

**IMPLEMENTATION REPORT FOR THE EUROPEAN TERRITORIAL
COOPERATION GOAL
PART A**

IDENTIFICATION OF THE ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

CCI	2014TC16RFTN004
Title	Interreg V-B Northern Periphery and Arctic
Version	2018.0
Date of approval of the report by the monitoring committee	19-Jun-2019

IDENTIFICATION OF THE ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION REPORT	1
KEY INFORMATION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME FOR THE YEAR CONCERNED, INCLUDING ON FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS, WITH RELATION TO THE FINANCIAL AND INDICATOR DATA.....	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PRIORITY AXIS.....	6
3.1 OVERVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION	6
3.2 COMMON AND PROGRAMME SPECIFIC INDICATORS (ARTICLE 50(2) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013)	8
PRIORITY AXES OTHER THAN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	8
TABLE 2: COMMON AND PROGRAMME SPECIFIC OUTPUT INDICATORS - 1.1B.....	8
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 1.1B.1.1.....	9
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 1.1B.1.2.....	10
TABLE 2: COMMON AND PROGRAMME SPECIFIC OUTPUT INDICATORS - 2.3A.....	11
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 2.3A.2.1	12
TABLE 2: COMMON AND PROGRAMME SPECIFIC OUTPUT INDICATORS - 2.3D.....	13
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 2.3D.2.2	14
TABLE 2: COMMON AND PROGRAMME SPECIFIC OUTPUT INDICATORS - 3.4C.....	15
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 3.4C.3.....	16
TABLE 2: COMMON AND PROGRAMME SPECIFIC OUTPUT INDICATORS - 4.6C.....	17
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 4.6C.4.....	18
PRIORITY AXES FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	19
TABLE 2: COMMON AND PROGRAMME SPECIFIC OUTPUT INDICATORS - 5.TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.....	19
TABLE 1: RESULT INDICATORS - 5.5.....	20
3.3 TABLE 3: INFORMATION ON THE MILESTONES AND TARGETS DEFINED IN THE PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK	21
3.4. FINANCIAL DATA.....	22
TABLE 4: FINANCIAL INFORMATION AT PRIORITY AXIS AND PROGRAMME LEVEL.....	22
WHERE APPLICABLE, THE USE OF ANY CONTRIBUTION FROM THIRD COUNTRIES PARTICIPATING IN THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME SHOULD BE PROVIDED (FOR EXAMPLE IPA AND ENI, NORWAY, SWITZERLAND)	23
TABLE 5: BREAKDOWN OF THE CUMULATIVE FINANCIAL DATA BY CATEGORY OF INTERVENTION.....	25
TABLE 6: CUMULATIVE COST OF ALL OR PART OF AN OPERATION IMPLEMENTED OUTSIDE THE UNION PART OF THE PROGRAMME AREA	27
(1) ERDF SUPPORT IS THE COMMISSION DECISION ON THE RESPECTIVE COOPERATION PROGRAMME	28
4. SYNTHESIS OF THE EVALUATIONS.....	29
5. ISSUES AFFECTING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE PROGRAMME AND MEASURES TAKEN.....	31
(A) ISSUES WHICH AFFECT THE PERFORMANCE OF THE PROGRAMME AND THE MEASURES TAKEN.....	31
(B) OPTIONAL FOR LIGHT REPORTS, OTHERWISE IT WILL BE INCLUDED IN POINT 9.1. AN ASSESSMENT OF WHETHER PROGRESS MADE TOWARDS TARGETS IS SUFFICIENT TO ENSURE THEIR FULFILMENT, INDICATING ANY REMEDIAL ACTIONS TAKEN OR PLANNED, WHERE APPROPRIATE.	33
6. CITIZEN'S SUMMARY (ARTICLE 50(9) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013)	34
7. REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS (ARTICLE 46 OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013)	35
8. PROGRESS IN PREPARATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF MAJOR PROJECTS AND JOINT ACTION PLANS (ARTICLE 101(H) AND ARTICLE 111(3) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013 AND ARTICLE 14(3)(B) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1299/2013).....	36
8.1. MAJOR PROJECTS	36
TABLE 7: MAJOR PROJECTS.....	36
SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN IMPLEMENTING MAJOR PROJECTS AND MEASURES TAKEN TO OVERCOME THEM	36
ANY CHANGE PLANNED IN THE LIST OF MAJOR PROJECTS IN THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME	36
8.2. JOINT ACTION PLANS	37
TABLE 8: JOINT ACTION PLANS (JAP)	38
SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED AND MEASURES TAKEN TO OVERCOME THEM	39
9. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME (ARTICLE 50(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013 AND ARTICLE 14(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1299/2013).....	40
9.1 INFORMATION IN PART A AND ACHIEVING THE OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAMME (ARTICLE 50(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013)	40
9.2. SPECIFIC ACTIONS TAKEN TO PROMOTE EQUALITY BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN AND TO PROMOTE NON-DISCRIMINATION, IN PARTICULAR ACCESSIBILITY FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES, AND THE ARRANGEMENTS IMPLEMENTED TO ENSURE THE	

