



**Interreg** 

**Austria-Hungary 2014-2020**

European Union – European Regional Development Fund



# **GUIDE ON INDICATORS**

Definition of output and result indicators  
and description of methods for data collection

Version 1, 06 March 2017





## INDEX

<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2 OUTPUT INDICATORS</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 IP 3d / SO11: Strengthening regional entrepreneurship, the performance of start-ups and the innovation capacities of SMEs with a focus on the development of (internationally) competitive products	5
Output indicator OI11: SMEs involved in cooperation projects	6
Output indicator OI12: Intermediate organizations involved in cooperation projects	7
2.2 IP 6c / SO21: Improving the protection, promotion and development of natural and cultural heritage through common approaches to sustainable tourism	8
Output indicator OI21: Jointly developed strategies and action plans and capacity building measures	8
Output indicator OI22: Jointly developed investments at cultural and natural heritage sites	9
Output indicator OI23: Common offers	9
2.3 IP 6d / SO22: Improving the ecological stability and resilience of landscape and ecosystems	10
Output indicator OI24: Jointly developed protection and management plans	11
Output indicator OI25: Protection measures (including investments)	11
Common indicator CO23 (Nature and biodiversity): Surface area of habitats supported to attain a better conservation status	12
Output indicator OI26: Joint research projects	13
Output indicator OI27: Participants in joint training schemes and awareness raising programmes	13
2.4 IP 6f / SO23: Improving the management and protection of water bodies	14
Output indicator OI28: Jointly developed pilots and infrastructures	15
Output indicator OI29: Measures securing or improving the status of water bodies in qualitative and quantitative terms	15
Common indicator CO42 (Productive investment): Number of research institutions participating in cross-border, transnational or interregional research projects	16
2.5 IP 7b / SO31: Improving cross-border connectivity of regional centres to the TEN-T network	17
Common indicator CO13 (Roads): Total length of newly built roads	17
Common indicator CO14 (Roads): Total length of reconstructed or upgraded roads	18
Common indicator CO12 (Railway): Total length of reconstructed or upgraded railway line	18
Output indicator OI31: Pre-investment studies	19
2.6 IP 7c / SO32: Enhancing sustainable mobility on the local and regional level	20
Output indicator OI32: Jointly developed strategies, transport concepts and actions	21
Output indicator OI33: Joint schemes for promoting environmentally friendly transport	22
2.7 IP 11 CBC / SO41: Improving institutional cross-border cooperation in order to strengthen the integration; SO42: Strengthening intercultural capacities and labour mobility of the border population by supporting cross-border education initiatives and vocational training	22
Output indicator OI41: Actors involved in cross-border cooperation	23
Output indicator OI42: Joint cross-border cultural, educational, recreational and other type of community events and actions (“people to people”)	24
Common indicator CO46 (Labour market and training): Number of participants in joint education and training schemes to support youth employment, educational opportunities and higher and vocational education across borders	25





<b>3</b>	<b>RESULT INDICATORS</b>	<b>26</b>
3.1	IP 3d / SO11: Strengthening regional entrepreneurship, the performance of start-ups and the innovation capacities of SMEs with a focus on the development of (internationally) competitive products	26
	Result indicator RI11: Survival rate of enterprises after 3 years	26
3.2	IP 6c / SO21: Improving the protection, promotion and development of natural and cultural heritage through common approaches to sustainable tourism	28
	Result indicator RI21: Overnight stays	28
3.3	IP 6d / SO22: Improving the ecological stability and resilience of landscape and ecosystems	29
	Result indicator RI22: Conservation degree A (of all habitat types in the Natura 2000 sites of the programme region)	29
3.4	IP 6f / SO23: Improving the management and protection of water bodies	31
	Result indicator RI23: Chemical and ecological condition of border water bodies classified as “good” and “very good”	31
3.5	IP 7b / SO31: Improving cross-border connectivity of regional centres to the TEN-T network	33
	Result indicator RI31: Average travel time (individual transport) to a node with TEN-T network connection	33
3.6	IP 7c / SO32: Enhancing sustainable mobility on the local and regional level	34
	Result indicator RI32: Intermodal public transport nodes	34
3.7	IP 11 CBC / SO41: Improving the environment for cross-border cooperation in order to strengthen the integration	36
	Result indicator RI41: Level of cooperation quality in the border region (share of above-average ratings of cross-border cooperation)	36
3.8	IP 11 CBC / SO42: Strengthening intercultural capacities and labour mobility of the border population by supporting cross-border education initiatives and vocational training	38
	Result indicator RI42: Institutions involved in cross-border education schemes	38
<b>4</b>	<b>Annex</b>	<b>39</b>





## 1 INTRODUCTION

The guide on indicators aims to define the output and result indicators relevant to the Cooperation Programme Interreg V-A Austria-Hungary.

This document is partly based on already existing programme documents:

- The definition of result indicators was already included in the guide on indicators attached to the Cooperation Programme adopted by the EC (see annex 08 of the CP). For two result indicators (RI 11 and RI21) the baselines had to be changed according to clerical errors. This resulted in a modification of the CP (version 2.0 adopted by the EC on 27 September 2016). These changes are already reflected in this document. In general, definitions of result indicators have not changed compared to annex 08 of the CP, but related descriptions and reference to the respective data sources are updated in this document.
- The definitions and rationales for the targets set to each output indicator are strongly related to the documentation on the performance framework (see annex 09 of the CP).

The guide on indicators at hand is a consolidation of the information in the annexes of the CP (as mentioned above), completed with the definitions of output indicators, and thus is the document with all information consolidated.

## 2 OUTPUT INDICATORS

### 2.1 IP 3d / SO11: Strengthening regional entrepreneurship, the performance of start-ups and the innovation capacities of SMEs with a focus on the development of (internationally) competitive products

Output indicators for IP3d relate to the following examples of actions defined in the CP:

1. Encouragement and support of technology and know-how transfer between research or technology institutions and businesses or clusters for the development and adaptation of new technologies, products or services
2. Support of the creation, linkage or further development of the cross-border clusters, innovation centres, and/or SME networks in order to
  - (i) develop new or improved products, services or supply chains through joint research and innovation activities as well as through jointly established laboratories or innovation/technological centres for start-up companies,
  - (ii) set up “knowledge platforms” aiming at finding appropriate solutions through involving business partners or launching projects
  - (iii) promote the creation of joint local products, logistic and quality management solutions and sale systems in the border region
  - (iv) develop common marketing activities (developing common brands, web-shops, etc.)





- (v) establish and develop commercial centres and markets to be used by the producers and distributor enterprises in order to promote marketing and positioning local products
3. Support of collaboration of organisations dealing with economic development to improve their effectiveness in enhancing the internationalisation of the local business sector , e.g. by
- (i) Supporting the exchange of experiences in the field of business and innovation development, such as the identification of common fields of interest and the implementation of joint approaches to innovation (e.g. cross-border innovation voucher scheme)
  - (ii) Reducing administrative barriers in the field of innovation and improving framework conditions for research
  - (iii) Developing and testing strategies/services that facilitate the access to financing innovation or new products and for (innovative) start-ups
  - (iv) Improving the coordination of cluster policies and cluster cooperation
  - (v) Developing joint tools and services to improve skills and competences for innovative entrepreneurship, improving the innovation culture, management skills and capacity building for start ups.

The definition of output indicators for IP3d is as follows:

**Output indicator OI11: SMEs involved in cooperation projects**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
OI11	SMEs involved in cooperation projects	Number	100	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator OI11 relates to action 1 and 2, and is part of the performance framework.

**Definitions:**

**SMEs:** An enterprise is any legal entity engaged in an economic activity, irrespective of its legal form. This includes, in particular, self-employed persons and family businesses engaged in craft or other activities, and partnerships or associations regularly engaged in economic activity.

