

# REFORM

Interreg Europe



European Union  
European Regional  
Development Fund



# REFORM

Good Practices  
Guiding Material

[www.interregeurope.eu/reform](http://www.interregeurope.eu/reform)



# Table of contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>1 - INTRODUCTION</b>   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>2 - WHY COLLECT AND ANALYZE GPS</b>                              | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>3 - DEFINITION OF THE METHODOLOGICAL STEPS</b>                   | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>STEP 1: DEFINITION OF THE FIELD AND THE TARGET</b>               | <b>5</b>  |
| 4.1 - Step 1 Checklist  | 6         |
| <b>STEP 2: ANALYSIS OF THE STATE OF THE ART IN THE REGIONS</b>      | <b>6</b>  |
| 5.1 - Step 2 Checklist  | 8         |
| <b>STEP 3: DEFINITION OF THE REGIONAL NEEDS AND PRIORITIES</b>      | <b>9</b>  |
| 6.1 - Step 3 Checklist  | 10        |
| <b>STEP 4: IDENTIFICATION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE GPS</b>            | <b>10</b> |
| 7.1 - Definition of GP  | 10        |
| 7.2 - Objectives of GPs' collection and analysis                    | 11        |
| 7.3 - What should GPs refer to                                      | 11        |
| 7.4 - How to identify a potential GP                                | 12        |
| 7.5 - GP classification   | 12        |
| 7.6 - GP description  | 16        |
| 7.7 - Step 4 Checklist  | 17        |
| <b>STEP 5 EVALUATION OF THE GPS ACCORDING TO THE REGIONAL NEEDS</b> | <b>18</b> |
| 8.1 - Evaluation criteria   | 18        |
| 8.2 - Evaluation process  | 19        |
| 8.3 - Step 5 Checklist  | 22        |
| <b>REFORM PARTNERS</b>  | <b>24</b> |
| <b>REFORM CONTACT</b>   | <b>24</b> |

## 1 - Introduction

This document is based on the methodology followed by the REFORM project for analysing, selecting, describing and evaluating the Good Practices (GPs). The Interreg Project REFORM stands for "Integrated REgional Action Plan For Innovative, Sustainable and LOw CaRbon Mobility" and its application field focuses on mobility planning and particularly on Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMP). Consequently, from the application point of view, the document refers to the same specific topic, but it can be considered as a general guideline for selecting, describing and evaluating GPs within the scope of the INTERREG projects.



REFORM aims to improve, through a mutual learning process, Regional Policy Instruments supporting the funding and diffusion of SUMPs, as well as the effectiveness of the existing regional or wider-scale SUMPs, as the main planning tool for shifting mobility towards low carbon patterns.

REFORM's new approach is based on the key role of Regions, which can trigger the SUMP development process by amplifying the adoption rate by the cities setting a suitable strategic framework, able to overcome the existing limit.

**In particular the REFORM project is built on four "pillars":**

- › Formulating regional strategies to concrete measures/actions in close cooperation with cities' SUMP for improving transport and mobility;
- › Developing specific multi stakeholder participatory processes for enhancing the development of local SUMPs;
- › Defining the role and organizational/operational scheme of the Regional Competence Centers which will guide cities during SUMPs development ensuring their complementarity at the regional level;
- › Specifying the use of ICT as a useful tool for collecting traffic data and citizens' opinions.

Starting from the REFORM experience, a general guideline for selecting, describing and evaluating GPs within the scope of the INTERREG projects has been developed and reported in this document. It contains the description of all the steps to be followed and includes specific explicative examples that are extracted by the REFORM case (contained in boxes).

This document targets all of the interested parties involved in INTERREG projects or facing the task of analyzing GPs related to mobility planning. The target audience for the document is major Public Bodies such as Regions, but its content can be applied to all mobility planning instruments, even if the application is restricted to a smaller administrative area. Given its general methodological approach, it can effectively support specialists, technicians, as well as decision and policy makers.

Finally, this document could be adapted to suit other application fields and support a wider set of users who are carrying out specific thematic-driven analyses.

## 2 - Why collect and analyze GPs

The identification, description and evaluation of Good Practices is a pillar of the INTERREG methodology for spreading innovation across the European regions through a mutual learning process. The underlying idea of INTERREG Europe is to improve the local situation in the regions, applying solutions that have proved to be effective in other local environments. In order to achieve this objective, it is necessary to acquire knowledge about these solutions and understand if they could be applied elsewhere.

This activity provides a starting point for the definition of the regional Action Plans, with the purpose of identifying a set of actions to improve the addressed application topics. The collected GPs are the reference model for the regions to write their Action Plan, although the application of any specific GP to a region must be carefully evaluated to be successfully adapted to the local conditions and needs, as well as the targets of the specific project.

