Number	Questions	Answers	Logic
Title	**2021-2027 Interreg common indicators review**		
Intro text	We need your valuable input to shape the future of Interreg common indicators! The Evaluation Unit of DG Regio, in collaboration with Interact, is conducting a survey to take stock of the Interreg common indicators' uses in the Interreg programmes. It aims at further improvement of the indicator system for the next generation of Interreg programmes post 2027. Your input will support us in assessing which indicators should be retained, modified, deleted, or if there is a need to add any additional common Interreg indicators for post-2027. Your practical experience and insights are vital to this process. **Why does it matter?** Interreg common indicators are the basis for showcasing the achievements of Interreg programmes, representing 95% of all indicators used in the 86 programmes. They allow us to aggregate data across all programmes, revealing important trends and successes. However, to enhance their effectiveness, we must review and refine them based on your practical experiences. **How you can help?** By participating in this survey, you will contribute to a comprehensive review that will inform the drafting of the future legal package by the Commission, expected by mid-2025. Your feedback will influence the next set of common indicators, ensuring they are practical, robust, and reflective of our common experiences.		
	A. Respondents		
Multiple choice	1. Which Interreg strand do you represent?	a. A b. B c. C d. D	

Single choice	2. What is your role?	a. MA b. JS c. Other	
Text field	2.a If other, please specify		
	B. Overall assessment of 21-27 Interreg common indicators		
1-6 Scale (1 Very negative to 6 Very positive)	3. What is your opinion on the extended list of common indicators for 2021-2027, compared with previous programming periods?		
Text field	3.a Please provide details		
Single choice	4. Has your programme opted for ERDF/mainstream common indicators in addition to Interreg-specific common indicators?	a. Yes b. No	
Text field	4.a If yes, why?		
Single choice	5. Are there any major operations/outputs/results in your programmes not covered by Interreg common indicators?	a. Yes b. No	
Text field	5.a If yes, please specify and explain how you accounted for this?		

Multiple choice	6. For which stakeholders are the indicators most useful?	a. Managing Authority b. National Authority c. Joint Secretariat d. Monitoring Committee e. Controllers/Management verification f. Beneficiaries g. Others	
Text field	6.a If other, please specify		
Text field	7. How would you further improve the current common indicators? (Any general recommendations are welcome, e.g., regarding definitions, guidance, etc.)		
Single choice	8. We would appreciate your feedback to learn! In general, did you encounter any challenges with the selected indicators?	**a.** Yes **b.** No	
Intro text	8.a Please briefly identify the challenges encountered with Interreg common indicators at different stages of the programme life cycle:		
Text field	8.a.1 Programming		
Text field	8.a.2 Guidance to applicants		
Text field	8.a.3 Contracting		
Text field	8.a.4 Project monitoring		

Text field	8.a.5 Communication results		
Text field	8.a.6 Audit		
Text field	8.b If you have any specific challenge related to any specific indicator, please briefly name, provide the indicator code and the related challenge		
C. Feedback on the common indicators used in your programmes			
Multiple choice	9. Which Interreg common indicators do you use in your programmes?	RCO 81 - Participations in joint actions across borders RCO 82 - Participations in joint actions promoting gender equality, equal opportunities and social inclusion RCO 83 - Strategies and action plans jointly developed RCO 84 - Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects RCO 85 - Participations in joint training schemes RCO 86 - Joint administrative or legal agreements signed RCO 87 - Oganisations cooperating across borders RCO 90 - Projects for innovation networks across borders RCO 115 - Public events across borders jointly organised	

		RCO 116 - Jointly developed solution	
		RCO 117 - Solutions for legal or administrative obstacles across border identified	
		RCO 118 - Organisations cooperating for the multi-level governance of macroregional strategies	
		RCO 120 - Projects supporting cooperation across borders to develop urban-rural linkages	
		RCR 79 - Joint strategies and action plans taken up by organisations	
		RCR 81 - Completion of joint training schemes	
		RCR 82 - Legal or administrative obstacles across borders alleviated or resolved	
		RCR 83 - Persons covered by joint administrative or legal agreements signed	
		RCR 84 - Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion	
		RCR 85 - Participations in joint actions across borders after project completion	
		RCR 114 - Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations	

Single choice	10. Did you find it easy to find indicator pairs you are using with a direct quantitative link between output (=RCO) and result (=RCR)?	a. Yes b. No	
Text field	10.a Please indicate the ones where it was easy to come up with pairs and shortly explain why.		
Intro text	11. For each common indicator selected in question 9, please rank the indicator according to the following criteria:		
1-6 Scale (1=low, 6=high)	11.a.1 **Relevance**: Does the indicator measure relevant outputs/results of the actions financed by the programme?		
Text field	11.a.2 Optional feedback		
1-6 Scale (1=low, 6=high)	11.b.1 **Acceptability**: Do stakeholders readily accept to measure the indicator? And are the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders for the indicator clear?		
Text field	11.b.2 Optional feedback		
1-6 Scale (1=low, 6=high)	11.c.1 **Clarity**: To your knowledge, is the indicator unambiguous and easy to interpret by the project beneficiaries?		
Text field	11.c.2 Optional feedback		

1-6 Scale (1=low, 6=high)	11.d.1 **Ease of use**: Is the indicator easy to monitor? Are there any problems with reporting the indicator?		
Text field	11.d.2 Optional feedback		
1-6 Scale (1=low, 6=high)	11.e.1 **Robustness**: Is the indicator robust against manipulation, i.e., is the use of the indicator likely to distort behaviour (over/underreporting)?		
Text field	11.e.2 Optional feedback		
Single choice	12. For each common indicator selected in question 9, is the indicator used in all specific objectives?	a. Yes b. No	
Text field	12.a Optional feedback		
Single choice	13. For each common indicator selected in question 9, did you use unit costs when calculating the indicator target?	a. Yes b. No	
Single choice	13.a For this indicator, were different unit costs used in different specific objectives to calculate targets?	a. Yes b. No	
Text field	13.b What were the assumptions made when calculating the unit cost of target values?		

	D. Programme specific indicators		
Single choice	14. Does your programme use any programme specific indicators?	a. Yes b. No	
	15.a If yes:		
Text field	i. Why have you chosen programme-specific output/result indicators over common indicators?		
Text field	ii. Are there other common output/result indicators not included in your programme that could nonetheless sufficiently cover the type of intervention of your programme? If so, can you provide the common indicator code?		
Single choice	iii. Does the monitoring of the programme specific indicator(s) require:	a. More b. Less c. The same effort as common indicators?	
Text field	For the above answer iii, please provide details.		

Multiple choice	15. Which of the topics below would you find most interesting to set up an additional common indicator? Please indicate max. 3 preferences and/ or propose your own.	a. Capacity increase at organisations b. Tools implemented for mitigating pollution c. Joint actions (investments, constructions, etc) in education, training and life-long learning services d. Population benefiting from protection measures against climate related natural disasters (flood, wildfire, other) (a composite indicator of RCR 35, RCR 36 and RCR 37) e. Population benefitting from better ecosystem services (biodiversity, green corridors, improved ecological status, etc.)	
Text field		f. Own proposal	