# Summary of evaluation findings for INTERREG V-A Italy-Slovenia 2014-2020

(ex art. 114 of CPR 1303/2013 for programmes 2014-2020)

## Report summarising findings of evaluations

*The template is divided into 3 parts. The **first** is to provide an overview of the evaluations undertaken on the OP concerned and is accompanied by a summary table in an annex. The **second** is to compile the findings from each evaluation. It is proposed that findings are broken down by Priority axis and by investment priority. Findings should be linked to output and result indicators. The **third** part is to draw general conclusions on findings on the achievements of the OP as evident from all the evaluations undertaken (on the basis of the information provided in the second section).*

*In each case, the findings reported should be those which the MA regards as being reasonably reliable, in the sense that they have reasonable confidence in their validity and, where relevant, are prepared – or would be prepared – to take action based on them.*

## Contents

## 1. Overview of the evaluation work

*Include here a summary of the evaluation work for this OP in no more than half a page (300 words). All evaluations covering the OP should be considered. A summary table of this section is included in an annex.*

*While all evaluation should be listed in the table in annex one by one, the input for this section should be limited to a concise and general overview of the evaluation work done addressing the OP. The section should address overall budget, number of evaluations, evaluation framework, dissemination of results and general lessons learned/challenges faced about the implementation of the evaluations from evaluation methodology point of view.*

*Note that MA should not write about the findings of evaluations under this section.*

The Programme Evaluation Plan approved in April 2017 foresaw the following evaluation framework:

- **an Integrated Evaluation Plan** analysing the Evaluation reports and Thematic Reports of the Programme in the period 2007-2013, the policy for each Programme's NUTS III areas, interaction with other Programmes financed by Structural Funds, mapping relevant actors, setting indicators for each Specific Objective and Investment Priority of the Programme, mapping existing or acquirable relevant data, designing evaluation

objectives and fine-tuning evaluation questions and evaluation methods to be adopted and their feasibility. This Plan was issued in June 2017 and updated in June 2020.

- **First extensive Evaluation Report** evaluating programme management and implementation, project application and selection procedures, communication strategy, implementation of ITI principles included in the Programme. This Report was issued in March 2018.
- **Second extensive Evaluation Report** (efficiency and effectiveness evaluations) evaluating assessments and contributions to the achievement of the Thematic Objectives/Intervention Plan goals, the contribution of the Programme to the 2020 EU Strategy, a description of the I.T.I., the integrated use of ERDF resources. This Report was issued in May 2019

With the first revision of the Evaluation Plan in February 2019 the Monitoring Committee decided to shift the contents of the two foreseen Thematic Reports and to anticipate their release while postponing the issuance of the Third Extensive Evaluation Report for including most financed projects whose closure was scheduled in 2022 (ref. Evaluation Plan – revision February 2019). This decision of anticipating in 2020 the Report on I.T.I. was motivated by the importance of the I.T.I. instrument in light of the negotiations on the new programming period 2021-2027.

- **First (previously scheduled as second) Thematic Report on** ITI performance and/or institutional cooperation and analysis of the place-based territorial approach and valorization of the participative local development, capacity of networking, crossborder governance and pilot actions of institutional cooperation. This Thematic Report was issued in May 2020 (initially foreseen in December 2023).

Through a second revision to the Evaluation Plan in October 2020 (ref. Evaluation Plan – revision October 2020) the Monitoring Committee decided to anticipate the final release of the second Thematic Report from December 2021 to July 2021 in the attempt to make the Report a timely bridge between the capitalization on the 2014-2020 Programme results and the perspective Programme documents to be drafted for 2021-2027 period by also detailing the Report title according to the changed context across Europe and to the latest EC Green Deal approach.