The analysis and description of the GPs should give the Regions the main elements to carry out the process described above.

## 3 - Definition of the methodological steps

The whole process of searching for suitable GPs can be divided into different sequential steps:

- 1 - Definition of the application field and the target of the job
- 2 - Analysis of the state of the art in the regions
- 3 - Definition of the regional needs and priorities in the field
- 4 - Identification, collection and description of the GPs
- 5 - Evaluation of the GPs according to the regional needs

Fig. 1: The steps of the overall process



## Step 1: Definition of the field and the target

There are several mobility planning processes and tools used at different levels of the planning process. A good starting point is to identify the boundaries of the research, closely related to the target of the project. Different application fields require different kinds of GPs, so it is important to assess this point as a preliminary activity of the workflow.

### As an example:

- › the application field can be the SUMP.

### But it can be seen by different players from different viewpoints. For example:

- › Regions could be interested in developing and adopting a SUMP at a city level (because of its effects on the air quality, energy efficiency, traffic flow or other) and not to directly develop a regional SUMP, in order to ensure greater coherence among different territorial plans. Therefore a specific focus could be the measures and techniques to support cities in developing SUMPs, to integrate the different local SUMPs in a wider coherent territorial perspective, etc.
- › On the other side, a city could be directly involved in developing their own SUMP, so their focus of attention could be on methodologies to efficiently do so, to involve citizens in the process, to ensure the homogeneity among different planning instruments, etc.

### In both cases the application field is SUMP but the targets are different and could be summarized this way:

- › “support to SUMP development” (former case)
- › “methodologies and tools to develop SUMP” (latter case)

It is crucial to devote the right attention to this step and above all to reach a common understanding among all the partners reflective of the potential bias that some partners might have over the different targets of the same field.

### In the case of REFORM, application field and targets can be defined as follows:

#### APPLICATION FIELD:

- › SUMP

#### TARGETS:

- › Support policies that can be implemented by the Regions to spread the development and adoption of SUMPs;
- › Advanced ICT tools that can be used to ease the development of SUMPs;
- › Improve the integration between SUMPs and other area wide planning instruments;
- › Facilitate the adoption of SUMPs by medium sized cities;
- › Define the role and organizational/operational scheme of the Regional Competence Centers which will guide cities during SUMPs development ensuring their complementarity at the regional level.

## 4.1 Step 1 Checklist

- ✓ Define the application field and the specific point of view to adopt;
- ✓ Define the specific targets of the research;
- ✓ Make sure that the defined targets are the result of a selection process carried out and agreed by all of the interested players.



## Step 2: Analysis of the state of the art in the regions

Before approaching the task of selecting the suitable GPs, a good knowledge of the state of the art of the selected topics in the regions is necessary. This provides the opportunity to benchmark any considered GPs with the local state of play.

The “state of play” in the regions in fact constitutes the starting point for defining the actions to be implemented according to the project strategy and defines the “baseline” for further evaluations that will be carried out. Depending on the specific nature of the project, information to be gathered should refer to technical or technological, normative and financial issues.

Information gathered in this step will also be of great interest, because it will allow a productive debate with the decision makers in the next step.

It is important to underline that this analysis will also contribute to the identification of the GPs at the regional level, giving a clear view of all the experiences in the participating regions, and also providing indications about whether some of them possess the characteristics to become a GP.

Depending on the type of project and resources available, a survey (or audit) can be useful to investigate existing professional skills and the training needs regarding the project topics, as perceived by the different stakeholders. The scope of such a survey is to provide elements to plan activities to improve the regional capacities in the specific field. Moreover, existing skills are important as the project can leverage them for supporting the introduction of innovative GPs and can improve the general professional skill level in the region, satisfying the needs of professional training requirements.

The collection of information should be carried out utilising a variety of methods (e.g. desk analysis, interviews, etc). One of the recommended methods is the use of a questionnaire to be distributed to stakeholders. This technique could be complementary to the use of direct interviews with selected key players who can give an overview of the state of the art in specific environments. Interviewing important stakeholders with the purpose of collecting information also has the advantage of involving them in the project from its initial stages and in sharing with them the project’s targets and organization, creating the basis for further participation and buy-in.



**In the case of the REFORM Project, the attention has been focused on:**

- › The more advanced cities with a strategy for improving their know-how;
- › A larger audience of cities with a lower level of experience for providing them with the basic training for approaching the matter of developing a SUMP.

