not clearly demonstrate how it will add value beyond what these initiatives have already achieved. Consequently, it appears redundant rather than innovative, missing the opportunity to build upon and enhance the comprehensive work already done in sustainable mobility.

The project does not plan to cooperate with other projects.

II. Partnership	SCORE	2
------------------------	--------------	----------

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 weak potential to realise the planned activities and to achieve the planned objective.

The partnership seems to possess weak competencies for implementing the planned project.

The partnership consists solely of higher education and research institutions, which could technically develop the planned Toolkit. However, the description of roles does not clarify how the partners will achieve broader impacts beyond technical development. Local public authorities are engaged as associated organisations, but their role in the project is not prominent and not completely clear. Participating municipalities expect to learn from the project results, yet the formal collaboration to improve campus green mobility remains vague. Additionally, the partnership lacks representation from students (e.g., student associations) and NGOs, whose engagement is crucial for achieving behavioural changes.

The project's selected target groups are only partly involved in the partnership.



While the project's target groups are partially involved, only higher education and research institutions are included as partners. The roles and tasks of all partners in the project's implementation are not clearly explained. The description provides only generic details, such as involvement in specific work packages, and focuses more on their interest in participating than on the activities each partner will undertake. Furthermore, the project does not explain how it plans to make active use of the combined skills of the partners across various project implementation tasks.

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

The involvement and responsibilities of the partners in the project are partly planned in a balanced way. For example, there seem to be imbalances in the roles and planned budget of the partners (e.g. the role and budget of PP2 Tallinn University of Technology does not seem to be justified).

The roles and tasks of associated organisations are not clearly explained. The project involves local public authorities from the cities where the partner universities are located. Their role, however, is unclear; beyond learning from the project, it is unclear how their contribution will bring value and expertise to the implementation of project activities. Their involvement does not seem to bring additional value to the proposal. In general, the cooperation between municipalities and the universities in achieving the overall aim of greening transport infrastructure is evident. In the context of this project, however, the collaboration and joint effort to achieve the project results are not apparent from the descriptions.

It seems that there are no evident risks in relation to the project partners (private partners in particular). The partnership is composed solely of organisations with public status. All partners provide data on their employment figures and financial capabilities, affirming their capacity. Notably, Project Partner No. 3, the University of Skovde, despite having an operating profit of -1.5 MEUR, shows strong financial health through their annual turnover, and staff headcount, leaving no doubt about their financial capacity to participate in the project.

III. Work plan

SCORE

2

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 weak.

It seems that the planned solution only partly addresses the identified challenge. The challenge and objective of the project (though very generalised in the descriptions) are developing carbon-free mobility on campuses. The planned tool with the GHG emission measurement section, which is the tool's core, can provide a first step in understanding the current state by assessing the existing mobility behaviour and





calculating emissions. Nevertheless, the descriptions in the work packages remain vague and generalised, as in the rest of the project. Based on the information provided, it is challenging to conclude crucial aspects, such as how the project and the target groups plan to adapt the “Toolkit for green and smart campus mobility.” There is a partly clear approach to how the project plans to develop the solution. The work plan focuses on creating sustainability metrics and data gathering using mobility surveys. Hence, there is sufficient assurance that the project would potentially deliver such a tool by the end of implementation. Some elements of the tool's content like Impact assessment: environmental, social, and economic impacts of mobility solutions), Baseline data collection: gathering current mobility patterns, infrastructure, and user needs, Digital solutions for mobility management and smart infrastructure have also been provided.

The project insufficiently plans pilots to validate the usefulness of the solutions. There are generalised descriptions of pilot planning at the premises of the participating universities. However, no details are provided regarding the pilots' actual aims, the scope, the theme, the implementation method, and how each pilot will test the usefulness of the output.

The project weakly plans to evaluate and adjust solutions. Similar to the descriptions provided to the pilots, only generalised information was added regarding the evaluation and adjustments of the tool. It is not clearly described how the partnership will jointly carry this out and the other previous tasks. From the descriptions, it appears that each university will mainly work alone in the piloting and evaluating the results. Only “joint decisions” seem to be planned at different stages.

The project weakly plans to communicate and transfer the ready solutions. In this work plan section, similar to work packages one and two, only generalised information is provided. The project did not provide specific details on concrete actions, how it plans to communicate the project results beyond the partnership, what other target group members they intend to target through the transfer, which channels it intends to use to reach out to those etc..

The planned timeline seems realistic to prepare, pilot, evaluate, adjust, communicate and transfer solutions. Although as described above, the plans to pilot, evaluate, adjust, communicate and transfer the results are very vaguely described.

The project does not seem to encourage active and continuous use of the solutions after the project ends. The project did not provide any information on planned actions that would promote the constant use of the results after the project ended. Some generalised text is provided regarding e.g. how universities with a sustainability plan could make use of the tool, but no concrete actions are described in this respect.

Target groups

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

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

Across the preparation and piloting, only the involvement of the higher education and research institutions is clearly planned. Their role is partly clear for the evaluation. For the transfer, the active



involvement of target groups has not been planned. The participation of the remaining target groups (local and regional authorities) is not clearly planned. There are no demonstrated activities for collaboration with the associated organisations. Their role seems to be to observe the implementation and get information about the results, but no active role seems to be planned for them. The same applies to regional authorities who are not represented at all by the project partnership.