- **Second (previously scheduled as first) Thematic Report** on Development of joint projects regarding environmental sustainability and upgrading of attractiveness of the area and valorization of territory thanks to the interventions cofinanced by the Programme. New Subtitle: Areas of consistency and continuity across 2014-2020 and 2021-2027 programming periods, in consideration of new priorities across Europe, such as the EU Green Deal. It was issued in July 2021.
- **Third extensive Evaluation Report** assessing contributions to the achievement of the Thematic Objectives/Intervention Plan goals with main reference to the efficiency of the Programme structure and procedures (ref. Integrated Evaluation Plan – rev. 2020). This Report is in progress and due in February 2023 in order to include at the maximum extent the analysis after the majority of projects are concluded and reported (originally in December 2021). It will include a comparison with the 1st and 2nd Extensive evaluation report findings, with a focus on projects, follow-up on I.T.I. projects (compared to the status in the Specific thematic report) and on project's coherence with EU Green Deal objectives and in particular on "Farm to Fork" strategy.
- **Ex post evaluation** ex articles 57 and 114 EU Regulation No 1303/2013 supposedly expected by 31.12.2024.

Main evaluation findings are summarised in next section.

## 2. Findings by priority axis in relation to result & output indicators

*For each PA and investment priority covered by the OP indicate the main, or most important, findings on the impact or effects of the measures evaluated, which are regarded as reasonably reliable (no more than 60 words per finding). Indicate the output and/or result indicators related to the findings, the actions taken as a follow up to them (optional) and the identifier(s) of the evaluation(s) setting out the finding(s).*

*Findings can relate to one or more indicators. It can be linked to output indicators only, to result indicators only, or to both types of indicator. The MA is invited to merge/unmerge cells accordingly. For findings that concern a whole investment priority, the MA should enter "all" under the related output and result indicators. Findings that concern cross cutting instruments and entire priority axis can either be reported as general findings in the text above the table, or be inserted under the table (see second row below).*

*General findings that cannot be integrated in the table below should be included at the beginning of the section in no more than one page (500 words).*

Please find summarised a **comparison of Evaluation findings between the First (March 2018) and Second (May 2019) Extensive Reports**.