### Regional Framework

- 1 - Description of the regulatory framework and of the technical instruments of the regional policy about SUMP;
- 2 - Illustration of the importance of sustainable mobility issues in regional funds and Policy Instruments (PIs);
- 3 - Promotion policies / supports for development of SUMP in the territory;
- 4 - What (if any) are the methodologies and practices adopted to harmonize the other Territorial Plans (existing or not);
- 5 - Are there guidelines for the preparation of the call for the terms of reference for tenders about SUMP? Who is (are) their author(s)? Who approved them?

### Adopted SUMP

This analysis is focused on the cities dealing with SUMP. In cases where a regional SUMP has been developed, the list of the cities involved should be provided and the following information will refer to the SUMP itself and/or the involved cities.

- 1 - How many and which are the SUMP designed / implemented / adopted in the territory of the Region: list of cities that have started the SUMP with the relevant state of advance (designed / implemented / adopted);
- 2 - Specific aims in preparing the SUMP (national or regional obligation or law / specific political interest / specific solutions for mobility problems);
- 3 - Decision to start the process of adopting a SUMP (what is the subject (Municipalities or a Group of Municipalities, Regional government, etc.) who started the process? What kind of decision and formal resolution was taken)?
- 4 - Summary description of the development process (main steps carried out or planned);
- 5 - Synthetic description of the participatory process carried out;
- 6 - Time span necessary to develop the SUMP and to formally adopt it;
- 7 - Effects on local and regional mobility (both perceived and real);
- 8 - Benefits expected or already recorded arising from the implementation of the SUMP (including for instance any access to funds for sustainable mobility);
- 9 - Compliance and integration with the existing urban and regional planning instruments in the territory;
- 10 - SUMP and Wide Area Government. Was the SUMP developed taking into consideration the Metropolitan area or, in general, the wider area where the city is included? If yes, what kind of development process was followed?
- 11 - Brief description of the participatory processes adopted during the SUMP lifecycle;
- 12 - Description of difficulties /problems (if any) encountered during the SUMP lifecycle (start up, implementation, adoption).



### Costs and procedures for the drafting and development of the SUMP

- 1 - Sources of financing (own funds, European, national, regional or combinations thereof);
- 2 - Description of the team which developed the SUMP and of any task assigned to third parties;
- 3 - Costs of preparing the SUMP: in particular, details of the costs for the participatory process and any outside consulting / design costs.

### Existing professional skills and training needs in the regional cities

- 1 - Description of the technical professional skills involved in the process;
- 2 - Identification of any difficulties related to the availability of skills for the preparation of the SUMP documents;
- 3 - Identification of any difficulties related to the availability of skills for the monitoring of the SUMP outcomes.

## 5.1 Step 2 Checklist

- ✔ List the topics to be considered according to the outcomes of step 1;
- ✔ Identify the sources of information and in particular the key stakeholders who can provide valuable information;
- ✔ Prepare the material for collecting materials and carrying out interviews (questionnaires, guidelines, etc.);
- ✔ Collect information about the state of play of the considered topics in the regions;
- ✔ If required by the specific application, benchmark them with the state of the art in other situations (other regions, Europe, etc.);
- ✔ Analyze and homogenize the collected material to set a clear framework of the state of play in the region.



## Step 3: Definition of the regional needs and priorities

Another preliminary activity for the selection of the GPs suitable to be analyzed for transfer, is the assessment of the regional needs in the selected fields/targets and the policy priorities.

The target of this step is the definition of a list of priorities to implement the local objectives. This is needed as a driver for the evaluation of the GPs, and constitutes the reference element for the definition of some important points for the evaluation of the GP.

This step can be carried out through direct semi-structured interviews with policy and decision makers capable of having a complete view of the priorities of the Regions and of other public bodies involved in the project. Situations can significantly vary from region to region, but generally the target of the interviews should be politicians and officers from the regional and local administrations (and/or the other Bodies in charge of the specific project topics at the regional/local level) who have the following characteristics:

- › in charge of functions related to the project topics (from a political and technical point of view);
- › decision makers (for example officers in senior positions responsible for Department's, Councillors, etc.);

Additional interviews can be carried out with other relevant people, whose knowledge and expertise can integrate with that of the target group.

The topics approached by the semi-structured interviews are strictly linked to the specific project, but they must include all the elements needed to understand the priorities of the regions and about the specific project topics: priorities, existing policy instruments, questions to obtain the perception of the policy makers.



### For this step REFORM has adopted the technique of semi-structured interviews focused on the following points:

- 1 - Strengths and weaknesses of the national, regional and municipal regulations on land and mobility planning;
- 2 - Policies and instruments to support the involvement of stakeholders;
- 3 - Perception of the definition and role of SUMP;
- 4 - Potential supporting policies adopted by the Region;
- 5 - Professional skills and knowledge available at municipal and regional level related to SUMP development (i.e. familiarization with the cycle of SUMP);
- 6 - Missing professional skills and needs for professional training and education;
- 7 - Use of ICT instruments for mobility with special reference to the development of SUMP, description of the adopted and/or planned policies, description of the perceived needs about use of ICT.