Transnational cooperation

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

The project does not clearly plan to implement activities and outputs in a transnational setting.

The preparation, piloting, and evaluation of the solutions and the transfer is weakly planned transnationally. For instance, it is not clearly explained how the joint development, piloting, and evaluation of the tool by the project partners will occur. It is also unclear how the partnership will work together to transfer the results. Overall, it seems more like individual universities are working separately on the data collection and testing of the tool, and the relevance and added value of transnational cooperation remain unclear. Where hinting at “transnational” elements, the respective descriptions seem to remain substantially artificial and unspecific.

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 1
RCO 116 – Jointly developed solutions 1
RCO 87 - Organisations cooperating across borders 10

RCR 104 - Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations 1

PSR 1 - Organisations with increased institutional capacity due to their participation in cooperation activities across borders 30

The set targets seem to be realistic. However, it is unclear how the project plans to achieve the target of PSR1. There are no concrete activities provided that could justify the planned number.

IV. Durability	SCORE	1
-----------------------	--------------	----------





<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, does not seem to be planned in the application.</p> <p>It appears that the proposed solution, the Toolkit for Green and Smart Campus Mobility, may not see sustained use by the target groups beyond the implementation phase. Crucially, the project lacks concrete plans to ensure that the participating universities will integrate the toolkit into their daily operations once the project concludes. The project descriptions do not adequately demonstrate the partner universities' commitment to adopting or applying the toolkit beyond the immediate scope of the project. Notably, in the relevant sections, the text states, "The developed toolkit is integrated, where applicable, into the university's own sustainability programs"—a phrasing that suggests a lack of firm institutional commitment or widespread application.</p> <p>Moreover, the involvement of key target groups appears to be minimal, and there is insufficient detail on whether other universities outside of the partnership would find the toolkit valuable or be motivated to implement it. This raises further concerns about the project's outreach strategy and long-term impact.</p> <p>In addition to these concerns, there are lingering questions about the practical and added value of the toolkit itself, especially in light of existing mobility planning toolkits. The project does not clearly articulate how this toolkit stands apart or offers unique benefits. Without a clearer articulation of its distinctiveness and potential impact, the long-term success of the toolkit is questionable.</p> <p>The durability concept is not clearly described. It does not include clear institutional and financial support to keep the outputs functional after the project ends. It only contains a general statement on what is theoretically needed to maintain the tool, but the project does not seem to have planned anything concrete in this respect at this stage. For example, it is also not mentioned which universities will take responsibility for keeping the tool available for other users after the project ends.</p>		
V. Budget	SCORE	2
<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 weakly in line with the planned activities, outputs, results and involvement of partners.</p> <p>The planned partner budgets seem partly adequate considering their involvement and responsibilities in the project.</p>		





There is an imbalance in budget shares between the involved countries: 36% of the total project budget is allocated to the project partner from Finland (represented by one out of four partners), while, for example, the budget for Sweden is only 10% (one partner). Additionally, there are imbalances between the project partners, particularly evident with PP02 receiving 36% of the total budget and PP01 receiving 30%. The Lead Partner's budget share is justified by their leading role in the project.

Even though the total project value (1.7 million EUR) is below the call average (2.6 million EUR), the foreseen budgets for project partners 02 and 04 are significantly higher than the average for regular partners. This is especially pronounced in the case of PP02, which has a budget of more than 240% of the average.

As all partners are higher education and research institutions, the entire budget is allocated to this type of partner. This allocation is justified by the partnership structure.

The planned shares of management and work packages seem partly adequate considering their importance for the planned outputs/solutions and results.

20% of the total project budget was allocated to work package no. 3, "transferring solutions." However, this does not seem to be reflected in the planned activities.

The planned total budget does not seem adequate considering the planned outputs and results.

The project addresses sustainable transportation and climate protection on university campuses but lacks specific data and examples related to campus congestion, air pollution, and traffic accidents. Additionally, the roles of key stakeholders like students, faculty, and the community are not thoroughly explored, and there are no tailored solutions for campuses with different needs. The project's partnership, composed solely of higher education and research institutions, lacks representation from students and NGOs, which is crucial for achieving behavioural changes. The roles of associated organisations, like local public authorities, are not clearly defined, limiting their potential contribution. Furthermore, the plans for piloting, evaluating, and adjusting the solutions are vague and lack detail. Transfer of the project results beyond the partnership is insufficiently planned, and there are no concrete actions to ensure the continuous use of the solutions after the project ends. The durability concept lacks institutional and financial support to maintain the outputs. Considering the weak quality of the work plan the application does not demonstrate a good value for money relation.

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) are partly precise, clear and justified. Some items require explanations regarding the estimation of their value and scope (e.g. "development of KPI visualisation and measurement platform", 150 000 EUR).



The planned expenditures in these categories are eligible from the financial point of view.

The project plans a budget for the travel of external experts. According to the Programme rules, travel and accommodation costs for external experts and speakers are eligible if their participation is justified and contributes to the project content and activities. The active role must be ensured.

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.

Further, the MA/JS carried out plausibility checks for project partners no. 01 with medium to high risk for implementing State aid relevant activities as requested in the application.

The MA/JS did not carry out plausibility checks for project partners no. 02+03+04 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.