An SME employs fewer than 250 persons and has an annual turnover not exceeding 50 million €, and/or an annual balance sheet total not exceeding 43 million €<sup>1</sup>.

A **cooperation project** is a project in the programme Interreg AT-HU.

<sup>1</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/business-friendly-environment/sme-definition\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/business-friendly-environment/sme-definition_en)





To **be involved** means that the SME shall actively be involved in activities of the project with a continuous or regular participation (e.g. being member in a network or cluster, or participate in know-how transfer among business and innovation development institutions), but the SME does not necessarily have to be a project partner. One-off (non-regular) participation of an SME in e.g. a project training does not count. The SME shall directly benefit from the activities of the project. SMEs benefitting from the project indirectly through a general benefit to their respective branch do not count.

**Rationale for the targets set:**

The estimated number of projects in this IP is 8, so that for each project an average of 12-13 participating SMEs is envisaged, leading to the target value of 100.

For the milestone in the performance framework it is assumed that at least two projects will be running in 2018.

**Output indicator OI12: Intermediate organisations involved in cooperation projects**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
OI12	Intermediate organisations involved in cooperation projects	Number	8	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator OI12 relates to action 3.

**Definitions:**

**Intermediate organisations** are (often public-equivalent, but in some cases private) bodies that support the information transfer and mediate between political institutions and decision making bodies and the relevant stakeholder groups (for the purpose of IP3d/SO11 the economic sector, especially SMEs), help to set up decision making alternatives, support their orientation and provide other services.

A **cooperation project** is a project in the programme Interreg AT-HU.

To **be involved** means to be project partner or strategic partner.

**Rationale for targets set:**

According to the CP (special criteria and principles for the selection of applications) there is no preference of direct involvement of SMEs as project partner. In contrast, an involvement of intermediate organisations as project partners is more likely and expected. Therefore the target values for OI11 and OI12 follow different approaches.

The estimated number of projects in this IP is 8. For each project at least one intermediate organisation is envisaged to be project partner or strategic partner, leading to a target value of 8.





## 2.2 IP 6c / SO21: Improving the protection, promotion and development of natural and cultural heritage through common approaches to sustainable tourism

Output indicators for IP6c relate to the following examples of actions defined in the CP:

1. Preparation and implementation of joint strategies and action plans, capacity building and pilot investments regarding sustainable utilization of cultural and natural heritage
2. Preservation, reconstruction, development and utilization of cultural and natural heritage sites in order to use it for sustainable tourism and community purposes, such as eco tourism
3. Support of know-how transfer and development of common standards for products and services

The definition of output indicators for IP6c is as follows:

### **Output indicator OI21: Jointly developed strategies and action plans and capacity building measures**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
OI21	Jointly developed strategies and action plans and capacity building measures	Number	5	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator OI21 relates to action 1.

#### **Definitions:**

A **strategy** is a common vision and a set of objectives and priorities in a longer perspective, in order to answer problems that are relevant for the participating regions. For the purposes of IP6c/SO21 a strategy is considered to be **jointly developed**, if in ideal case all regions participating in the project are represented in the strategy, but at least one Austrian and one Hungarian region.

An **action plan** breaks down the strategy objectives into specific tasks. It includes a sequence of steps to be taken or activities to be carried out to reach a common goal.

**Capacity building measures** are measures that enhance the abilities to achieve a common understanding, to solve common problems or to reach joint objectives, like setting up and fostering networks or institutional structures.

#### **Rationale for targets set:**

The estimated number of projects in IP6c is 10. Half of the projects are expected to implement soft measures like strategies and action plans or capacity building measures. This leads to a target value of 5 for OI21.





**Output indicator OI22: Jointly developed investments at cultural and natural heritage sites**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
OI22	Jointly developed investments at cultural and natural heritage sites	Number	5	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator OI22 relates to action 1 and 2, and is part of the performance framework.

**Definitions:**

In general, single investment measures are counted as 1 **investment**. If measures are very similar (like three bird-watching towers in one project), the bundle of measures counts as 1 investment.

It is important to mention that investments are not necessarily investments into the heritage site itself, but “investment at”, meaning the investment is linked, by its location, and probably thematic relevance, to the heritage site.

Investments are considered to be **jointly developed**, if project partners from both Austria and Hungary participate in the preparation and the investment has beneficial impact on both sides of the border.

**Natural heritage sites** are areas of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, science, conservation or natural beauty.

**Cultural heritage sites** are works of man or the combined works of nature and man which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view.

**Rationale for targets set:**

The estimated number of projects in IP6c is 10. Half of the projects are expected to include investments. This leads to a target value of 5 for OI22.

As investments (even in small scale infrastructure) tend to require more preparation time, in the performance framework the milestone for 2018 was calculated conservatively with 1.

**Output indicator OI23: Common offers**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
OI23	Common offers	Number	3	Monitoring	Annually





The output indicator OI23 relates to action 2 and 3.

### Definitions:

**Common offers** in terms of IP6c/SO21 mean common cross-border tourist offers or products that are shared over the border. Examples can be a single booking platform for both Austrian and Hungarian clients or jointly developed or applied quality standards.

### Rationale for targets set:

The estimated number of projects in IP6c is 10. Experiences from the last period show that it was difficult to establish common, real cross-border offers. This leads to the assumption that in 10 projects 3 common offers will be established.

## 2.3 IP 6d / SO22: Improving the ecological stability and resilience of landscape and ecosystems

Output indicators for IP6d relate to the following examples of actions defined in the CP:

1. Development of joint management and protection plans with a focus on restoration and, whenever it is possible, improving connectivity of areas, such as
  - (i) management plans targeting the Natura 2000 areas and other protected areas and
  - (ii) protection plans targeting the conservation of species of Community interest, protected species and species concerned by different international conventions typical to the border region
2. Implementation of protection measures, such as
  - (i) Measures, including small scale infrastructure investments serving the conservation and sound management of Natura 2000 sites and other protected areas located in the cross-border region (e.g. rehabilitation of degraded habitats, in situ & ex situ conservation programmes, control of invasive alien species and succession processes, improving ecological connections among natural habitats, rehabilitation of streams etc.)
  - (ii) joint species protection measures including small scale infrastructure investments (targeted habitat restoration measures, ex situ conservation programmes)
  - (iii) investments in green infrastructure
3. Implementation of joint research projects and supporting the cooperation of research institutions in the border area, aiming to support the long term conservation of species and habitats (e.g. exploring the ecology and taxonomy of data deficient species, assessment of conservation status, applied research to support nature conservation management etc.)
4. Development and implementation of joint education and trainings schemes and promotion of awareness raising with the direct involvement of local communities (including investments in nature interpretation infrastructure)





The definition of output indicators for IP6d is as follows:

**Output indicator OI24: Jointly developed protection and management plans**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
OI24	Jointly developed protection and management plans	Number	2	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator OI24 relates to action 1.

**Definitions:**

A **protection and management plan** sets out the approach and goals, together with a framework for decision making, to apply in the protected area. It identifies the key features or values of the protected area, clearly establishes the management objectives to be met and indicates the actions to be implemented.

**Jointly developed protection and management plans** are elaborated for national/nature parks, Natura 2000 sites or other protected areas on both sides in the border region.

**Rationale for targets set:**

The estimated number of projects in IP6d is 9. National parks are obliged to develop management plans to be founded, and many of the other protected areas in the programme region have already developed protection plans, the target value for OI24 is only 2.

**Output indicator OI25: Protection measures (including investments)**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
OI25	Protection measures (including investments)	Number	15	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator OI25 relates to action 2.

**Definitions:**

**Protection measures** are all measures aiming at the protection and/or conservation of species and habitats, and at investment in green infrastructures.