## 6.1 Step 3 Checklist

- ✓ Identify the proper regional stakeholders to define the regional needs and priorities;
- ✓ Creation of a full listing of stakeholders that will be involved in the evaluation of the GP (see step 5);
- ✓ Specify the setting of the interviews to be carried out and structure the questionnaire/report appropriately;
- ✓ Carry out the interviews and organize structured reports;
- ✓ Analyze information obtained to clearly outline regional needs and priorities;
- ✓ Identify the policy tools to be addressed for satisfying the detected needs.



## Step 4: Identification and description of the GPs

### 7.1 Definition of GP

When approaching this step, the first question should be:  
“What is a Good Practice?”

**There are various definitions of a GP: for the purposes of this document, the definition adopted is the Interreg one:**

“GOOD PRACTICE is an initiative e.g. methodology, project, process and technique, undertaken in one of the Interreg program’s priorities which is already proved successful and has the potential to be transferred to different geographic areas. A GP is proved successful when it has already provided tangible and measurable results in achieving specific objectives.”<sup>1</sup>

**Therefore a practice, to be classified as GP, should be:**

- › Relevant to the application field and targets of the project;
- › Significant under some perspective (impact, methodology, process, innovation, etc.);
- › Transferrable (i.e. effectively feasible in other local conditions).

<sup>1</sup>Interreg Programme Manual - 13 December 2016 (version 4) (pg. 36) <http://www.interregeurope.eu/>.

It is important to point out that, the success of a GP can be determined when the practice is concluded and verified. However, in some situations an ongoing action can be considered as a GP, that is if some partial objective has been already achieved and there is evidence of its success. For example, a practice entails the development of a methodology to improve the public participation in the development of a SUMP: the overall SUMP development process may not yet be finished, but if the considered action has been completed and has produced a good level of participation, it can be considered as a GP.

Another important concept is the transferability of the practice. It is important to highlight that no GP can simply be replicated, as it is specific to its environment: therefore, each GP must be evaluated in terms of its appropriateness to the regional policies and targets, effectiveness and transferability. For these reasons, the GP’s description should include the element to carry out an evaluation of the GP itself.

### 7.2 Objectives of GPs’ collection and analysis

**The collection and analysis of GPs have a twofold scope:**

- › to highlight significant experiences at the regional level in terms of organization of process, results, barriers and enabler factors, etc. that could become the basis for the further development of plans of policy planning interventions<sup>2</sup>;
- › to establish the process of exchange of experiences within the working group, gaining knowledge and awareness about the subject.

### 7.3 What should GPs refer to

The INTERREG philosophy is based on the exchange of experiences and GPs among the different project partners, so the analysis of the GPs at a regional level is crucial. Each region should identify its GP carried out at a local level, in order to make it applicable for the exchange of experience and know-how transfer among the partners.

In some cases, however, depending on the subject of the project, it is important to frame the GP developed at a regional level into the wider context of the European experience, to understand what is the level of innovation of the analyzed regional GP and its potential.

For example, in the specific case of mobility planning and SUMP, the scientific debate is at a European level. Therefore, important suggestions and examples, with a particular innovative stamp, can be found within European GPs as well.

For this reason, it is suggested to collect both from Project’s regions and EU experiences, to allow benchmarking with the most advanced experiences in the field.

<sup>2</sup>INTERREG Programme foresees for any project the preparation of a specific Regional Action Plan based on the knowledge acquired through the selection of GP and the subsequent knowledge exchange and learning process. According to the INTERREG definition an Action Plan is “a document providing details on how the lessons learnt by the cooperation will be implemented to improve the policy instruments tackled within a given region. The document specifies the nature of the actions to be implemented, their timeframe, the players involved, the costs and funding sources”.

## 7.4 How to identify a potential GP

To fit the above-mentioned definitions, the identification of the GPs should be driven by the specific field and targets of the project (see Step 1) and take into consideration the policy instruments addressed by the project itself. In fact, it should always be considered that the general aim of the INTERREG projects is the definition of practices and methodologies that can improve the effectiveness of the addressed regional policy instruments.

An accurate identification of the GPs is of paramount importance for the success of the process, as the selected GPs, properly analyzed, described and evaluated, will be the basis for the improvement of the regional policies.