| Topic | First Report Recommendations (I Report covers the period Dec 2015-July 2017) | Follow up of Second Report and Recommendations (recommendations are highlighted in bold) (II Report covers the period Aug 2017-Dec 2018) |
|---|---|---|
| **Programme management** | Programme management structures must continue to satisfy all the requirements according to the Common Provision Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013, particularly in terms of adequate capacities and staffing. Decision making processes must continue to be clear and transparent. | Programme implementation (preparation, approval and launching of two calls for strategic projects - call n. 5/2018 and call n.6/2018 - and preparation and approval of the last call for standard projects - call n. 7/2019) proved to keep complying with all the requirements according to the Common Provision Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013, also in terms of clarity and transparency (3 MCs, 11 written procedures, Working groups, bilateral group meetings for call 7/2019). |
|  | Effectiveness of procedures, mostly those involving stakeholders and beneficiaries, must be fine-tuned with the timing of Programme implementation, in order to avoid delays. | The IT system is still representing the main issue to be managed by the Programme, affecting the reporting of standard projects, the first level control system, as well the second level control, the system does not guarantee the audit trail in general the timely delivery of services and information. **Improvement is needed**. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | In order to avoid delays, lengthy reporting and any misunderstanding, the Programme granted a specific guidance to project partners by organising one-to-one meetings right after approval, at the start of the project implementation. Dedicated workshops on the use of the on line reporting system were organized, targeting the beneficiaries. **Improvement must be realised in the progress of Programme implementation.** **Capacity building action to support the understanding and dissemination of practices fostering effectiveness (e.g. simplified cost options) is to be considered appropriate and recommended.** |
| **Progress of programme implementation** | Indicators system must be checked when requested/allowed to support the efficient monitoring of the Programme. A deeper reasoning should be done about milestones and target values for 2018 and 2023. As outcome of the first standard call, in some cases it seems to be a relevant disproportion among some of the targets and the capacity of the current projects to reach them, even in a future perspective. Tools and procedures must continue in the effort of reducing the administrative burden of applicants and beneficiaries, fine-tuning online procedures. Decision making/selection procedures must be optimised in order to avoid delays or time extensions in the granting of resources. Future calls must focus on those targets and indicators that need a stronger effort to be satisfied/reached. | In the process of preparation and adoption of the last call for standard projects, a specific effort has been made on indicators, in the light of reducing gaps with final targets, following a specific gap analysis. In the process of defining and approving the calls, the Monitoring Committee has progressively focused on the contribution of co-financed activities to indicators. A process of increasing focus, however, that went hand in hand with the reduction of available resources. This has meant that many resources have been committed and expenses with less impact on the indicators and that the residual resources must necessarily be much more targeted towards those indicators. **The Programme should have been more demanding before. Gap analysis on indicators shows an overall gaps reduction & tackling. It is therefore recommended to monitor the follow-up of current and future projects regarding their focus on indicators.** |
| | Decision making/selection criteria and procedures must continue to be clear and transparent, with a regular update of the information channels. Articulation and complexity of selection procedures can be simplified, even with the objectives of avoiding delays, keeping the same quality level. | Assessment procedure has been revised to meet recommendations asking for simplification and time reduction. |
| | Projects successfully meeting the quality requirements of the first call, which could not be eligible for the allocated funding, | The Programme adopted different solutions by publishing new calls. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | must be valorised as a good source of support to reach the indicators in an economic and timely manner. | |
| **Communication strategy** | Programme communication must continue to ensure coherence with EU rationale and guidelines. Considering that communication competences and responsibilities are shared among different actors an efficient coordination must be put in place. Actions at local level in the Programme area must satisfy the high expectations of stakeholders, applicants and beneficiaries about the quality and frequency of meetings/events. | Compared to findings from the First Report, there was a positive step forward in the sense that the shift from the preparation phase to the mature phase was successfully obtained. The number of events for the stakeholders increased, the events were more focused on the stakeholders' needs. **There is still potential to work on capitalisation activities and in targeted promotion on Programme's results and for specific groups (e.g. young public).** |
| **Description of I.T.I. as for implementation of I.T.I. principles included in the Programme** | I.T.I. organisation and management must continue to ensure coherence with the EU regulations and guidelines, in the light of supporting the implementation of Programme. Result and output indicators appear not easy to be fully satisfied in a 2018 perspective, therefore need to be regularly monitored and eventually desirably revised. | The strongly innovative element is represented by the management structure. This pilot experience on IB governance is a unique case among Cooperation Programmes. Such a unicity does not allow comparisons and benchmarking and can be properly evaluated more in an outcome/final perspective than in output/medium term one. **At the current implementation stage, ITI projects show patterns of improved cross border cooperation, which naturally need to evolve in stable dynamics.** **On the other hand, the sole beneficiary as a collector of extra resources from other sources seems still to be an objective to be reached.** In this perspective, **there are still open questions that need to be answered: if the IB governance of an ITI carried out by an EGTC is an effective management tool** in the Cooperation Programme **filling up also the linguistic gaps that could affect the results of joint activities.** |

**Evaluation findings on the ITI governance (from the First Thematic Report**):

| Topic | Evaluation findings from the First Thematic Report |
|---|---|
| **Effectiveness** | The projects have achieved their results with a certain delay so far but they are on their way and they will potentially achieve all the foreseen results before the project end date. For the Isonzo-Soča project, the building of infrastructure has suffered from technical delays and for the changing prices of services in the construction and real-estate market. However, all obstacles have been and will be overcome and all the Lots of work will be completed within the project's end date. |