INTEGRATION OF THE GENDER PERSPECTIVE IN THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME AND OPERATIONS (ARTICLE 50(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013 AND ARTICLE 14(4), SUBPARAGRAPH 2, (D) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1299/2013)	46
9.3.SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (ARTICLE 50(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013 AND ARTICLE 14(4), SUBPARAGRAPH 2, (E) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1299/2013).....	48
9.4. REPORTING ON SUPPORT USED FOR CLIMATE CHANGE OBJECTIVES (ARTICLE 50(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013).....	50
9.5 ROLE OF PARTNERS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME (ARTICLE 50(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013 AND ARTICLE 14(4), SUBPARAGRAPH 1, (C) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1299/2013)	51
10. OBLIGATORY INFORMATION AND ASSESSMENT ACCORDING TO ARTICLE 14(4), SUBPARAGRAPH 1 (A) AND (B), OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1299/2013	52
10.1 PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EVALUATION PLAN AND THE FOLLOW-UP GIVEN TO THE FINDINGS OF EVALUATIONS	52
10.2 THE RESULTS OF THE INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY MEASURES OF THE FUNDS CARRIED OUT UNDER THE COMMUNICATION STRATEGY	55
11. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION WHICH MAY BE ADDED DEPENDING ON THE CONTENT AND OBJECTIVES OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME (ARTICLE 14(4), SUBPARAGRAPH 2 (A), (B), (C) AND (F), OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1299/2013).....	58
11.1. PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED APPROACH TO TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING INTEGRATED TERRITORIAL INVESTMENTS, SUSTAINABLE URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND COMMUNITY LED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME	58
11.2 PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS TO REINFORCE THE CAPACITY OF AUTHORITIES AND BENEFICIARIES TO ADMINISTER AND TO USE THE ERDF	59
11.3 CONTRIBUTION TO MACRO-REGIONAL AND SEA BASIN STRATEGIES (WHERE APPROPRIATE)	60
<i>EUSBSR</i>	61
<i>ATLSBS</i>	63
11.4 PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS IN THE FIELD OF SOCIAL INNOVATION	65
13. SMART, SUSTAINABLE AND INCLUSIVE GROWTH	66
14. ISSUES AFFECTING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE PROGRAMME AND MEASURES TAKEN — PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK (ARTICLE 50(2) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013).....	68
DOCUMENTS.....	69
LATEST VALIDATION RESULTS.....	70

2. OVERVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME (Article 50(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 and Article 14(3)(a) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

Key information on the implementation of the cooperation programme for the year concerned, including on financial instruments, with relation to the financial and indicator data.

In June 2018, the Monitoring Committee approved 9 projects out of 29 submitted in the Fifth Call, bringing the total of approved main projects to 44. During the year another 23 preparatory projects were approved, bringing the total number of preparatory projects to 56. By the end of the year, 47 885 003 or 85% of the total NPA funding for projects was allocated, when taking into account de-commitments from the first finalized projects.

After 5 calls, the allocation is unevenly distributed across the funding sources. Of the ERDF funding, 84% was committed, whilst 102% of the Norwegian, 92% of the Icelandic, 97% of the Faroese and 93% of the Greenlandic funding to projects was committed, although some of the non-member states decided to increase their contribution to the programme in 2017.

The beneficiaries are distributed as follows across the three geographical zones of the programme area: 129 partners in Finland, Sweden and Norway, 120 partners in Scotland, Ireland and Northern Ireland and 50 partners in Greenland, Iceland and Faroe Islands, and other countries 14. When looking at the geographical distribution of Lead Partners, the distribution between the three zones is more uneven, mainly because Greenlandic and Faroese partners cannot be Lead Partners.

Seen in relation to the four programme priority axes, by the end of 2018, the highest commitment rate is in Axis 2 (Entrepreneurship) with 14 approved main projects and 13 preparatory projects and 89% of the ERDF funding committed, followed by Axis 3 (Energy) with 7 main projects and 17 preparatory projects approved and a commitment rate of 82%. Axis 1 (Innovation) is the third most popular theme with 13 main projects and 18 preparatory projects, and a commitment rate of 80%. The commitment rate for Axis 4 (Sustainability) is at 78% and 10 main projects and 8 preparatory projects have been approved.

The Fifth Call was launched on 1st October 2017, and closed in February 2018. The Terms of Reference for this call were informed by a thematic gap analysis after the Fourth Call. To support project applicants, *How to Apply* seminars were held in November 2017 and January 2018. In addition, a Facebook live Question and Answer session for applicants was held in February 2018.

The overall payment rate of the ERDF by the end of 2018 was that 28,9 % of the total NPA budget had been paid, broken down by Priority Axis as follows: PA1 33,5%, PA2 32,3%, PA3 21,8%, PA4 22,5% and PA5 (Technical Assistance) 33,5%.

The NPA addresses the “Arctic Dimension” as a cross cutting theme, and the integrated European Union policy for the Arctic mandated the NPA to have a leading role in bringing together a network of managing authorities and stakeholders from cooperation programmes in the European Arctic. In 2018, a wide range of activities was organized jointly by NPA, Interreg Nord, Interreg Botnia-Atlantica, Kolarctic and Karelia CBC ENI.

The second edition of the Arctic Awards project competition was launched in the spring, with a deadline end of May. The 2018 categories were *Arctic Entrepreneurial Spirit* and *Cold Climate Opportunities*. The category winners were selected in June by a jury representing all programmes.

The Arctic Award ceremony took place following an Arctic seminar at Scotland House, during the European

Week of Regions and Cities in October. The winner of Category 1, *Arctic Entrepreneurial Spirit*, was Rural Youth Entrepreneurship (NPA). The winner of Category 2, *Cold Climate Opportunities*, was Wind Centre of Excellence (Interreg Botnia-Atlantica).

On behalf of the Cooperation, the NPA was invited to speak at the 1st *Arctic Stakeholder Conference* and Annual Indigenous Peoples Round Table organised by the European Commission on 17th September, in Brussels. The conference focused on different types of funding instruments available to tackle the challenges in the Arctic.