There are several methods to identify a potential GP: literature and internet, conferences, direct knowledge, interviews with experts and stakeholders, existing database. A valuable database is the INTERREG database within the Policy Learning Platform<sup>3</sup>, which contains a large amount of important information about potential GPs. The identification of GPs involves a lengthy and investigative process, to be carried out progressively, following different strands and elaborating step-by-step on the information gathered. The specific research approach is up to the individual and the context in which she/he operates.

To achieve a sufficient knowledge of the GP, detailed information is required, although details are not always present in literature/internet. Direct contact with the developers of the GP is frequently required and strongly recommended. The existence of an accessible contact for obtaining information is important to consider a practice as a GP.

## 7.5 GP classification

It is methodologically very helpful to define a classification for the selected GPs to point out their main characteristics with reference to the project targets/regional needs and objectives. The GPs should be clustered into a set of categories in order to provide an explanatory grid for the collection and their subsequent comparative analysis.

The classification of the GPs can significantly vary from project to project. For the purposes of this document, the use of a classification matrix is suggested. An example of such a grid is showed in Figure 2.

**This grid will highlight and will create a link between the following two aspects:**

- › the links between the selected GPs and the specific policy (or policies) they address;
- › the main topic line the GPs follow, or the main technique they apply.

For this reason, this classification will be important for the purpose of the description and the evaluation of the GPs, described in the following paragraphs.

**The grid employs two sets of parameters to classify the GPs.**

- › The first parameter relates to the nature of the policy tools that can be adopted by the Regions and/or the policy priorities identified by the Regions: these policy tools will be classified and listed to cover the whole set of policies addressed by the project.
- › The second parameter links to the subject of the selected GP. Each GP will be characterized by one (or more) specific outstanding methodologies adopted or technical solution that represents the added value of the GP itself. These aspects can be grouped into homogeneous categories, so that GPs adopting similar methodologies and/or techniques can be included in the evidence relevant comparisons made.

Each selected GP can be classified **both** under the dimension of “policy tools/priorities” and the dimension of “methodology / technique”. Upon considering both of these dimensions, the GP can then be placed into the classification matrix.

Each single selected GP should be classified in **at least one of the cells**, even if, in certain cases, the same GP could cover different aspects and therefore be classified in more than one cell. In some cases, especially when a single GP can be classified in several cells of the matrix, it may be useful to use a code to indicate the level of pertinence of the single GP to the cell (e.g. 1=fully pertinent , 2=partially pertinent, 3=pertinent at a low degree or similar).



**For the classification of the GPs the REFORM project has adopted a grid based approach based on the following elements:**

### NATURE OF THE POLICY TOOLS:

- › Technical support (e.g. use of Regional competence Center / agreements with Universities / provision of specific guidelines etc.);
- › Economic support / Funding (Regional, EU via ROP, etc.);
- › Standard technical material provided at regional level (e.g. common tender documents, questionnaires that can be reused for planning);
- › Other types of incentives (financial or non-financial privileges given to the cities on the condition that a SUMP is adopted, provision of in-kind facilities, etc.);
- › Normative obligations (e.g. coming from specific laws, regulations etc.);
- › Regional scale implementation<sup>4</sup>;
- › Other (if the selected GP does not fit with this classification, use this category and specify its nature).

### METHODOLOGY / TECHNICAL PROFILE:

- › Methodologies for the development of SUMP (in particular for small and medium cities referred to the complexity and the costs of an exhaustive compliance to the European methodology);
- › Development of local know-how and expertise (e.g. training courses to improve professional skills for cities' employees);
- › Tools for large scale integration that will allow the development of a SUMP based on a wider area perspective and territorial integration (e.g. aggregated municipalities with similarities such as same industrial vocation/activates, Functional Urban Area<sup>5</sup>);
- › ICT use for facilitating the SUMP development;
- › SUMP as an evolution of existing planning instruments and plans;
- › Implementation of “replicable modules” at local level<sup>6</sup>;
- › Methodologies and practices for public involvement and participation;
- › Other (if the selected GP doesn't fit with this classification please use this category and specify its nature).

<sup>4</sup>This category is specifically addressed to the policies adopted to foster the elaboration of large scale SUMP and their implementation and of other measures targeted at improving the effectiveness of the existing “wide scale” SUMP.

<sup>5</sup>Definition of FUA: <https://www.oecd.org/gov/regional-policy/Definition-of-Functional-Urban-Areas-for-the-OECD-metropolitan-database.pdf>.

<sup>6</sup>“Replicable modules” are tools, initiatives, methodologies, etc. developed to be adopted by several cities with the same format and that can be replicated locally. This procedure can save efforts, improve effectiveness, standardization and integration.