| Efficiency | The works were planned in times of the financial crisis. The funds allocated to pilot actions were sufficient. Afterwards, market conditions and prices changed through the years, bringing a significant increase in the costs of the infrastructure works and construction services. However, thanks to the common work done some scale economies were created. |
|---|---|
| | It is difficult to propose alternative project models to achieve similar or better results in a more efficient manner: for both projects, by working together costs and timings have been harmonized, implementation has been shorter and more efficiently managed (minor loss of time). |
| Coverage | Both projects reached the populations in the region via activities put in place had a positive impact on the local population. In project Health, there was a valorization of participatory local development. For the Isonzo-Soča project, infrastructures will be used by both the residents and the tourists, so the impact is potentially even larger. Target groups were given adequate opportunity to access project activities, there was no "a priori" exclusion and the work was open for the general public in both projects. There is an increase and deepening of cross-border everyday collaboration and governance. The sole beneficiary had to overcome legislation obstacles (different laws apply in different countries for the infrastructure works) and although being time-consuming those were over-come. The issue of language is very important and a lot of efforts were made to maintain the equality in this aspect. The need for language courses came out and several initiatives were put in place for the better use of both the languages in many institutions (during interviews courses/initiatives for municipalities' staff, social workers, people active in NGOs and associations were mentioned). The need for language courses and language mediation or translation was mentioned in many interviews. In these terms an additional allocation of funds could be needed in the future to improve mutual knowledge of the two languages. |
| Relevance | The project objectives proved to be consistent with beneficiaries' needs, this was granted already in the preparatory phase. The projects even at this stage already seem relevant in the current context in the territory of the three Municipalities. The challenge is how to capitalize the experience gained so far and upgrade it with new and enlarged scope in the future. |
| Sustainability | Even if sustainability needs to be assessed and monitored in the medium-long term, the benefits are likely to continue after funding ends because of the cooperation put in place on daily-level and because of mutual impacts on policy level. This is mainly valid for the health project but extends also to the infrastructure built up in the cross-border area that will stay in place and be used by locals and tourists. Looking specifically at the health sector, the benefits of the activities will continue in the future because of the links established, the additional infrastructure built with national funds and because of the activities offered to the local population. |
| | In terms of capacity of networking, a lot has been done on local and regional as well as on national level. Possibilities on transnational or thematic programmes have not been fully exploited. The capacity of networking going beyond the present and pending projects and exploring further EU networking on transnational and macro-regional levels are a potential for the future. The EGTC-GO has proven to be an institution providing a solid framework for cooperation and as such is well suited for the development and implementation of a wide variety of projects and policies. The future actions could focus on projects in the field of mobility, tourism, strategic spatial planning, creative industries and culture. Within the EGTC GO, the Office for Intermediate Body, acting as IB, is functionally independent from the Permanent Office for the Projects Management acting as SB in implementation of ITI pilot actions. The functional independence of the IB is enshrined in Article 8 of EGTC GO's Internal Organization Regulation where it is foreseen that the same employees, in carrying out both functions, either respond to the Director or to the President, respectively when implementing SB or IB function. The EGCT, the IB and the SB within the same organizational context, with the same staff and skills necessarily are three |

different but closely interrelated functions of the same organisation. This organizational choice may display advantages and critical aspects at the same time. The mentioned interaction, in fact, can lead both to overlaps, on one hand, and to completion/completeness of an organic action, on the other hand. From interviews emerges appreciation on a single-competence-centre overseeing the programming-management-implementation-monitoring cycle performing in line with the expected objectives (i.e., the objectives of the two ITI projects). The interaction among the three functions (EGCT, IB and SB) results in some advantages in terms of territorial governance, partnership involvement, creation of long-lasting relationships with local stakeholders. On the other hand, this does not mean that the current organizational structure of IB and SB within an EGTC is the best possible nor that this model cannot be improved and fine-tuned even in the years to come. Looking at the governance of the EGTC, the IB and the SB, the overlaps seem to be excessive and the functional division blurred. Moreover, it seems feasible to achieve the same objectives and performance levels even if the only actor would have been the SB.

The question remains the following: is an administrative action (even implying an interaction with the territorial partnership) managed by a central government more efficient than one implemented through local governments closer to local needs (or vice versa)? Is more efficient a centralized institutional model or a model combining public policy competencies at regional or local level? Or even, is a centralized, national managing authority within European Structural and Investments Funds more efficient than a model envisaging regional/ local Programs managing authorities?