In November, the 2nd Arctic Project Clustering event took place in Rovaniemi, Finland. During the day, participants heard presentation from Programme representatives, INTERACT, the Russian Federation and one of the previous round's clustering projects. In the afternoon, participants joined a networking session to discuss 7 themes: Innovation, Entrepreneurship, Circular economy, Tourism, Energy efficiency, Environment, and Cultural and Natural Heritage. The event closed with the opening of the 2nd clustering call, which runs until end of April 2019.

Currently, the previously funded Arctic clustering projects, "Arctic Cluster" and "North-European Energy Cluster", as well as the micro project "Protection of Sami cultural heritage" have successfully concluded their projects and submitted main project applications.

Other collaboration activities included updating and disseminating the Arctic Cooperation factsheet and exchanging applications between programmes to invite feedback on synergies and overlaps.

Besides this, the impact evaluation of the NPA looked into the Arctic Cooperation and underlined the benefits of this type of "soft cooperation" without very formal structures.

In connection to the EU's sea basin strategy for the Atlantic, in October, the NPA joined a meeting of MAs for the Atlantic Action Plan in Vigo, Spain. This was an opportunity to learn about the Atlantic cooperation. At the 5th Atlantic Stakeholder Platform Conference, the NPA project Cool Route won an Atlantic Award.

Analyzing the programme achievements in relation to how well the targets in the operational programme have been reached, it became evident already in the early stages of project implementation that forecasts on outputs to be delivered by projects were fairly high in relation to target values set by the programme.

In 2018, 3 Project Closure Seminars were organised by the MA and JS to instruct projects about final reporting, in particular how to provide evidence for their achieved results. The indicator values are therefore expected to decrease somewhat once projects are asked to provide robust evidence for their achievements in their final report.

By the end of 2018 milestones set for 2018 had been reached for all output indicators and in most cases also final targets for the year 2023 had been exceeded, which caused the programme management to suggest an adjustment of the programme's output indicators at the MC meeting in March 2019.

3. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PRIORITY AXIS

3.1 Overview of the implementation

ID	Priority axis	Key information on the implementation of the priority axis with reference to key developments, significant problems and steps taken to address these problems
1	Using Innovation to Maintain and Develop Robust and Competitive Communities	<p>Five main projects have been approved in relation to Specific Objective 1.1 (Increased innovation and transfer of new technology to SMEs) under Priority Axis 1. The supported projects are addressing 6 out of 8 prioritised actions mentioned in the Cooperation Programme document.</p> <p>Considering the list of actions supported in the Cooperation Programme document, the following type of actions are not yet addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clustering of SMEs in order to develop critical mass to access R&D, facilitating business networks across regional and national borders • sinking SMEs to the creative sector to promote innovation, • solutions facilitating the participation of underrepresented groups in innovative sectors, such as young women. <p>To encourage applicants to address these actions, these topics have been highlighted in the Terms of Reference for calls, and we can see that one additional action, clustering of SMEs, is addressed by one of the Sixth Call projects, approved in 2019.</p> <p>Eight main projects are addressing Specific Objective 1.2 (Increased innovation within public service provision) under Priority Axis 1. The supported projects are addressing all prioritised actions mentioned in the Cooperation Programme document.</p>
2	Promoting Entrepreneurship to Realise the Potential of the Programme Area's Competitive Advantage	<p>Nine main projects are addressing Specific Objective 2.1 (Improved support systems tailored for start-ups and existing SMEs) in Priority Axis 2. In this specific objective, all actions have been fulfilled.</p> <p>Five main projects are addressing Specific Objective 2.2 (Greater market reach beyond local market for SMEs) under Priority Axis 2. Two out of three prioritised actions in the Cooperation Programme are addressed by the supported projects. Not yet addressed are actions regarding transfer and development of concepts for clustering and creating networks of SMEs to meet a larger-scale, more diverse and/or more complex demand.</p> <p>Priority Axis 2 has the highest commitment rate. However, in specific objective 2.2, there is still scope to fund further projects.</p>
3	Fostering Energy-Secure Communities through Promotion of Renewable Energy	<p>Seven main projects have been approved in this Priority Axis. The supported projects are addressing all three types of prioritised actions mentioned in the Cooperation Programme document. The supported projects are</p>

ID	Priority axis	Key information on the implementation of the priority axis with reference to key developments, significant problems and steps taken to address these problems
	and Energy Efficiency	now mainly addressing the development and use of renewable energy sources suitable for cold climate and dispersed settlements, while the programme is looking to fund more projects addressing new energy efficiency concepts and smart energy management.
4	Protecting, promoting and developing cultural and natural heritage	Ten main projects have been approved in this Priority Axis. The supported projects are addressing all prioritised actions mentioned in the Cooperation Programme document.
5	Technical Assistance	<p>The Technical Assistance budget consists of the below programme bodies and cost items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Joint Secretariat - Managing Authority - Certifying Authority - Audit Authority - MC meetings - Regional Contact Points - Greenland Travel Fund - Other costs (including seminars and networks, promotion material, partenariats, IT, database and monitoring system and evaluation) <p>All cost related to technical assistance are transmitted into the accounts of and reported by the Managing Authority.</p> <p>In the first years of NPA 2014-2020 implementation, the NPP 2007-2013 budget was used for the programme closure. This fact, in combination with vacancies at the Managing Authority, delayed invoicing from some of the programme bodies and for the development of the monitoring system (eMS) contributed to an underspending in the first years of programme implementation. In 2018 the TA spending has caught up and is expected to be accurate over time.</p> <p>The development of eMS has been a large task in the first years of programme implementation and by the end of 2017 project applicants applied online, the eligibility check, appraisals by Regional Advisory Groups, the quality assessment and the contracting took place in the system. Furthermore the reporting and other modules to process and pay project claims are in place and the rate of payments has increased after having made the first payments in November 2016 and is at a satisfactory stage. In total 14,5 million EUR, or 28,9% of the allocated funding (including TA), has been paid by the end of 2018.</p> <p>There have not been any problems experienced in relation to TA expenditure. At its meeting in December the Management Group was informed that approximately 36 % of the total TA budget had been spent.</p>