Fig. 2: Classification grid for GP

| Classification grid for GPs  |               | REGIONAL POLICIES / INSTRUMENTS |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
|                              |               | Policy 1                        | Policy 2 | Policy 3 | Policy 4 | Policy 5 | Policy 6 | Policy N |
| METHODOLOGIES / TECHNOLOGIES | Methodology 1 |                                 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|                              | Methodology 2 |                                 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|                              | Methodology 3 |                                 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|                              | Methodology 4 |                                 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|                              | Methodology 5 |                                 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|                              | Methodology 6 |                                 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|                              | Methodology 7 |                                 |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|                              | Methodology N |                                 |          |          |          |          |          |          |



## 7.6 GP description

Once the GPs have been identified, they should be described and the information gathered should be reported. This procedure has two targets:

- › To make GPs comparable to each other through their description in a standard format;
- › To permit detailed analysis of the GP's characteristics, required for the exchange of experiences and cross-fertilization and the subsequent assessment of the actions to be implemented to improve regional policies.

For this task, the use of an appropriate template is required. The template should include not only the description of the GP characteristics, but also targeted questions to assess its perceived effects, potential implementation difficulties, implementation processes adopted, and so on.

The structure of the template can be largely standardized with some sections added to reflect some specifics of the application field and targets of the project.

### TEMPLATE FOR THE DESCRIPTION OF THE SELECTED GPs

#### SECTION 1: Identification of the GP

- 1 - GP Title (should be self-explanatory);
- 2 - Classification of the GP within the interpretive grid provided (see 7.5);
- 3 - Does this GP come from an INTERREG Project? If yes, mention the project acronym;
- 4 - Objectives of the GP;

#### SECTION 2: General framework

- 5 - Territorial and socio-environment context (Region / Municipality / population, other);
- 6 - Body which implemented the GP and other Bodies involved with the relevant role stated (stakeholders, partners, etc.);
- 7 - Motivations for the selection of the GP - highlighting the points that are considered as elements of success;

#### SECTION 3: Detailed description of the GP and its implementation

- 8 - Description of the GP, pointing out its key implementation issues, especially those related to the aspects for which the GP was identified as such;
- 9 - Any regulatory / administrative tools to which the GP refers;
- 10 - Short description of the implementation process with the roles undertaken by all the involved Bodies and stakeholders;
- 11 - Elements of innovation with respect to the regional state of the art or adopted policies.
- 12 - Time scale for the implementation of the GP;
- 13 - Financial resources used for implementing the GP and the amount of allocated funds;

#### SECTION 4: Results achieved and problems encountered

- 14 - Results achieved by the implementation of the GP (particularly in relation to the stated objectives);
- 15 - Other possible effects recorded (especially the unexpected ones);
- 16 - Identification of evaluation indicators (they can also be very different from case to case, quantitative or qualitative, direct or indirect, and relate to specific aspects of the GP, but, in any case, must be related to the elements considered successful).

17 - Specific mechanism(s) for monitoring the GP's results. If existing, provision of their description and of the most important indicators and methods adopted;

18 - Main problems encountered in the GP's implementation and description of the measures taken to overcome them;

#### SECTION 5: Transferability analysis

- 19 - Prerequisites for the adoption / implementation of the GP;
- 20 - Any significant element of obstacle to the adoption / implementation of the GP;
- 21 - Transferability of the GP items among the Project Partners or to other European Regions;
- 22 - Resources necessary for the development and / or implementation (financial, technical and professional and so on).

Each section addresses a specific aspect of the analysis, which is then detailed in the single points of the template. In this way, the analysis will follow the same structure, and could be carried out by simply commenting on each single section/point of the template.

The above-mentioned topics constitutes the backbone of the analysis to be carried out for understanding and then evaluating each GP.

**It is important to point out that a good analysis and description of each GP should not only consider the contents and the results of the selected practice, but also provide an accurate analysis of aspects such as:**

- › the implementation process, the application environment, the role played by all of the stakeholders;
- › the transferability of the GP, including evidence relating to particular aspects and elements such as the barriers to adoption and the facilitating measures;
- › the expected costs and the related expected benefits.

These aspects are very important to facilitate the collection of all useful information for the preparation of the Action Plans. For these reasons, the GP template includes specific sections devoted to this kind of analysis.

## 7.7 Step 4 Checklist

- ✔ Define the appropriate set of sources to be investigated (see point 7.4);
- ✔ Define a classification grid for the GPs (see point 7.5);
- ✔ Develop an exhaustive template for the description of the GPs (see point 7.6);
- ✔ Make sure that all the subjects involved in detecting and describing GPs have a clear understanding of the adopted methodology and of the expected quality of the results;
- ✔ Carry out the work of identifying and describing the GPs;
- ✔ Make sure that all the described GPs contain the elements needed to carry out the evaluation (see step 5);
- ✔ Check that each described GP contains a reference contact to allow for further in-depth analysis.