Green infrastructure is a strategically planned network of natural and semi-natural areas with other environmental features designed and managed to deliver a wide range of ecosystem services.

If single measures are very similar, the bundle of measures counts as 1 measure.

### Rationale for targets set:

The estimated number of projects in IP6d is 9. It is assumed that some of the projects will focus on protection measures and thus will implement more of them in one project. This leads to the target value of 15 for OI25.

### **Common indicator CO23 (Nature and biodiversity): Surface area of habitats supported to attain a better conservation status**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
CO23	Surface area of habitats supported to attain a better conservation status	Hectares	100 000	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator CO23 relates to action 2, and is part of the performance framework.

### Definitions:

The **surface area of habitats supported to attain a better conservation status** is the surface of restored or created areas with the aim to improve the conservation status of habitats. The operations shall be carried out in Natura 2000 areas and shall be capable of improving the conservation status of targeted habitats. For the indicator the total area of the NATURA 2000 area involved should be counted, not only the directly affected surface area where the funded action takes place. The conservation status of habitats at Natura 2000 sites is listed in Standard Data Forms.

Areas that receive support repeatedly should be counted only once.

In the EC guidelines for monitoring and evaluation the definition of CO23 says that the measures can be carried out both in or outside of Natura 2000 areas. The programme Interreg AT-HU counts only measures in Natura 2000 areas.

### Rationale for targets set:

The estimated number of projects in IP6d is 9.

The target value for this common indicator is closely connected to the IP's result indicator. For both, Natura 2000 Standard Data Forms are used as source of data (see also result indicator RI22). All Natura 2000 sites that are in the programme region add up to 621 907 ha, but naturally not all of them will be involved in projects financed by the programme. The institutions (national or nature park management) that are very likely to be





future beneficiaries in this field could be identified during network meetings for the preparation of the programme and through the expertise of the regional programme partner. The surface areas of the corresponding Natura 2000 sites have been added up for the estimation of the target value and the milestone.

It is estimated that there will be protection measures supported by the programme in the National Park Neusiedlersee / Fertő-Hanság and in at least one of the nature parks of the programme region. Therefore the target value consists of the surface area of the national park and one nature park.

### **Output indicator OI26: Joint research projects**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
OI26	Joint research projects	Number	3	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator OI26 relates to action 3.

#### **Definitions:**

**Research projects** in the context of IP6d/SO22 mean all analysis, counting or mapping of species (fauna and flora) and of habitats that contribute to a better knowledge about the examined species or habitat. Research projects are considered to be **joint**, if project partners from both Austria and Hungary participate in the research.

A research project is a project in the programme Interreg AT-HU.

#### **Rationale for targets set:**

The estimated number of projects in IP6d is 9. It is assumed that less than half of the projects will deal with research activities, which leads to a target value of 3 joint research projects.

### **Output indicator OI27: Participants in joint training schemes and awareness raising programmes**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
OI27	Participants in joint training schemes and awareness raising programmes	Number	200	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator OI27 relates to action 4.





### Definitions:

A joint **training scheme** in the context of IP6d/SO22 is a jointly implemented activity, action or measure for trainings in the field of environment or nature protection. Only schemes open to all members of the relevant target group or to the general public count.

**Awareness raising** programmes are intended to increase the environmental consciousness of the target group. Such environmental programmes can take various forms (e.g. information campaigns, trainings, etc.). Only programmes open to the general public count.

Training schemes and awareness raising programmes are considered to be **joint**, if they are prepared and implemented by partners from both sides of the border and available for target groups from both Austria and Hungary.

### Rationale for targets set:

The estimated number of projects in IP6d is 9. It is envisaged that at least two projects have trainings and awareness raising programmes as components in their projects. With two events each, 4 training events with 50 participants seem realistic to be implemented. This leads to the target value of 200 participants.

For the purpose of the indicator the number of individual participants at training schemes or awareness raising programmes is added up. Participants at two different schemes or programmes (not two events of the same scheme or programme!) count to both.

## 2.4 IP 6f / SO23: Improving the management and protection of water bodies

Output indicators for IP6f relate to the following examples of actions defined in the CP:

1. Cooperation in the field of water management and public services, securing and improving sustainable utilisation of water resources according to the Water Framework Directive and Flood Directive, such as
  - (i) Joint monitoring surveys and status assessment of border water bodies to detect the status and impacts of measures taken.
  - (ii) Determination of ecological minimum flow needs for surface water bodies.
  - (iii) Preparing and implementing joint pollution load assessment tests for cross-border surface water bodies, determination of limit values.
  - (iv) Exchange of innovative waste water purification methods.
  - (v) Determination of available ground water resources.
  - (vi) Preparing and implementing river restoration measurements in the border area.
  - (vii) Measures of integrated flood protection, including refining and setting up a joint cross-border flood forecast systems.
  - (viii) Development and implementation of measures elaborated on the basis of the results of the different water related strategic studies.





- (ix) Construction or upgrading of jointly used infrastructure for the purpose of research and monitoring in the field of water management.

The definition of output indicators for IP6f is as follows:

**Output indicator OI28: Jointly developed pilots and infrastructures**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
OI28	Jointly developed pilots and infrastructures	Number	2	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator OI28 relates to action 1 (there is only one action in SO23).

**Definitions:**

A **pilot action** (or **infrastructure**) is to be understood as a practical implementation of a new service, tool, method or approach (respectively infrastructure). It has an experimental nature as it is aimed at testing, evaluating or demonstrating the feasibility and effectiveness of approaches. For example a pilot action may cover the testing of innovative solutions or demonstrating the application of existing solutions to a new territory/sector. A pilot action is limited in its scope (area, duration, scale, etc.), and must be unprecedented in a comparable environment.

A pilot action (or infrastructure) is **jointly developed** if partners from both sides of the border are involved, strongly considering cross-border aspects of the pilot’s implementation.

**Rationale for targets set:**

The estimated number of projects in IP 6f is 2. At least one pilot action and one pilot infrastructure are expected to be implemented, which leads to the target value of 2.

**Output indicator OI29: Measures securing or improving the status of water bodies in qualitative and quantitative terms**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
OI29	Measures securing or improving the status of water bodies in qualitative and quantitative terms	Number	5	Monitoring	Annually





The output indicator OI29 relates to action 1 (there is only one action in SO23), and is part of the performance framework.

**Definitions:**

**Measures securing or improving the status of water bodies** in qualitative and quantitative terms can take the form of strategies, action plans, physical actions or investments intended to secure or improve the quality, regulate or optimise the quantity of water bodies such as a river, a lake, ground waters or reservoirs.

**Rationale for targets set:**

The actions for this IP were planned in close cooperation with the members of the (very limited) number of responsible institutions for the water sector. The estimated two large scale projects will each comprise at least two measures including also infrastructure, which is why the target value is 5. As investments (even in small-scale infrastructure) tend to require more preparation time, the milestone for 2018 was calculated conservatively with 1.

**Common indicator CO42 (Productive investment): Number of research institutions participating in cross-border, transnational or interregional research projects**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
CO42	Number of research institutions participating in cross-border, transnational or interregional research projects	Organisations	5	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator CO42 relates to action 1 (there is only one action in SO23).

**Definitions:**

A **research institution** is an organisation of which research and development (R&D) is a primary activity. It can be a legal entity under public or private law.

A **cross-border research project** is a research project in the programme Interreg AT-HU. Transnational and interregional projects are not relevant to be counted by the projects in our programme.

To **participate** in a cross-border research project means that the institution shall be actively involved in activities of the project with a continuous or regular participation but does not necessarily have to be a project partner.





**Rationale for targets set:**

The estimated number of projects in IP 6f is 2.