3.2 Common and programme specific indicators (Article 50(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013)

Priority axes other than technical assistance

Priority axis	1 - Using Innovation to Maintain and Develop Robust and Competitive Communities
Investment priority	1b - Promoting business investment in R&I, developing links and synergies between enterprises, research and development centres and the higher education sector, in particular promoting investment in product and service development, technology transfer, social innovation, eco-innovation, public service applications, demand stimulation, networking, clusters and open innovation through smart specialisation, and supporting technological and applied research, pilot lines, early product validation actions, advanced manufacturing capabilities and first production, in particular in key enabling technologies and diffusion of general purpose technologies

Table 2: Common and programme specific output indicators - 1.1b

(1)	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value	2018	Observations
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	32.00	141.00	
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	32.00	50.00	
F	CO26	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions	Enterprises	16.00	194.00	
S	CO26	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions	Enterprises	16.00	240.00	

(1)	ID	Indicator	2017	2016	2015	2014
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	56.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	50.00	50.00	50.00	0.00
F	CO26	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions	141.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO26	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions	240.00	79.00	49.00	0.00

(1) S=Cumulative value - outputs to be delivered by selected operations [forecast provided by beneficiaries], F=Cumulative value - outputs delivered by operations [actual achievement]

Priority axis	1 - Using Innovation to Maintain and Develop Robust and Competitive Communities
Investment priority	1b - Promoting business investment in R&I, developing links and synergies between enterprises, research and development centres and the higher education sector, in particular promoting investment in product and service development, technology transfer, social innovation, eco-innovation, public service applications, demand stimulation, networking, clusters and open innovation through smart specialisation, and supporting technological and applied research, pilot lines, early product validation actions, advanced manufacturing capabilities and first production, in particular in key enabling technologies and diffusion of general purpose technologies
Specific objective	1.1 - Increased innovation and transfer of new technology to SMEs in remote sparsely populated areas

Table 1: Result indicators - 1.1b.1.1

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	Observations
1.1	Degree of transnational collaboration between SMEs and R&D	Composite index aggregating sub-indicators from a scoreboard	100.00	2015	181.70	115.50		In line with expectations for 2018, but below the target value.

ID	Indicator	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
1.1	Degree of transnational collaboration between SMEs and R&D			107.80					

Priority axis	1 - Using Innovation to Maintain and Develop Robust and Competitive Communities
Investment priority	1b - Promoting business investment in R&I, developing links and synergies between enterprises, research and development centres and the higher education sector, in particular promoting investment in product and service development, technology transfer, social innovation, eco-innovation, public service applications, demand stimulation, networking, clusters and open innovation through smart specialisation, and supporting technological and applied research, pilot lines, early product validation actions, advanced manufacturing capabilities and first production, in particular in key enabling technologies and diffusion of general purpose technologies
Specific objective	1.2 - Increased innovation within public service provision in remote, sparsely populated areas

Table 1: Result indicators - 1.1b.1.2

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	Observations
1.2	Awareness and attitudes among health professionals towards the use of eHealth technologies	Composite index aggregating sub-indicators from a scoreboard	100.00	2015	293.10	184.80		Above the target value for 2018

ID	Indicator	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
1.2	Awareness and attitudes among health professionals towards the use of eHealth technologies			128.10					

Priority axis	2 - Promoting Entrepreneurship to Realise the Potential of the Programme Area's Competitive Advantage
Investment priority	3a - Promoting entrepreneurship, in particular by facilitating the economic exploitation of new ideas and fostering the creation of new firms, including through business incubators

Table 2: Common and programme specific output indicators - 2.3a

(I)	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value	2018	Observations
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	16.00	1,059.00	
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	16.00	604.00	
F	CO28	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the market products	Enterprises	8.00	75.00	
S	CO28	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the market products	Enterprises	8.00	49.00	

(I)	ID	Indicator	2017	2016	2015	2014
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	427.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	569.00	510.00	510.00	0.00
F	CO28	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the market products	18.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO28	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the market products	44.00	67.00	67.00	0.00

(1) S=Cumulative value - outputs to be delivered by selected operations [forecast provided by beneficiaries], F=Cumulative value - outputs delivered by operations [actual achievement]

Priority axis	2 - Promoting Entrepreneurship to Realise the Potential of the Programme Area's Competitive Advantage
Investment priority	3a - Promoting entrepreneurship, in particular by facilitating the economic exploitation of new ideas and fostering the creation of new firms, including through business incubators
Specific objective	2.1 - Improved support systems tailored for start-ups and existing SMEs in remote and sparsely populated areas

Table 1: Result indicators - 2.3a.2.1

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	Observations
2.1	Conditions for start ups in remote and sparsely populated areas	Composite index aggregating sub-indicators from a scoreboard	100.00	2015	132.70	112.60		Slightly exceeding the 2018 target.