The answer is not simple; especially in an evaluation process focused on a given period and on two ITI projects, which can be a quite "limited and small" experience. In very general terms, past experiences in the programming and management of European funds show that IBs are not always highly effective and efficient, as many administrative burdens are maintained on MAs, while IBs often have represented additional costs and additional procedures. In the EU, it can be noticed a progressive reduction of IBs from the programming period 2000-2006 to 2014-2020. Additional costs and procedures coming from IBs should be balanced by a greater proximity to local and sectoral needs and to the territorial partnership. The difficulty for the evaluator, however, lies in the absence of alternative comparative scenarios, because the action of the EGTC, both as IB and as SB, has developed in this specific time and territory, with conditions that cannot be easily replicated elsewhere but can only be imagined in other contexts. In a nutshell: the SB has a foreseeable capacity to exploit the heritage, knowledge and experience background as well as the relational and analytical skills of the EGTC even without the contribution of the IB. Moreover, as far as management aspects are concerned, the outcomes of this analysis does not highlight any specific management practice or element allowing to determine a greater efficiency and efficacy than the ones at MA's level.

Please find in the next table the **reccomandations out of the Second Thematic Report**.

| Project topics | |
|---|---|
| POLICY AREA CLIMATE CHANGE | Further solutions based on the already existing projects or new ones. |

| | |
|---|---|
| POLICY AREA CLEAN ENERGY | Comparing the topics tackled to those foreseen by the EGD, we can see that the topic of renewable energies, in particular the one of **renewable sources of energy is not yet covered, as well as the topic of energy storage or hydrogen applications.** |
| POLICY AREA SUSTAINABLE INDUSTRY | Compared to other topics that can be tackled under this theme within the EGD targets, there still seems to be a lot of space to deal with the **recycling of raw materials, digital transformation (AI, 5G, cloud, edge computing, internet) and support to transport, natural resources and energy management.** There is also potential to tackle green public procurement that was not particularly explored in the 2014-2020 programming period. |
| POLICY AREA BUILDING AND RESTRUCTURING | It needs to be mentioned that actors from the Programme area have strongly participated in Alpine Space Programme projects that were tackling the two topics on Building and Restructuring. These could nevertheless be a potential for future synergies and capitalizations. More information is available under the section dedicated to the Alpine Space Programme and the EUSALP macro-regional strategy. |
| POLICY AREA SUSTAINABLE MOBILITY | Comparing the topics tackled to targets foreseen by the EGD, there were no specific projects dedicated to **public charging and refueling points** and none dedicated to **air transport** but it needs to be mentioned that those topics were extensively tackled respectively in the Alpine Space Programme projects and in AdrionProgramme projects, hence there are perhaps potentials for synergies and capitalization. More information is provided in the sections dedicated to the two Programmes towards the end of this report. |
| POLICY AREA FARM TO FORK AND SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE | Compared to the targets mentioned in the EGD, there are still opportunities for the players in the **food value chain** because new technologies and scientific breakthroughs, combined with increased public awareness and demand for sustainable food, will benefit all stakeholders. **Efforts to tackle climate change and protect the environment should also be encouraged.** In line with strategic national plans, the Programme should strive to increase the use of sustainable practices such as preserving farming, precision farming, organic farming, agroecology, agro-forestry etc. even though this will be tackled also on regional and national level in the agriculture sector. |
| POLICY AREA BIODIVERSITY | Compared to the list of themes under the targets in biodiversity in the EGD, there still seems to be space to tackle two wide topics: **forestation and sustainable blue economy.** |
| POLICY AREA POLLUTION REDUCTION | Further solutions based on the already existing projects or new ones. |

| Project focus and size | |
|---|---|
| Preference for the new programming period 2021-27 | **Projects focusing on policy implementation** with concrete application on the territory and positive impact on the quality of life of the inhabitants. |

Follows an **overview on Programme output indicators**.

On the basis of the internal analysis carried out by the JS on the declared output targets by all financed projects with reference to their achievements (intermediate target value and final), it has been confirmed that **all output indicators will be fulfilled** and in some cases even over-reached as Programme targets were underestimated during the initial programming phase. The Programme indicators picture is the following with highlight of modifications needed (8th column) – undergoing written procedure no. 52 for Programme modification (still not finalized). The need for modification follows informal indications received by EC DG Evaluation in the framework of drafting Programme AIR 2021:

| PA | | Id | Indicator | Measure | Final Target 2023 | Declared Target by funded projects | Notes referring to need for modification |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1b | CO26 | Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions (Common Indicator) | Enterprises | 38 | 50 | Over-Reached<br><br>To be modified |
| 1 | 1b | 1.1.1 | Number of innovative services, products and tools transferred to enterprises | Number | 10 | 39 | Over-Reached<br><br>NO modification needed |
| 1 | 1b | CO42 | Number of research institutions participating in cross-border, transnational or interregional research projects | Organisation | 27 | 54 | Over-Reached<br><br>To be modified |
| 2 | 4e | 2.1.1 | Number of implemented actions towards the decrease of annual primary energy consumption in existing public buildings | Number | 25 | 25 | Reached |
| 2 | 4e | 2.1.2 | Pilot implementation of innovative services for smart low carbon mobility | Number | 5 | 16 | Over-Reached<br><br>NO modification needed |
| 3 | 6c | CO09 | Increase in expected number of visits to supported sites of cultural and natural heritage and attractions | Visits/year | 20.000 | 39.953 | Over-Reached<br><br>To be modified |
| 3 | 6c | 3.1.1 | Number of investments implemented or services/products created supporting preservation/restoration of natural and cultural heritage | Number | 30 | 40 | Over-Reached<br><br>NO modification needed |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 6c | 3.1.2 | Km bicycle path/lane completed | Km | 12 | 12 | Reached<br><br>Indicator specific for ITI (which fulfilled 12) |
| 3 | 6d | CO23 | Surface area of habitats supported in order to attain a better conservation status (Common indicator) | Hectares | 6.000 | 30.402 | Over-Reached<br><br>To be modified |
| 3 | 6d | 3.2.1 | Tools and services developed for assessing and promoting ecosystem services | Number | 7 | 8 | Reached |
| 3 | 6d | 3.2.2 | Cross-border pilot actions to support biodiversity | Number | 48 | 51 | Reached |
| 3 | 6d | 3.2.3 | Participants to educational and divulgative events | Number | 8.500 | 18.063 | Over-Reached<br><br>NO modification needed |
| 3 | 6f | 3.3.1 | Number of innovative green technologies tested and implemented | Number | 13 | 13 | Reached |
| 3 | 6f | 3.3.2 | Number of enterprises applying new green innovation solutions | Number | 7 | 22 | Over-Reached<br><br>NO modification needed |
| 3 | 6f | CO20 | Risk prevention and management: Population benefiting from flood protection measures | Persons | 1.111 | 33.700 | Over-Reached<br><br>To be modified |
| 4 | 11b CTE | 4.1.1 | Cross-border agreement and protocols signed | Number | 10 | 21 | Over-Reached<br><br>NO modification needed |
| 4 | 11b CTE | 4.1.2 | Joint solutions increasing integration, coherence, harmonization of the Programme area governance | Number | 11 | 34 | Over-Reached<br><br>NO modification needed |
| 4 | 11b CTE | 4.1.3 | Number of beneficiaries participating in joint training schemes | Number | 400 | 1.551 | Over-Reached<br><br>NO modification needed<br><br>Indicator specific for ITI |
| 4 | 11b CTE | 4.1.4 | Number of cross-border medical-social teams full-formed and operational | Number | 5 | 8 | Reached |

# 3. General conclusions

*Include here a general conclusion in no more than 2 pages (1000 words) on evaluation findings on the achievements (result and output indicators) of the OP concerned. This section should provide a concise narrative regarding the implementation, evaluation and the results of the programme. Managing Authorities are expected to build their conclusions on the concrete achievements of the OP, lessons learned and evaluation work done.*

At the stage of Programme implementation during the submission of the Second Extensive Evaluation Report, it is noted that most of the delays detailed in the previous stages have been overcome.

As for projects, there are good first results and good coverage of the EU 2020 strategy. The gap analysis on indicators made before the launch of the last standard call in 2019 has been a useful instrument to address the remaining Programme activities and served a careful and timely inside into indicators fulfillment.

The main findings out of the survey to beneficiaries has been a general satisfaction with the Programme although a rather scarce level of participation of beneficiaries to these kind of surveys launched at Programme level. The main problems highlighted by beneficiaries were related to the e-system platform, to bad quality of translations, to difficulties in integrating FLC procedures in the e-system, which caused the need to repeat operations on paper.