It is assumed that activities in cross-border water management will in many cases contain research components, meaning a participation of more than one research institution in each project seems likely. This leads to a target value of 5 research institutions.

**2.5 IP 7b / SO31: Improving cross-border connectivity of regional centres to the TEN-T network**

Output indicators for IP7b relate to the following examples of actions defined in the CP:

1. Investments in constructing missing border-crossing elements of road/rail links for a better connection of the tertiary nodes to the TEN-T network
2. Investments in reconstructing or upgrading missing border-crossing elements of road/rail links for a better connection the tertiary nodes to the TEN-T network
3. Investments in upgrading and technical improvements of the cross-border rail network
4. Pre-investment studies for rail/road infrastructure investments

The definition of output indicators for IP7b is as follows:

**Common indicator CO13 (Roads): Total length of newly built roads**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
CO13	Total length of newly built roads	km	8	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator CO13 relates to action 1.

**Definitions:**

The indicator describes the **length of roads** (in kilometres) **constructed** by the project where...

- a. no road existed before OR
- b. as a consequence of project completion, the capacity and quality of the previously existing local/secondary road is significantly improved to reach a higher classification (e.g. national road or equivalent). In this case the road cannot be counted under indicator CO14, total length of reconstructed or upgraded roads.

**Rationale for targets set:**

The estimated number of projects in IP 7b is 5.





Based on talks between Hungary and Burgenland with regard to cross-border road and rail infrastructure, it is envisaged to support the construction / reconstruction of 5 border crossings for which about 8 kilometres of roads have to be newly built.

### **Common indicator CO14 (Roads): Total length of reconstructed or upgraded roads**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
CO14	Total length of reconstructed or upgraded roads	km	10	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator CO14 relates to action 2.

#### **Definitions:**

The indicator describes the **length of roads** where the **capacity or quality** of the road (including safety standards) was **improved**. If the upgrade is significant enough for the road to qualify as new road, it will be counted under CO13, total length of newly build roads and not under CO14. See also explanation for CO13.

#### **Rationale for targets set:**

The estimated number of projects in IP 7b is 5.

Based on talks between Hungary and Burgenland with regard to cross-border road and rail infrastructure, it is envisaged to support the construction / reconstruction of 5 border crossings for which about 10 kilometres of roads have to be reconstructed or upgraded.

### **Common indicator CO12 (Railway): Total length of reconstructed or upgraded railway line**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
CO12	Total length of reconstructed or upgraded railway line	km	10	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator CO12 relates to action 2 and 3, and is part of the performance framework.





**Definitions:**

The indicator describes the **length of railroads** of which **quality or capacity** has been **improved**. This can include electrification, developing single track railroad into double track, increasing the possible speed on the track, or any combination of these, but excludes installation of signalling systems (e.g. ensuring ERTMS (European Rail Traffic Management System) compatibility).

The approach chosen here is to exclude signalling systems as they distort the values. Signalling systems should not be treated in CO12.

**Rationale for targets set:**

The estimated number of projects in IP 7b is 5.

Based on talks between Hungary and Burgenland with regard to cross-border road and rail infrastructure, it is envisaged to support one major rail project within the cooperation programme. The length of this railway section is ca. 10 km, and it is estimated that construction will have started until the end of 2018, which is why the milestone is 2 km.

**Output indicator OI31: Pre-investment studies**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
OI31	Pre-investment studies	Number	2	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator OI31 relates to action 4.

**Definitions:**

**Pre-investment studies** for infrastructure projects in IP 7b analyse the feasibility of the planned investment, including the assessment of e.g.:

- needs,
- socio- environmental benefits
- regulatory environment,
- location, environmental impacts
- conceptual or detailed (technical) plans,
- project design and options,
- procurement,
- value for money (costs, revenues, savings),
- implementation and execution plan
- impacts,
- risks.

The above list is neither exclusive nor is compulsory to include all of its elements in a pre-investment study. Content of the study must be established according to the actual needs of the project.





### Rationale for targets set:

The estimated number of projects in IP 7b is 5.

It is estimated that two pre-investment studies will be carried out, one for road and one for rail infrastructure.

## 2.6 IP 7c / SO32: Enhancing sustainable mobility on the local and regional level

Output indicators for IP7c relate to the following examples of actions defined in the CP:

1. Actions that improve the interoperability of the regional transport system, e.g. preparation of joint strategies, concepts and action plans as well as small scale investments, for the construction of new as well as the extension of existing park and ride, bike and ride and park and drive facilities in transport nodes
2. Actions that improve the coordination of the regional public transport services, e.g. preparation of joint strategies, concepts and action plans as well as small scale investments, for the development of integrated information systems, tariff systems and timetables
3. Actions that close the gaps in the cross-border public transport system, e.g. preparation of joint strategies, concepts and action plans as well as small scale investments, for new/adapted cross-border rail and bus services
4. Actions that support the possibilities to use the bicycle for daily trips, e.g. preparation of joint strategies, concepts and action plans as well as small scale investments, for new and upgraded cycling infrastructure (cycle paths, parking facilities, etc.) closing existing gaps in the local, regional and cross-border cycling network.
5. Actions that improve mobility on the local level, e.g. preparation of joint strategies, concepts and action plans as well as small scale investments, for alternative mobility concepts (flexible public transport offers, car-sharing, etc.), walking, e-mobility

Furthermore mobility management measures like

6. Establishment and operation of regional mobility centres that act as one-stop-shops for information about the existing mobility offers in the region
7. Promotion of the use of environmentally friendly means of transport for different target groups (commuters, tourists, schools, etc.)





The definition of output indicators for IP7c is as follows:

**Output indicator OI32: Jointly developed strategies, transport concepts and actions**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
OI32	Jointly developed strategies, transport concepts and actions	Number	12	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator relates to actions 1 to 5, and is part of the performance framework.

**Definitions:**

A **strategy** is a common vision and a set of objectives and priorities in a longer perspective, in order to answer problems that are relevant for the participating regions. For the purposes of IP7c/SO32 only transport strategies are considered

A **transport concept** can be aimed at e.g. planning the distribution of public transport spaces, as well as planning and ranking of related measures.

**Transport strategies, concepts and actions** must be aimed at increasing the use of sustainable means of transport, such as e.g. a larger share of people using sustainable transport, increased frequency in the use of, or longer distances travelled with sustainable transport.

For the purposes of IP7c/SO32 a strategy, transport concept or action is considered to be **jointly developed**, if the development is done in the project with the involvement of at least one Austrian and one Hungarian project partner, strongly considering cross-border aspects.

**Rationale for targets set:**

The estimated number of projects in IP 7c is 4.

It is estimated that due to the available funds in the IP and the limited number of beneficiaries in this field, four projects will be funded, each encompassing several measures or targeting different transport modes. As the number of 3 measures (strategies, concepts, actions) per project seems to be realistic, the target value is 12.

For the milestone it is assumed that at least two projects will be running in 2018 with two actions, strategies, concepts each. This leads to the milestone of 4.





**Output indicator OI33: Joint schemes for promoting environmentally friendly transport**

ID	Indicator	Measurement Unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
OI33	Joint schemes for promoting environmentally friendly transport	Number	4	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator relates to action 6 and 7.

**Definitions:**

Joint schemes:

**Environmentally friendly transport** contributes to the decrease of CO<sub>2</sub> emission. For the purposes of OI33 its **promotion** should contribute to the shift from private vehicles with internal combustion engines to public transport, bicycle, car sharing, or vehicles using renewable energy sources, etc.

A **scheme** is a bundle of measures to be counted, not a single action. For the purpose of IP7c/SO33 schemes are considered to be **joint** if in ideal case all regions participating in the project are represented, but at least one Austrian and one Hungarian region.