ID	Indicator	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
2.1	Conditions for start ups in remote and sparsely populated areas			99.20					

Priority axis	2 - Promoting Entrepreneurship to Realise the Potential of the Programme Area's Competitive Advantage
Investment priority	3d - Supporting the capacity of SMEs to grow in regional, national and international markets, and to engage in innovation processes

Table 2: Common and programme specific output indicators - 2.3d

(1)	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value	2018	Observations
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	16.00	248.00	
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	16.00	68.00	
F	CO28	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the market products	Enterprises	8.00	117.00	
S	CO28	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the market products	Enterprises	8.00	73.00	

(1)	ID	Indicator	2017	2016	2015	2014
F	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	5.00	0.00	0.00	
S	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	35.00	35.00	35.00	
F	CO28	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the market products	117.00	0.00	0.00	
S	CO28	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the market products	23.00	0.00	0.00	

(1) S=Cumulative value - outputs to be delivered by selected operations [forecast provided by beneficiaries], F=Cumulative value - outputs delivered by operations [actual achievement]

Priority axis	2 - Promoting Entrepreneurship to Realise the Potential of the Programme Area's Competitive Advantage
Investment priority	3d - Supporting the capacity of SMEs to grow in regional, national and international markets, and to engage in innovation processes
Specific objective	2.2 - Greater market reach beyond local markets for SMEs in remote and sparsely populated areas

Table 1: Result indicators - 2.3d.2.2

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	Observations
2.2	Awareness of the business opportunities beyond local markets	Composite index aggregating sub-indicators from a scoreboard	100.00	2015	139.50	110.30		In line with expectations for 2018, but slightly below the target value.

ID	Indicator	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
2.2	Awareness of the business opportunities beyond local markets			102.80					

Priority axis	3 - Fostering Energy-Secure Communities through Promotion of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency
Investment priority	4c - Supporting energy efficiency, smart energy management and renewable energy use in public infrastructure, including in public buildings, and in the housing sector

Table 2: Common and programme specific output indicators - 3.4c

(1)	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value	2018	Observations
F	CO31	Energy efficiency: Number of households with improved energy consumption classification	Households	250.00	7,562.00	
S	CO31	Energy efficiency: Number of households with improved energy consumption classification	Households	250.00	4,778.00	

(1)	ID	Indicator	2017	2016	2015	2014
F	CO31	Energy efficiency: Number of households with improved energy consumption classification	3,316.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO31	Energy efficiency: Number of households with improved energy consumption classification	4,748.00	4,515.00	0.00	0.00

(1) S=Cumulative value - outputs to be delivered by selected operations [forecast provided by beneficiaries], F=Cumulative value - outputs delivered by operations [actual achievement]

Priority axis	3 - Fostering Energy-Secure Communities through Promotion of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency
Investment priority	4c - Supporting energy efficiency, smart energy management and renewable energy use in public infrastructure, including in public buildings, and in the housing sector
Specific objective	3 - Increased use of energy efficiency and renewable energy solutions in housing and public infrastructures in remote, sparsely populated areas

Table 1: Result indicators - 3.4c.3

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	Observations
3	Awareness of energy efficiency opportunities and renewable solutions in housing sector and public infrastructures in remote and sparsely populated areas	Composite index aggregating sub-indicators from a scoreboard	100.00	2015	111.10	97.40		The trend appears to be negative, but this is most likely caused by the method, with varying degrees of completeness of data and one of the sub indicators not compensating for natural weather variations. The value for 2017, which was based on extrapolations from previous years, was possibly underestimated.

ID	Indicator	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
3	Awareness of energy efficiency opportunities and renewable solutions in housing sector and public infrastructures in remote and sparsely populated areas			103.00					

Priority axis	4 - Protecting, promoting and developing cultural and natural heritage
Investment priority	6c - Conserving, protecting, promoting and developing natural and cultural heritage

Table 2: Common and programme specific output indicators - 4.6c

(1)	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value	2018	Observations
F	CO42	Productive investment: Number of research institutions participating in cross-border, transnational or interregional research projects	Organisations	11.00	9.00	
S	CO42	Productive investment: Number of research institutions participating in cross-border, transnational or interregional research projects	Organisations	11.00	45.00	
F	4	Number of organisations introducing a decision-making tool or governance concept facilitating sustainable environmental management	Organisations	22.00	5.00	
S	4	Number of organisations introducing a decision-making tool or governance concept facilitating sustainable environmental management	Organisations	22.00	39.00	

(1)	ID	Indicator	2017	2016	2015	2014
F	CO42	Productive investment: Number of research institutions participating in cross-border, transnational or interregional research projects	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	CO42	Productive investment: Number of research institutions participating in cross-border, transnational or interregional research projects	45.00	28.00	0.00	0.00
F	4	Number of organisations introducing a decision-making tool or governance concept facilitating sustainable environmental management	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
S	4	Number of organisations introducing a decision-making tool or governance concept facilitating sustainable environmental management	39.00	26.00	0.00	0.00

(1) S=Cumulative value - outputs to be delivered by selected operations [forecast provided by beneficiaries], F=Cumulative value - outputs delivered by operations [actual achievement]

Priority axis	4 - Protecting, promoting and developing cultural and natural heritage
Investment priority	6c - Conserving, protecting, promoting and developing natural and cultural heritage
Specific objective	4 - Increased capacity of remote and sparsely populated communities for sustainable environmental management

Table 1: Result indicators - 4.6c.4

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	Observations
4	Preparedness of responsible authorities in remote, sparsely populated areas for environmental management in relation to climate change and impacts of new investments in the exploitation of natural resources	Composite index aggregating sub-indicators from a scoreboard	100.00	2015	131.30	120.60		Above expectations for 2018. This is mainly due to that important steps have been taken in one of the three regions concerning international cooperation in relation to climate change adaptation.