As the main difficulties related to the monitoring e- system, its functioning has represented a challenge for the Programme. There has been a constant and frequent dialogue of the MA/JS with the service provider, Insiel, with the involvement also of the FLCs. The main bottleneck initially resulted for activities of controllers with delays in validation/certification of expenditures caused by errors/failures of the e-system which delayed repaying back to beneficiaries with a temporary negative cash flow. Thanks to positive changes in the FRONT-END section, to weekly meetings with Insiel supporting the path to needed additional changes and to huge training to all users, Programme authorities finally resulted successful in facilitating a smooth implementation and closure of the projects.

The first steps towards **capitalization** have been made for more mature topics, with the support of Interact. For the future, the Programme might increase working together with other Interreg programmes and macro-regional strategies. There are still potentials in both sectoral or cross-sectoral communication and capitalization activities, possibly by projects' sectoral and cross-sectoral integration facilitated by several Programme initiatives, such as the capitalization within priority axes 2 and 3 and the 2019 Annual Event on capitalization.

## Annex: Evaluations undertaken in respect of the OP concerned

*List all the evaluations by publication date, with the most recent first. All evaluations covering the OP even if covering other OPs should be reported.*

| Iden tifier | Brief description of measures/ Intervention subject of evaluation | Title | Fund(s) concerned by the eval. | TOs | Link to report |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | finetuning of Evaluation Questions | Integrated Evaluation Plan (**June 2017 rev. – April 2020**) | ERDF | TOs selected by the Cooperation Programme | https://www.ita-slo.eu/sites/default/files/INTEGRATED%20EVALUATION%20PLAN%20REV%202020_CLEAN.PDF |
| 1 | Cooperation Programme | I Extensive Evaluation Report (**March 2018**) | ERDF | TOs selected by the Cooperation Programme | https://www.ita-slo.eu/sites/default/files/FIRST%20EVALUATION%20REPORT_9MAR_approved_for_publication_CLEAN.pdf |
| 2 | Cooperation Programme | II Extensive Evaluation Report (**May 2019**) | ERDF | TOs selected by the Cooperation Programme | https://www.ita-slo.eu/sites/default/files/2nd%20Extensive%20Report_31%20May%202019_clean.pdf |
| 3 | ITI interventions | I Thematic Report "Integrated territorial investments (ITI) and European grouping on territorial cooperation (EGTC)" (**May 2020**) | ERDF | TOs selected by the Cooperation Programme | https://www.ita-slo.eu/sites/default/files/THEMATIC_REPORT_ITI_%20FINAL.PDF |
| 4 | Interventions in consistency and continuity across 2014-2020 and 2021-2027 programming periods, in consideration of new priorities across Europe, such as the European Green Deal | II Thematic Report "Development of joint projects regarding environmental sustainability and measure the upper degree of attractiveness of the area and valorization of territory thanks to the interventions cofinanced by the Italy-Slovenia Interreg cooperation Programme. *Areas of consistency and continuity across 2014-2020 and 2021-2027 programming periods, in consideration of new priorities across Europe, such as the European Green Deal*" (**July 2021**) | ERDF | TOs selected by the Cooperation Programme | https://www.ita-slo.eu/sites/default/files/II%20THEMATIC%20REPORT_GREENDEAL_30GIU21_CLEAN1.pdf |

| 5 | Cooperation Programme | III Extensive Evaluation Report (**forthcoming in 2023**) | ERDF | TOs selected by the Cooperation Programme | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | Ex post evaluation | Articles 57 and 114 EU Regulation No 1303/2013 (supposedly expected by **31.12.2024**) | ERDF | TOs selected by the Cooperation Programme | |

Note:
- Identifier – numbering of evaluations in the table; evaluations listed in decreasing order of date of publication
- Brief description of intervention/measure/action subject of the evaluation: indicate in no more than 30 words the essence of the subjects of evaluation
- Title – in the national language as set out on the cover page of the evaluation report
- Funds concerned by evaluation (ERDF, ESF, CF, YEI)
- TOs
- Link to report – indicate the link to the pdf of the evaluation report