**Rationale for targets set:**

The estimated number of projects in IP7c is 4. It seems to be realistic, that at least two of them will include schemes for promoting environmentally friendly transport, and as project can typically involve more than one such measure, this leads to the target value of 4.

**2.7 IP 11 CBC / SO41: Improving institutional cross-border cooperation in order to strengthen the integration; SO42: Strengthening intercultural capacities and labour mobility of the border population by supporting cross-border education initiatives and vocational training**

Output indicators for IP11 CBC relate to the following examples of actions defined in the CP:

1. Delivery of harmonised and high quality public services through better cooperation of municipalities, cities and regions exchanging knowledge and developing strategies and processes (supporting SO41)
2. Preparation and implementation of joint research, strategies, studies, action plans and management activities of cross-border networks and institutions on local/regional level in the field of renewable energy/energy efficiency (supporting SO41)





3. Preparation and implementation of joint strategies, studies, action plans and management activities of cross-border networks and institutions in the field of regional development (supporting SO41)
4. Strengthening cooperation between local/regional institutions and/or citizens, e.g. via cultural activities or by “people to people cooperation”, (supporting SO41)
5. Design and implementation of education schemes in pre-schools, schools and other educational institutions, aiming at acquiring and improving qualifications, skills and competences (e.g. intercultural communication trainings and language courses, joint schemes to support traineeships) (supporting SO42)
6. Harmonisation of vocational education systems (dual education) for meeting the needs of SMEs and the joint labour market (e.g. resulting in mutual acceptance of qualifications and in higher labour mobility) (supporting SO42)

The definition of output indicators for IP11 CBC is as follows:

**Output indicator OI41: Actors involved in cross-border cooperation**

ID	Indicator	Measurement Unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
OI41	Actors involved in cross-border cooperation	Number	250	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator relates to action 1 to 5, and is part of the performance framework.

**Definitions:**

**Actors** are components interacting in a cross-border network or cooperation. They play an active role and are thus competent in a specific field and take respective thematic responsibilities. Actors are not participants in events or trainings.

Depending on the nature of the network/cooperation, actors can be individual persons, institutions or units of an institution.

Actors do not necessarily have to be project partners or strategic partners.

**Rationale for targets set:**

Basic assumption was that on average projects should have a budget of approximately EUR 730 000, therefore 26 projects in total are estimated for this IP. The character of the projects will be quite diverse in this IP, comprising larger networks as well as smaller partnerships. The average number of actors involved (actively and regularly involved in project activities, but not participants in events or trainings) is assumed with 9 to 10, leading to a target value of 250.

For the milestone it is further estimated that at least 5 or 6 projects will be established until 2018. This leads to the milestone of 50.





**Output indicator OI42: Joint cross-border cultural, educational, recreational and other type of community events and actions (“people to people”)**

ID	Indicator	Measurement Unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
OI42	Joint cross-border cultural, educational, recreational and other type of community events and actions (“people to people”)	Number	25	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator relates to action 4.

**Definitions:**

**People to people** community events and actions are activities characterised by direct involvement and mobilisation of citizens, also via NGOs, such as cultural or community development associations. Expected effects of such events and actions include (among others) removing existing prejudices, improving inter-cultural understanding and in some cases indirectly the development of cross-border economic relations. For the purpose of the indicator people to people actions are counted mainly, but not exclusively in the field of culture, education and recreation.

People to people community events and actions are considered to be **joint**, if they are prepared and implemented by partners from both sides of the border and available for target groups from both Austria and Hungary.

**Rationale for the targets set:**

The indicator OI42 relates mainly to action 4 (strengthening cooperation between local/regional institutions and/or citizens, e.g. via cultural activities or by „people to people cooperation”), but it is not excluded that community events and actions will be carried out also in projects with their focal point in other actions.

It is estimated that about 5 projects deal with cooperation between institutions and/or citizens primarily, whereas 3 community events or actions will be organised per project – which leads to a number of 15 events or actions. Furthermore, for 5-10 projects that focus on other actions in IP11 it seems likely that one or two community events or actions will be organised. This leads to a target value of total 25 community events and actions.





**Common indicator CO46 (Labour market and training): Number of participants in joint education and training schemes to support youth employment, educational opportunities and higher and vocational education across borders**

ID	Indicator	Measurement Unit	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
CO46	Labour market and training: Number of participants in joint education and training schemes to support youth employment, educational opportunities and higher and vocational education across borders	Persons	200	Monitoring	Annually

The output indicator CO46 relates to action 5 and 6.

**Definitions:**

A joint **education and training scheme** in the context of IP11CBC/SO42 is a jointly implemented activity, action or measure in accordance with the investment priority set out in article 7 (a) (iii) of the ETC regulation (the CBC-IP “investing in education, training and vocational training for skills and lifelong learning by developing and implementing joint education, vocational training and training schemes”), preferably with a direct positive impact on the chances of the participants on the labour market. Only schemes open to the general public count.

For the purpose of the indicator the number of individual **participants** at education and training schemes is added up. Participants at two different schemes or programmes (not two events of the same scheme!) count to both.

Education and training schemes are considered to be **joint**, if they are prepared and implemented by partners from both sides of the border and available for target groups from both Austria and Hungary.

**Rationale for targets set:**

The estimated number of projects in IP11 is 26. It is envisaged that at approximately five projects deal with education and training. With two events each, 10 training events would be held. As in the field of education and training the number of participants in one event is usually not too high, 20 participants per event seem to be realistic. This leads to the target value of 200 participants.





### 3 RESULT INDICATORS

#### 3.1 IP 3d / SO11: Strengthening regional entrepreneurship, the performance of start-ups and the innovation capacities of SMEs with a focus on the development of (internationally) competitive products

##### **Result indicator RI11: Survival rate of enterprises after 3 years**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
RI 11	Survival rate of enterprises after 3 years	Percent	61.78% (AT: 67,85; HU: 51,87)	2012	62%	KSH, Statistik Austria	Annually

##### **Source of Data and Data Collection:**

This quantitative indicator is based on statistics provided by both national statistical offices on NUTS 3 level.

The number of n-year survival enterprises for a particular year t refers to the number of new enterprises in year t-n that have not died in year t. For example, a 3-year survival rate (in percent) for the reference year 2009 refers to the profit organisations founded in 2009 that survived until 2012 divided by the total number of newly founded business organisations in 2009. For the respective definitions of the national statistical offices for new/dead enterprises see the paragraphs below.

The survey unit used in business demography is the enterprise. An enterprise is defined as a legal (organisational) unit that produces goods or services and has a certain degree of autonomy in decision-making, especially for the allocation of its current resources. The enterprise may carry out one or more activities at one or more locations (local units).

The Hungarian Central Statistical Office (Központi Statisztikai Hivatal, KSH) provides data on the 3 year survival rate of for-profit organisations, which is available in percentage on a NUTS 3 level ([https://www.ksh.hu/thm/1/indi1\\_2\\_4.html](https://www.ksh.hu/thm/1/indi1_2_4.html)).

Detailed KSH data on NUTS 3 level about

- the number of newly established enterprises in the year “t-3”
- and how many of them survived in the year “t”

is also available and enable the precise calculation of 3 survival rate of enterprises. Data is available 2 years after the year “t”, i.e. for the AIR 2015 data is available from 2013.

Up to date statistical data is available for the year 2013 at [www.ksh.hu/docs/hun/xftp/idoszaki/valldemog/valldemog13.xls](http://www.ksh.hu/docs/hun/xftp/idoszaki/valldemog/valldemog13.xls), respectively at [www.ksh.hu/docs/hun/xftp/idoszaki/valldemog/valldemog14.xls](http://www.ksh.hu/docs/hun/xftp/idoszaki/valldemog/valldemog14.xls) for the year 2014.