ID	Indicator	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
4	Preparedness of responsible authorities in remote, sparsely populated areas for environmental management in relation to climate change and impacts of new investments in the exploitation of natural resources			114.60					

Priority axes for technical assistance

Priority axis	5 - Technical Assistance
---------------	--------------------------

Table 2: Common and programme specific output indicators - 5.Technical Assistance

(1)	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Target value	2018	Observations
F	16	Number of simplification measures implemented	Simplification measures		0.00	No reporting since target values have not been decided by the MC
S	16	Number of simplification measures implemented	Simplification measures		0.00	No reporting since target values have not been decided by the MC
F	17	Number of project development support activities	Events and activities		0.00	No reporting since target values have not been decided by the MC
S	17	Number of project development support activities	Events and activities		0.00	No reporting since target values have not been decided by the MC
F	18	Number of information and communication activities	Information and communication measures		0.00	No reporting since target values have not been decided by the MC
S	18	Number of information and communication activities	Information and communication measures		0.00	No reporting since target values have not been decided by the MC
F	24	Number of employees (full-time equivalents) whose salaries are co-financed by technical assistance	full-time equivalents		0.00	No reporting since target values have not been decided by the MC
S	24	Number of employees (full-time equivalents) whose salaries are co-financed by technical assistance	full-time equivalents		0.00	No reporting since target values have not been decided by the MC

(1)	ID	Indicator	2017	2016	2015	2014
F	16	Number of simplification measures implemented	0.00			
S	16	Number of simplification measures implemented	0.00			
F	17	Number of project development support activities	0.00			
S	17	Number of project development support activities	0.00			
F	18	Number of information and communication activities	0.00			
S	18	Number of information and communication activities	0.00			
F	24	Number of employees (full-time equivalents) whose salaries are co-financed by technical assistance	0.00			
S	24	Number of employees (full-time equivalents) whose salaries are co-financed by technical assistance	0.00			

(1) S=Cumulative value - outputs to be delivered by selected operations [forecast provided by beneficiaries], F=Cumulative value - outputs delivered by operations [actual achievement]

Priority axis	5 - Technical Assistance
Specific objective	5 - Leaner Programme management and more effective Programme implementation

Table 1: Result indicators - 5.5

ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Baseline value	Baseline year	Target value (2023) Total	2018 Total	2018 Qualitative	Observations
99	Not applicable because the support to TA does not exceed 15 MEUR. See Priority Axis 5 "result sought".	N/A			0.00			

ID	Indicator	2017 Total	2017 Qualitative	2016 Total	2016 Qualitative	2015 Total	2015 Qualitative	2014 Total	2014 Qualitative
99	Not applicable because the support to TA does not exceed 15 MEUR. See Priority Axis 5 "result sought".								

3.3 Table 3: Information on the milestones and targets defined in the performance framework

Priority axis	Ind type	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	Milestone for 2018 total	Final target (2023) total	2018	Observations
1	O	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	6.00	32.00	141.00	
1	O	CO26	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions	Enterprises	3.00	16.00	194.00	
1	F	1	Total certified expenditure for Priority Axis 1 (ERDF + national contribution)	EUR	3,267,506.00	21,783,372.00	7,356,560.00	
2	O	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	6.00	32.00	1,059.00	
2	O	CO28	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the market products	Enterprises	3.00	16.00	192.00	
2	F	2	Total certified expenditure for Priority Axis 2 (ERDF + national contribution)	EUR	3,267,506.00	21,783,372.00	7,186,386.00	
3	O	CO31	Energy efficiency: Number of households with improved energy consumption classification	Households	50.00	250.00	7,562.00	
3	F	3	Total certified expenditure for Priority Axis 3 (ERDF + national contribution)	EUR	2,178,337.00	14,522,247.00	3,207,496.00	
4	O	CO42	Productive investment: Number of research institutions participating in cross-border, transnational or interregional research projects	Organisations	2.00	11.00	9.00	
4	F	5	Total certified expenditure for Priority Axis 4 (ERDF + national contribution)	EUR	2,178,337.00	14,522,247.00	3,281,992.00	
4	O	4	Number of organisations introducing a decision-making tool or governance concept facilitating sustainable environmental management	Organisations	4.00	22.00	5.00	

Priority axis	Ind type	ID	Indicator	Measurement unit	2017	2016	2015	2014
1	O	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	56.00			
1	O	CO26	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions	Enterprises	141.00			
1	F	1	Total certified expenditure for Priority Axis 1 (ERDF + national contribution)	EUR	3,655,684.00			
2	O	CO01	Productive investment: Number of enterprises receiving support	Enterprises	432.00			
2	O	CO28	Research, Innovation: Number of enterprises supported to introduce new to the market products	Enterprises	135.00			
2	F	2	Total certified expenditure for Priority Axis 2 (ERDF + national contribution)	EUR	3,892,396.00			
3	O	CO31	Energy efficiency: Number of households with improved energy consumption classification	Households	3,316.00			
3	F	3	Total certified expenditure for Priority Axis 3 (ERDF + national contribution)	EUR	1,084,097.00			
4	O	CO42	Productive investment: Number of research institutions participating in cross-border, transnational or interregional research projects	Organisations	2.00			
4	F	5	Total certified expenditure for Priority Axis 4 (ERDF + national contribution)	EUR	816,727.00			
4	O	4	Number of organisations introducing a decision-making tool or governance concept facilitating sustainable environmental management	Organisations	0.00			

3.4. Financial data

Table 4: Financial information at priority axis and programme level

As set out in Table 1 of Annex II to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1011/2014 (Model for transmission of financial data) and table 16 of model for cooperation programmes under the European territorial cooperation goal