## Step 5: Evaluation of the GPs according to the regional needs

### 8.1 Evaluation criteria

Once the GPs are described, it is possible to carry out their evaluation according to the regional needs identified in step 3. The purpose of the evaluation criteria and process is not to define the absolute degree of quality of the selected GP, but to indicate the GP's appropriateness for application in the Regions. Therefore, the aim of the evaluation process is to point out which of the analyzed GPs can be considered as models for fitting the regional needs and priorities.

In this respect, the points of view among the working group on the GPs appropriateness can differ; therefore, the evaluation process should be mainly carried out at a regional level, with a final exchange of information by the group and appropriate fine-tuning.

**There are five main criteria to be applied to the evaluation of each GP:**

- a - *GP's relevance compared to the objectives, priorities and needs of the Regions.* It should be emphasized that the evaluation of the usefulness and relevance of individual GPs may differ depending on the priorities and objectives of the region. For this scope, it is necessary to focus on the needs and priorities of the various regions while evaluating the GP. The GP could fit with regional requirements at a different extent, so an overall judgment is required.
- b - *GP's effectiveness and efficiency in terms of achieved results or topic approached and devoted resources.* This concept is a measure of how and to what extent the GP has achieved the desired results with respect to the allocated resources.
- c - *Significance of the potential impact that the GP has on significant indicators linked to the specific field and targets (for example mobility, territory, citizens, or any other specific elements relevant to the GP).* The single impact factors can vary from project to project and from GP to GP within the project, but the question behind this criterion should be: which parts of the potential "target group" were really affected by the GP? Can the impacts on these target groups be measured?
- d - *GP's innovation level* with respect to the current status of the partner Regions.
- e - *GP's transferability*, i.e. the tangible possibility to transfer the concepts characterizing the GP in the context of the partner Regions.

All of the elements of the evaluation should be implied within the description of the GP itself, as the different sections of the GP's description contain the elements necessary to provide an evaluation according to the five mentioned criteria. Specifically, each criterion makes reference to specific sections of the template (see 7.6).

**From a general point of view, evaluation can be carried out by the following methods:**

- › Quantitative (for example measure of impact width - i.e. amount of interested cities over the potential universe, amount of population interested, funds collected, etc.);
- › Qualitative (for example impacts on population awareness, participation process, etc.).

These two types of evaluation methods can be used simultaneously and in a mixed way; this aspect is very important, as it is expected that the various GPs descriptions will not have the same level of detail and depth.

### 8.2 Evaluation process

There are several possible processes for carrying out the evaluation according to the above mentioned criteria. It is recommended to adopt a system that can give a concise indicator of the overall evaluation, adding when necessary specific comments and descriptions to justify and explain the indicator. This provides the opportunity to make comparisons between all of the GPs without losing their specific significance.

A possible method of evaluation process is as follows.

The evaluation process for each GP is carried out by filling out a specific voting table and assigning a score from 1 to 5 to each one of the evaluation criteria described in paragraph 8.1. The format of the 1 – 5 scale is as follows: 1 = very poor, 2 = poor, 3 = fair, 4 = good, 5 = very good. Each single score is accompanied by a comment explaining the motivations and other eventual elements to be considered beyond the mere numerical aspect.

**Once assigned a single score to each one of the evaluation criteria, the overall results for each GP can be summarized with different methodologies:**

- › simply adding the obtained results in an overall score;
- › carrying out a weighted sum of the scores for each single criterion with weights representing the importance of each single criterion according to the partners;
- › representing the results through a "spider graph" for each criterion and carrying out a qualitative assessment of the results.

It is recommended to produce a standard template for the evaluation, to be distributed to all the evaluators who will carry out their work individually or at a local level.

An evaluation working group has to be set up. It should include all the relevant people who can give a valuable evaluation: stakeholders from the regions or other administrative bodies, experts, policy makers already involved in the process of defining the regional needs (see step 3).

While the evaluation should be carried out separately by each member of the working group, the final assessment should be discussed and agreed in a common working session, achieving a final evaluation through the eventual fine-tuning arising from the exchange of views.

In any case, the numerical assessment should be just one (even if important) of the elements taken into account for the further analysis targeted to draft the Action Plan. Other qualitative elements should be considered.

The common working session devoted to define the final evaluation should be accurately prepared. In particular a concise document reporting on each of the GPs evaluated by the members of the working group should be produced and distributed in advance. The working session should be chaired by a skilled person, capable of driving the discussion and achieving consensus.

The achievement of consensus will be an important indicator that the exchange of knowledge has been fruitful and that the evaluation mechanisms have been effective.