Based on the terminology of the KSH, enterprises having revenue or at least one employee in a certain year are considered to be active that year. We may speak of a newly founded (new) enterprise in a given year if it belongs to the group of active enterprises, but was not active in the previous two years. An enterprise is dead (ceased), if it is not member of the group of active enterprises in two subsequent years.

Statistik Austria provides statistics on business demography, which include data on active enterprises, on births of enterprises, their survival and on deaths of enterprises (“Überlebensraten von im Jahr 200x neu gegründeten Unternehmen”). The year of birth is defined as the year in which the enterprise first achieved a turnover of more than 10 000 € or employed at least one person for the first time. The year of death is defined as the year in which the enterprise achieved a turnover of more than 10 000 € for the last time and/or had employees for the last time. For the survival of enterprises, the year of birth of the enterprise cohort in question has to be selected.

The following link of Statistik Austria (AT) includes data from 2012 for the calculation of the 3 year survival rate of enterprises (status 27.04.2016), both NUTS2 and NUTS3 levels:

[http://www.statistik.at/web\\_de/statistiken/wirtschaft/unternehmen\\_arbeitsstaetten/unternehmensdemo-grafie\\_bis\\_2014/fortbestand\\_neu\\_gegruendeter\\_unternehmen\\_bis\\_2014/070794.html](http://www.statistik.at/web_de/statistiken/wirtschaft/unternehmen_arbeitsstaetten/unternehmensdemo-grafie_bis_2014/fortbestand_neu_gegruendeter_unternehmen_bis_2014/070794.html)

Survival rates are available both for the NUTS2 and NUTS3 regions.

In both Austria and Hungary, the data is collected annually, but it takes about two years until it is available. Therefore, the baseline year for the programme is 2012. In the annual implementation report to be submitted in 2019 the value will therefore refer to data of 2017, in the final implementation report the value will therefore refer to data of 2021.

### **Frequency of reporting:**

The data will be collected annually and reported through the annual implementation reports. Data collection, calculation and reporting will be coordinated by the Joint Secretariat and the Managing Authority.

### **Rationale:**

Potential entrepreneurs and start-ups will profit most from better access to research results, funds for innovation and more effective services provided by the intermediary organisations (in comparison to well established and therefore competitive enterprises). However, the survival of a new business is mainly dependent on macro-economic and other many other factors. For the target value only a modest increase was chosen, as in the last decade regional survival rates decreased by rates between 2 and 10%.





### 3.2 IP 6c / SO21: Improving the protection, promotion and development of natural and cultural heritage through common approaches to sustainable tourism

#### **Result indicator RI21: Overnight stays**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Base-line year	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
RI 21	Overnight stays	Number	22 809 823	2013	25 000 000	Eurostat	Annually

#### **Source of Data and Data Collection:**

This quantitative indicator is based on EUROSTAT data on NUTS 2 level.

EUROSTAT collects “nights spent at tourist accommodation establishments [tour\_occ\_nin2], defined as each night a guest / tourist (resident or non-resident) actually spends (sleeps or stays) in a tourist accommodation establishment or non-rented accommodation. This data is collected for both Austria and Hungary on NUTS 2 level. Data for Wien was excluded as this major tourist destination and its cultural heritage sites are not targeted by the cooperation programme.

The data in both countries is available about two years after collection at EUROSTAT. Therefore, the baseline year for the programme is 2013. In the annual implementation report to be submitted in 2019 the value will therefore refer to data of 2017, in the final implementation report the value will therefore refer to data of 2021.

#### **Frequency of reporting:**

The data will be collected annually and reported through the annual implementation reports. Data collection, calculation and reporting will be coordinated by the Joint Secretariat and the Managing Authority.

#### **Rationale:**

Developing and expanding offers in connection with the rich natural and cultural heritage will make the border region more attractive for visitors and tourists, and therefore lead to an increase of overnight stays by an estimated 10%.





### 3.3 IP 6d / SO22: Improving the ecological stability and resilience of landscape and ecosystems

#### **Result indicator RI22: Conservation degree A (of all habitat types in the Natura 2000 sites of the programme region)**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
RI 22	Conservation degree A (of all habitat types in the Natura 2000 sites of the programme region)	Percent	10.5	2013 (release date)	12	Natura 2000 Standard Data Forms	2018, 2021, 2023

#### **Source of Data and Data Collection:**

This quantitative indicator is based on Natura 2000 Standard Data Forms, which are prepared annually by the responsible government departments and used for reporting to the EC. The Standard Data Forms contain information about all habitat types present on the site and assessment for them as well as information about species of flora and fauna. All forms are published via the Natura 2000 Viewer: <http://natura2000.eea.europa.eu/>

The Standard Data Forms for Natura 2000 sites located in the Austrian part of the programme region were obtained via the Natura 2000 Viewer or were provided directly by the responsible government department.

In Hungary, the most recent Standard Data Forms are also published on a website (<http://www.natura.2000.hu/hu/node/253>). This website was used to download all required forms for the Natura 2000 sites located in the Hungarian part of the programme region.

The table below gives an overview of the data analysed for establishing the baseline value:

Region	Number of Natura 2000 sites within programme region (= number of used Standard Data Forms)	Total Number of Habitats in these sites	Total number of habitats with conservation degree A
Burgenland	14	98	<b>10</b>
Wien	4	43	<b>2</b>
Oststeiermark und Graz	10	79	<b>11</b>





<b>Wiener Umland Süd und Nieder- österreich Süd</b>	5	164	<b>14</b>
<b>Győr-Moson- Sopron, Vas, Zala</b>	50	321	<b>37</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>705</b>	<b>74</b>

The Natura 2000 Standard Data Forms are prepared annually. Therefore, the baseline year for the programme is 2013. This refers, however, simply to the release date. The majority of data forms (Hungary, Burgenland and Niederösterreich) refer to 2012 (61 of 83 sites), additional 7 refer to 2013. Data from Wien (4 sites) refer to 2010 and from Steiermark (10 sites) to 2010 or before.

### Frequency of reporting:

As the value of this result indicator is not expected to change considerably over the whole programming period, it will not be reported annually. Therefore, only the annual implementation reports to be submitted in 2018 (referring to data of 2017), 2021 (referring to data of 2020) and 2023 (referring to data of 2022) will include information on progress of this result indicator. Data collection, calculation and reporting will be coordinated by the Joint Secretariat and the Managing Authority.

### Rationale:

The actions planned will explicitly target the protected areas in the programme region and therefore have a direct impact on the conservation status of their habitats. Despite of this, the percentage of conservation degree A is not expected to rise significantly during the programme period, as exogenous factors (e.g. climate change, pollution, infrastructure developments, traffic) pose a major threat to the habitats. For this reason, the programme aims at a slight improvement of the status quo, with a target value only 1.5% above the baseline, which is equivalent to 10 more habitats with conservation degree A.





### 3.4 IP 6f / SO23: Improving the management and protection of water bodies

#### **Result indicator RI23: Chemical and ecological condition of border water bodies classified as “good” and “very good”**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
RI 23	Chemical and ecological condition of border water bodies classified as “good” and “very good”	Number	2 (of 9)	2013 (2009/2010 for the Danube)	4	Expert report about the condition of the Austrian-Hungarian border water bodies by the Austrian-Hungarian Water Commission; Danube: National Water Management Plans Austria and Hungary	2018, 2021, 2023

#### **Source of Data and Data Collection:**

This quantitative indicator is based on the expert report about the condition of the Austrian-Hungarian border water bodies by the Austrian-Hungarian Water Commission. This report assesses the chemical and ecological condition of surface water bodies and the quantity and chemical condition of groundwater bodies.