Priority axis	Fund	Calculation basis	Total funding	Co-financing rate	Total eligible cost of operations selected for support	Proportion of the total allocation covered with selected operations	Public eligible cost of operations selected for support	Total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the managing authority	Proportion of the total allocation covered by eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries	Number of operations selected	Total eligible expenditure incurred by beneficiaries and paid by 31/12/2018 and certified to the Commission
1	ERDF	Total	21,783,372.00	65.00	17,709,375.83	81.30%	17,539,700.24	7,356,559.52	33.77%	31	7,356,560.00
2	ERDF	Total	21,783,372.00	65.00	19,574,273.66	89.86%	18,713,141.53	7,186,386.30	32.99%	27	7,186,386.00
3	ERDF	Total	14,522,247.00	65.00	12,039,532.56	82.90%	11,689,263.30	3,207,496.41	22.09%	24	3,207,496.00
4	ERDF	Total	14,522,247.00	65.00	11,245,768.87	77.44%	11,245,768.87	3,281,992.37	22.60%	18	3,281,992.00
5	ERDF	Total	6,025,186.00	50.00	6,025,186.00	100.00%	6,025,186.00	2,015,632.42	33.45%	3	
Total	ERDF		78,636,424.00	63.85	66,594,136.92	84.69%	65,213,059.94	23,048,067.02	29.31%	103	21,032,434.00
Grand total			78,636,424.00	63.85	66,594,136.92	84.69%	65,213,059.94	23,048,067.02	29.31%	103	21,032,434.00

Where applicable, the use of any contribution from third countries participating in the cooperation programme should be provided (for example IPA and ENI, Norway, Switzerland)

In addition to the ERDF financing in table 4, the non-member state contribution to the programme is 10 409 523 Euro, including 1 199 830 Euro for Technical Assistance. The budgeted ERDF equivalent funding to priority Axes 1-4 is 9 209 693 Euro, of which a total of 8 951 538 Euro or 97,2 % has been committed by end of 2018, which is a significantly higher commitment rate than for the ERDF funding. The high level of commitment already at an early stage of programme implementation caused some of the non-member states to increase their contribution to the programme in 2017.

The distribution of ERDF equivalent funding between non-member states and priority axis is described below (all figures in Euro):

Norwegian ERDF equivalent funding:

Priority axis 1: 1 731 743

Priority axis 2: 1 174 122

Priority axis 3: 345 748

Priority axis 4: 1 674 349

TOTAL: 4 925 962 Euro

The total Norwegian budget allocation to the programme for priority Axes 1-4 is 4 840 000 Euro and the intervention rate for Norwegian partners is 50%.

Icelandic ERDF equivalent funding:

Priority axis 1: 701 492

Priority axis 2: 588 054

Priority axis 3: 372 501

Priority axis 4: 798 668

TOTAL: 2 460 715 Euro

The total Icelandic budget allocation to the programme for priority Axes 1-4 is 2 706 794 Euro and the intervention rate for Icelandic partners is 60%.

Faroese ERDF equivalent funding:

Priority axis 1: 55 174

Priority axis 2: 177 739

Priority axis 3: 167 222

Priority axis 4: 308 879

TOTAL: 709 014 Euro

The total Faroese budget allocation to the programme for priority Axes 1-4 is 735 356 Euro and the intervention rate for Faroese partners is 65%.

Greenlandic ERDF equivalent funding:

Priority axis 1: -

Priority axis 2: 491 122

Priority axis 3: 110 211

Priority axis 4: 254 514

TOTAL: 855 847 Euro

The total Greenlandic budget allocation to the programme for priority Axes 1-4 is 927 543 Euro and the intervention rate for Greenlandic partners is 65%.

The total ERDF equivalent funding from non-member states is distributed across the priority axis according to the below:

Priority axis 1: 2 488 409

Priority axis 2: 2 431 037

Priority axis 3: 995 682

Priority axis 4: 3 036 410

TOTAL: 8 951 538 Eu

Table 5: Breakdown of the cumulative financial data by category of intervention

As set out in Table 2 of Annex II to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1011/2014 (Model for transmission of financial data) and tables 6-9 of Model for cooperation programmes