The following table reports a typical evaluation grid that can be applied to a generic project.



| Evaluation criteria   | No. of the field in the GP template | GP description template field   |  | Meaning of the evaluation  | Score | Motivation and notes |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|-------|----------------------|
| <b>The relevance of the selected GP with reference to the regional needs and priorities</b> | 3                                   | Objectives of the GP  |  | Is the objective of the GP in line with the needs and the priorities expressed by the Region(s)? Can it contribute in developing the envisaged strategy?   |       |                      |
|   | 7                                   | Motivations for the selection of the GP / points of success                               |  |  |       |                      |
|   | 8                                   | Description of the GP   |  |  |       |                      |
| <b>The significance of the impact of the GP</b>   | 5                                   | Territorial and social environment interested   |  | Is the potential impact of the GP wide under some perspective (territorial, social, administrative, stakeholders' involvement, etc.)? Has the GP a particular significance in one of the considered perspective? Does the GP fit the classification matrix? Is there a methodological significance? Is it in particular linked to any methodological or application aspects the project specifically addresses?  |       |                      |
|   | 6                                   | Body which implemented the GP and other Bodies involved                                   |  |  |       |                      |
|   | 8                                   | Description of the GP   |  |  |       |                      |
|   | 10                                  | Short description of the implementation process   |  |  |       |                      |
| <b>The level of innovation of the GP</b>  | 11                                  | Elements of innovation with respect to the regional state of the art or adopted policies. |  | Is the GP innovative from some methodological perspective? Is it an innovative policy scheme? This innovation is linked to one of the privileged project aspects?  |       |                      |
| <b>The effectiveness and efficiency of the GP</b>   | 13                                  | Financial resources for implementing the GP   |  | Are the achieved results positively related to the objectives or the expected results?<br><br>Is the cost/result ratio balanced/reasonable?<br><br>Has a specific methodology to monitor the results been defined (methodology and indicators)?<br><br>This part of the evaluation can be carried out both considering quantitative elements (if some indicator has been monitored) or developing only qualitative considerations (if no quantitative data is available) |       |                      |
|   | 14-15                               | Results achieved by the implementation of the GP and other effects recorded.              |  |  |       |                      |
|   | 16                                  | Identification of evaluation indicators.  |  |  |       |                      |
|   | 17                                  | Specific mechanism for monitoring the GP results eventually                               |  |  |       |                      |
| <b>Transferability</b>  | 19                                  | Prerequisites for the adoption / implementation of the GP                                 |  | Is the GP transferable or is closely linked to local peculiarities? Is there any particular impediment to the transfer? Has the policy/methodology embedded in the GP a general value? Are the resources (financial, technical and professional, etc.) needed for the development of the GP in the Region(s) available or can be obtained? Is the general regional framework suitable for the adoption of the GP?  |       |                      |
|   | 20                                  | Any significant element of impediment to the adoption / implementation of the GP          |  |  |       |                      |
|   | 21                                  | Portability or transferability of the GP  |  |  |       |                      |
|   | 22                                  | Resources necessary for the development and / or implementation                           |  |  |       |                      |

## 8.3 Step 5 Checklist

- ✔ Select all the evaluation criteria (see point 8.1);
- ✔ Define the evaluation scheme to be adopted (only qualitative, only quantitative, mixed) (see point 8.1);
- ✔ In the case of using a quantitative scheme define the scoring scale and the related meaning (see point 8.2);
- ✔ In the case of using a weighted classification scheme, define the weight for each criterion (see point 8.2);
- ✔ Select all the players that have to be involved in the working group for the evaluation process;
- ✔ Clearly explain to all the players involved in the evaluation process the evaluation criteria and methodology and try to achieve some level of consensus about the meaning of the criteria and the voting scheme;
- ✔ Provide a suitable template for reporting the results of the evaluation process (see point 8.2);
- ✔ Collect all the compiled evaluation templates and make a schematic synthesis of the results; distributing it to the whole working group;
- ✔ Carry out a common discussion of the results and define a final evaluation (quantitative and qualitative) according to the defined methodology
- ✔ Make every effort to achieve consensus about the final evaluation;
- ✔ Produce the final documentation about the evaluation process.

# REFORM Partners



# REFORM Contact

**REFORM coordinator:**

**CERTH**

Centre for Research and Technology Hellas  
Maria Morfoulaki [marmor@certh.gr](mailto:marmor@certh.gr)

**Main author:**

ITL, Istituto sui trasporti e la logistica

**Design coordination:**

Polis



[interregeurope.eu/REFORM](http://interregeurope.eu/REFORM)



REFORM group



@InterregREFORM



@InterregREFORM

**REFORM**  
Interreg Europe