However, this report does not cover the river Danube. The Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management publishes the assessment of the ecological status for the Austrian part of the Danube every six years in the National Water Management Plan (Nationaler Gewässerbewirtschaftungsplan). This report was published first in 2009 and the next update was foreseen for the year 2015. Information can be obtained by the “Wasser Informationssystem Austria (WISA)” [<https://www.bmlfuw.gv.at/wasser/wisa/fachinformation/ngp.html>]. As of March 2017, the Austrian National Water Management Plan 2015 is available as a draft.





Data used for the baseline on the ecological status of the river Danube was published in Hungary in 2010 by the Central Directorate for Water and Environment of the Ministry of Environment and Water Hungary in its report Ecological Monitoring of Surface Waters by the National Institute for Environment, Water Management Plan Hungary. (A felszínivíz-testek ökológiai minősítése, 2010, in Nemzeti Környezetügyi IntézetNeKI, Magyarország vízgyűjtő-gazdálkodásiterve, 2010). As of 2017 the responsible ministry is the Ministry of Agriculture (State Secretariat for Environment, Agricultural Developments and Hungaricums).

For the indicator, the assessment of the chemical and ecological condition of nine cross-border surface water bodies is used. These are the lake Neusiedler See / Fertő and the rivers Danube/Duna, Leitha/Lajta, Goldbach/Aranypatak, Rechnitzbach/Rohonc, Pinka/Pinka, Strem/Strém, Lafnitz/Lapincs and Raab/Rába. Assessment comprises five classifications very good, good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory and poor. Only those water bodies are counted if both – Austrian and Hungarian - parts of the water body are classified as “good” or “very good”. At the time when the baselines were set, in several cases Austrian and Hungarian parts of the river were classified differently.

The expert report of the Austrian-Hungarian Water Commission is set up annually - it takes about a year until it is available. The data on the Danube (National Water Management Plans in Austria and Hungary) is updated every six years. Therefore, the baseline year is 2013 with the exception of the Danube, for which the baseline year is 2009/2010.

### **Frequency of reporting:**

As the value of this result indicator is not expected to change considerably over the whole programming period, it will not be reported annually. Therefore, only the annual implementation reports to be submitted in 2018 (referring to data of 2017 / for the Danube 2015), in 2021 (referring to data of 2020 / for the Danube 2015) and 2023 (referring to data of 2022 / for the Danube 2021) will include information on progress of this result indicator. Data collection, calculation and reporting will be coordinated by the Joint Secretariat and the Managing Authority.

### **Rationale:**

The actions of this IP were defined in close cooperation with the Austrian-Hungarian Water Commission, which comprises the responsible bodies for this sector. The baseline value for the result indicator is based on the analysis of the Commission’s expert report, while the target value is in line with the future measures that have been agreed by the bilateral Water Commission for the coming years.





### 3.5 IP 7b / SO31: Improving cross-border connectivity of regional centres to the TEN-T network

#### **Result indicator RI31: Average travel time (individual transport) to a node with TEN-T network connection**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
RI 31	Average travel time (individual transport) to a node with TEN-T network connection	Minutes	14.08	2013	13	ERRAM (Grenz-über-schreitendes Erreichbarkeitsbasiertes-Raster-Raumanalyse-Modell HU-AT)	2018, 2021, 2023

#### **Source of Data and Data Collection:**

This quantitative indicator is based on the outcomes of the cross-border project ERRAM HU-AT dealing with grid based accessibility modelling that provides decision makers with comparable and comprehensive data on processes and trends in their regions. For the calculation of the result indicator only the core or comprehensive road network nodes in the programme area have been taken into consideration. As the first calculations have shown that the high accessibility levels within the city of Wien would have biased the results, it has been decided not to include Wien in the calculations.

Methodology: Access to the high level road network is an important indicator for the level of accessibility of regional centres. In the ERRAM project, the travel times from each inhabited grid cell to the next available high-level road network (motorways, Schnellstraßen) node have been calculated.

For monitoring the improvement of cross-border connectivity and accessibility the average travel time (in minutes) of inhabitants of the programme area to the next high-level road network node has been calculated.

The ERRAM model is available for future calculations. The basic input data for the modelling include the infrastructure development measures carried out by the national and regional authorities (depending on their responsibility) and can be collected easily. For the calculation the ERRAM road network graph has to be updated accordingly. The baseline year for the programme is 2013.





**Frequency of reporting:**

As the value of this result indicator is not expected to change considerably over the whole programming period and as for the calculation the ERRAM road network graph has to be updated by external experts, it will not be reported annually. Therefore, only the annual implementation reports to be submitted in 2018 (referring to infrastructure improvements carried out until then), 2021 (referring to infrastructure improvements carried out until then) and 2023 (referring to infrastructure improvements carried out until then) will include information on progress of this result indicator. Data collection, calculation and reporting will be coordinated by the Joint Secretariat and the Managing Authority.

**Rationale:**

The basic assumption is that cross-border connectivity of regional centres will improve, if travel times for the inhabitants of the border region decrease. However, not all traffic relations and routes can be monitored. As a consequence, access (from all grid cells) to the high level road network was selected as the most significant for this specific objective. Regarding the target value, tests within the ERRAM model have been conducted in order to estimate a reliable value. These tests have shown that infrastructure projects of the scope that can be expected for the programme, will decrease average travel time at its best by one minute.

**3.6 IP 7c / SO32: Enhancing sustainable mobility on the local and regional level**

**Result indicator RI32: Intermodal public transport nodes**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
RI 32	Intermodal public transport nodes	Number	1 274.5	2014	1 400	ERRAM	2018, 2021, 2023

**Source of Data and Data Collection:**

The **existing passenger railway stations** (collected in the project ERRAM) in the programme area are the basis for the calculation of the indicator. Furthermore the **number of trains leaving the stations** on a normal working day (AT: ERRAM, HU: provided by GYSEV 24.11.2014) and the availability of **park+ride and bike+ride facilities** (AT: P+R database of Wien, Niederösterreich and Burgenland updated 17.02.2014; HU: allosok-br-prprovided by GYSEV 7.11.2014) has been taken into account.

The Styrian part of the programme region was excluded for two reasons: Firstly, this thematic field has been and will continue to be of low importance for the programme and project partners from Steiermark, as Steiermark does not share a common border with Hungary. It can be assumed that there will be no projects with Styrian beneficiaries in





this field in the upcoming period. Secondly, ERRAM did not have a Styrian partner, which is why the data used for the result indicator was not available.

**Methodology:**

The quality of an intermodal public transport node highly depends on the number of connections offered from the station to other stations and the possibilities to change between car/bicycle and the train. In order to model the differences in quality within the programme area plus to come up with an overall value for the region, the railway stations have been assessed by using the following classification:

	more than ## slots	points
Number of Park+Ride slots	10	1
	50	2
	100	3
	250	5
	500	8
	1000	10
	more than ## slots	points
Number of Bike+Ride slots	5	1
	25	2
	50	3
	75	4
	100	5
	200	8
	more than ## departures	points
Number of trains leaving the station on a normal working day	8	1
	16	2
	32	3
	64	4
	100	5
	200	8

The updated information for the number of departures can be obtained from the Public Transport Association VOR (AT) and the railway operators GYSEV and MAV (HU). Data on park+ride and bike+ride facilities can be provided by the Austrian counties (Wien, Niederösterreich and Burgenland) as well as from the railway operators GYSEV and MAV in Hungary.

**Frequency of reporting:**

As the calculation of the result indicator’s value has to be done by external experts, it will not be reported annually. Therefore, only the annual implementation reports to be submitted in 2018 (referring to 2017 data of VOR, GYSEV, MAV, Wien, Niederösterreich, Burgenland), 2021 (referring to 2020 data of VOR, GYSEV, MAV, Wien, Niederösterreich, Burgenland) and 2023 (referring to 2022 data of VOR, GYSEV, MAV, Wien, Niederösterreich, Burgenland) will include information on progress of this result indicator. Data collection, calculation and reporting will be coordinated by the Joint Secretariat and the Managing Authority.



**Rationale:**

Actions under this IP will largely focus on the (cross-border) coordination and integration of the different modes of environmentally friendly transport. Focal point are the existing railway lines, which are the most attractive form of public transport in the region due to travel time, frequency and convenience – and in terms of public transport the only way to cross the border, as cross-border busses are negligible. In the rural Austrian – Hungarian border region railways serve a larger geographic area, which is why it is inevitable to create, improve and promote Park & Ride and Bike & Ride facilities.

The estimation of the target value is roughly based on an analysis of existing transport and development plans (number of Park & Ride slots plus 25%, number of Bike & Ride slots plus 20%).

**3.7 IP 11 CBC / SO41: Improving the environment for cross-border co-operation in order to strengthen the integration**

**Result indicator RI41: Level of cooperation quality in the border region (share of above-average ratings of cross-border cooperation)**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
RI 41	Level of co-operation quality in the border region	Percent of highest rating	54.03%	2014	65%	Survey among all beneficiaries and potential beneficiaries of the CBC AT-HU 2007-2013 and 2014-2020	2018, 2021, 2023

**Source of Data and Data Collection:**

This qualitative indicator is based on a survey (see annex to this document for the questionnaire) among a target group of about 400 actors (institutions), according to the most recent list of beneficiaries of the Cross-border Cooperation Programme Austria - Hungary 2007-2013 and potential beneficiaries of 2014-2020. According to the RECOM network analysis, the range of these actors reflect the programme fields of business, research and innovation (TO 3), natural and cultural heritage and tourism (IP 6c), environment and water issues( IP 6d, IP 6f), transport and mobility (TO 7) and (renewable) energy (focus field within TO 11).





### **Methodology:**

The answers in the questionnaire will be given as a rating on a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high). For the baseline and the target value the share of the two highest ratings (4 and 5) in the total of answers will be used.

For additional information, the questionnaire also asks for an affiliation of the interviewees to the thematic fields of the cooperation programme, the region of their workplace and the kind of institution they represent. This part is not relevant for the indicator, but allows for a differentiation between the target groups of the programme (e.g. for the purpose of information and communication measures, project development).

The baseline year for the programme is the year of the first survey, which is the year 2014. Further surveys will be conducted in 2017, 2020 and 2022.

### **Frequency of reporting:**

As the result indicator's value is based on surveys that will be conducted by external experts, it will not be reported annually. Therefore, only the annual implementation reports to be submitted in 2018 (referring to the survey conducted in 2017), 2021 (referring to the survey conducted in 2020) and 2023 (referring to the survey conducted in 2022) will include information on progress of this result indicator. Data collection, calculation and reporting will be coordinated by the Joint Secretariat and the Managing Authority.

### **Rationale:**

The actions of this priority axis seek to improve pre-conditions for cross-border cooperation and support capacity-building of networks, institutions and public administrations. Consequently, it is necessary that the result indicator reflects the qualitative aspects of cooperation and a survey among relevant regional actors has been chosen as the adequate method.





### 3.8 IP 11 CBC / SO42: Strengthening intercultural capacities and labour mobility of the border population by supporting cross-border education initiatives and vocational training

#### **Result indicator RI42: Institutions involved in cross-border education schemes**

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023)	Source of data	Frequency of reporting
RI 42	Institutions involved in cross-border education schemes	Number	35	2014	45	Monitoring	Annually

#### **Source of Data and Data Collection:**

This quantitative indicator is based on the AT-HU programme monitoring. For the baseline data has been extracted from ATMOS, while the values for the annual reporting will be extracted from the newly introduced eMS.

#### **Methodology:**

“Institutions involved” have been defined as project partners and associated (formerly known as strategic) partners in SO42 education projects (related to actions 5 and 6). During the 2007-2013 programme period, 12 projects received funding in the field of education and vocational training: AT-HU ISA, BILKIG, DX, EdTWIN, EDUCORB, EDUCORB extended, FA, FEMCOOP, LENA, MULITILING, OPTICOM and Solarschule II. The total number of involved institutions (partners involved in more than one project were only counted once) adds up to 35.

#### **Frequency of reporting:**

The data will be collected annually and reported through the annual implementation reports. Data collection, calculation and reporting will be coordinated by the Joint Secretariat and the Managing Authority.

#### **Rationale:**

The actions of this priority axis aim to strengthen basic skills (such as languages or intercultural knowledge) and build capacities (such as vocational or other professional and specialist qualifications) of individual inhabitants of the border region. This will enable them in the long term to engage with inhabitants from the partner country or seek employment on the other side of the border. For a better representation of the programme’s (short term) contribution to this long term and complex objective, a quantitative indicator has been chosen that captures the level of involvement of key institutions and multipliers in this field.





## 4 Annex

### Questionnaire for RI41 - Level of cooperation quality in the border region

#### Question 1:

Please rate on a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high) the frame conditions for cross-border cooperation in the Austrian-Hungarian border region!

- How do you rate the level of institutional cooperation between Austria and Hungary in general (cross-border coordination of strategies and processes)?

Low 

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

 High

- To what extent do you feel supported by the national public services in Austria and Hungary?

Low 

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

 High

- To what extent do you feel supported by the regional development organisations, e.g. RECOM, Regionalmanagements?

Low 

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

 High

#### Question 2:

Please rate on a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high) the current cooperation intensity within your Austrian-Hungarian partner network (in terms of stability, continuity, frequency...)!

Low 

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

 High

#### Question 3:

Did you cooperate

- always with the same partner(s)?
- with different partners in each project?
- with several partners, in consortia?

#### Question 4:

Please rate on a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high) your own ability for cross-border cooperation (in terms of language competences, intercultural competences, knowledge about the administrative/legal/institutional structures of the other country, personal contacts etc.)!

Low 

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

 High





**Question 5:**

In which region do you work (multiple answers are possible)?

- Wien
- Niederösterreich
- Burgenland
- Steiermark
- Győr-Moson-Sopron
- Vas
- Zala

**Question 6:**

What kind of institution do you represent?

Categories	Examples
• local public authority	• municipality, etc.
• regional public authority	• regional council, etc.
• national public authority	• ministry, etc.
• sectoral agency	• local or regional development agency, environmental agency, energy agency, employment agency, etc.
• infrastructure and (public) service provider	• public transport, utility company (water supply, electricity supply, sewage, gas, waste collection, etc.), airport, port, railway, etc.
• interest groups including NGOs	• international organisation, trade union, foundation, charity, voluntary association, club, etc.
• higher education and research	• university faculty, college, research institution, RTD facility, research cluster, etc.
• education/training centre and school	• primary, secondary, pre-school, vocational training, etc.
• enterprise, excluding SME	•
• SME	•
• business support organisation	• chamber of commerce, chamber of trade and crafts, business incubator or innovation centre, business clusters, etc.
• EGTC	
• International organisation, EEIG under national law	
• General public	
• Other	





### Question 7:

In which thematic field do you work (multiple choices possible)?

- Business, research, innovation (TO 3)
- Natural heritage / cultural heritage / tourism (IP 6c)
- Environment / water issues (IP 6d, IP6f)
- Transport and mobility (TO 7)
- (Renewable) energy
- Other: ...

### Question 8:

Have you already been involved in Austrian-Hungarian cross-border projects?

- I / we have implemented a project / several projects.
- I / we prepared a project that has not been submitted / approved.
- Not yet.

Target group of questionnaire: all beneficiaries and potential beneficiaries of the Cross-border Cooperation Programme Austria - Hungary 2007-2013 and 2014-2020.