Priority axis	Fund	Intervention field	Form of finance	Territorial dimension	Territorial delivery mechanism	Thematic objective dimension	ESF secondary theme	Economic dimension	Location dimension	Total eligible cost of operations selected for support	Public eligible cost of operations selected for support	The total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the managing authority	Number of operations selected
1	ERDF	055	01	07	07	01		12	UKM6	2,306,595.63	2,229,222.14	534,334.92	1
1	ERDF	055	01	07	07	01		20	SE33	1,506,987.10	1,506,987.10	355,128.60	1
1	ERDF	055	01	07	07	01		20	UKN05	44,989.71	42,533.30	0.00	1
1	ERDF	055	01	07	07	01		21	UKM6	45,000.00	45,000.00	45,000.00	1
1	ERDF	062	01	07	07	01		02	IS	597,101.00	597,101.00	367,071.99	1
1	ERDF	062	01	07	07	01		02	NO07	175,789.00	175,789.00	175,788.99	1
1	ERDF	062	01	07	07	01		02	UKM64	24,130.00	24,130.00	0.00	1
1	ERDF	062	01	07	07	01		07	UKN0	1,904,785.08	1,904,785.08	157,685.86	1
1	ERDF	062	01	07	07	01		11	FI1D	84,855.61	82,364.36	84,855.61	2
1	ERDF	062	01	07	07	01		13	UKN04	45,000.00	45,000.00	0.00	1
1	ERDF	062	01	07	07	01		15	UKM6	27,143.00	27,143.00	27,143.00	1
1	ERDF	062	01	07	07	01		23	FI1D	21,000.00	21,000.00	0.00	1
1	ERDF	063	01	07	07	01		02	FI1D	23,482.31	20,355.64	23,482.31	1
1	ERDF	063	01	07	07	01		02	UKM2	17,322.32	12,698.78	17,322.31	1
1	ERDF	063	01	07	07	01		03	IS00	245,901.57	245,901.57	182,825.09	1
1	ERDF	063	01	07	07	01		24	UKN0	1,548,482.00	1,548,482.00	1,040,708.65	1
1	ERDF	064	01	07	07	01		22	IE011	1,592,723.00	1,592,723.00	0.00	1
1	ERDF	065	01	07	07	01		22	SE312	36,785.50	36,785.50	0.00	1
1	ERDF	065	01	07	07	01		24	FI1D	1,710,040.49	1,635,661.26	1,283,117.06	1
1	ERDF	081	01	07	07	01		13	FI1D	39,996.54	39,996.54	39,996.54	1
1	ERDF	081	01	07	07	01		18	IE01	1,107,656.48	1,107,656.48	784,132.71	1
1	ERDF	081	01	07	07	01		20	FI1D	44,994.50	44,994.50	44,994.50	1
1	ERDF	081	01	07	07	01		20	IE02	23,294.00	21,294.00	23,294.00	1
1	ERDF	081	01	07	07	01		20	NO07	1,264,320.58	1,264,320.58	633,234.89	1
1	ERDF	081	01	07	07	01		20	SE33	1,535,411.79	1,535,411.79	1,303,459.20	1
1	ERDF	081	01	07	07	01		20	UKN0	44,993.05	44,993.05	44,993.05	1
1	ERDF	081	01	07	07	01		20	UKN04	27,319.65	24,094.65	0.00	1
1	ERDF	081	01	07	07	01		21	FI1D	89,919.12	89,919.12	89,919.12	2
1	ERDF	081	01	07	07	01		21	UKN0	1,573,356.80	1,573,356.80	98,071.12	1
2	ERDF	066	01	07	07	03		01	FI1D	1,901,021.17	1,745,590.84	244,142.21	1
2	ERDF	066	01	07	07	03		15	FI1D	61,756.38	61,756.38	61,756.38	2
2	ERDF	066	01	07	07	03		15	IE02	945,125.98	781,696.71	783,053.97	1
2	ERDF	066	01	07	07	03		15	UKM6	1,277,076.60	1,277,076.60	895,540.57	1
2	ERDF	066	01	07	07	03		23	IE01	1,847,111.98	1,847,111.98	1,202,141.77	1
2	ERDF	066	01	07	07	03		24	FI1D	1,690,099.04	1,575,545.29	0.00	1
2	ERDF	067	01	07	07	03		04	NO053	1,114,661.53	1,114,661.53	0.00	1
2	ERDF	067	01	07	07	03		15	FI1D	1,007,401.12	999,121.12	0.00	1
2	ERDF	067	01	07	07	03		21	FI	1,333,717.37	1,333,717.37	1,073,019.82	1
2	ERDF	067	01	07	07	03		21	IE01	40,788.38	40,788.38	0.00	1
2	ERDF	067	01	07	07	03		23	NO05	989,057.10	841,263.18	925,155.78	1
2	ERDF	067	01	07	07	03		24	IE01	1,418,398.00	1,317,762.81	977,178.45	1
2	ERDF	067	01	07	07	03		24	IE013	1,143,256.72	974,740.05	0.00	2
2	ERDF	067	01	07	07	03		24	SE110	36,210.00	36,210.00	36,210.00	1
2	ERDF	067	01	07	07	03		24	SE33	46,566.00	46,566.00	46,566.00	1
2	ERDF	071	01	07	07	03		22	IE013	45,000.00	45,000.00	45,000.00	1
2	ERDF	071	01	07	07	03		22	UKM6	913,338.78	913,338.78	735,678.13	1
2	ERDF	071	01	07	07	03		24	SE33	44,777.00	42,284.00	44,777.00	1
2	ERDF	072	01	07	07	03		03	FI1D	26,152.77	26,152.77	0.00	1
2	ERDF	073	01	07	07	03		21	UKN0	41,682.95	41,682.95	41,682.95	1
2	ERDF	073	01	07	07	03		24	NO073	17,480.00	17,480.00	0.00	1
2	ERDF	076	01	07	07	03		15	UKN05	1,996,688.94	1,996,688.94	44,020.00	2
2	ERDF	076	01	07	07	03		23	SE33	30,463.27	30,463.27	30,463.27	1

Priority axis	Fund	Intervention field	Form of finance	Territorial dimension	Territorial delivery mechanism	Thematic objective dimension	ESF secondary theme	Economic dimension	Location dimension	Total eligible cost of operations selected for support	Public eligible cost of operations selected for support	The total eligible expenditure declared by beneficiaries to the managing authority	Number of operations selected
2	ERDF	082	01	07	07	03		13	IE013	1,606,442.58	1,606,442.58	0.00	1
3	ERDF	013	01	07	07	04		22	FI1D	3,528,924.69	3,425,678.37	974,529.75	6
3	ERDF	013	01	07	07	04		22	IE01	1,645,523.00	1,645,523.00	631,659.74	2
3	ERDF	013	01	07	07	04		22	IE011	36,648.00	36,648.00	0.00	1
3	ERDF	013	01	07	07	04		22	IE02	37,546.95	37,546.95	37,546.95	1
3	ERDF	013	01	07	07	04		22	IE025	36,300.00	36,300.00	0.00	1
3	ERDF	013	01	07	07	04		22	NO07	6,927.91	6,927.91	6,927.91	1
3	ERDF	013	01	07	07	04		22	UKM61	29,893.56	26,147.03	0.00	1
3	ERDF	013	01	07	07	04		22	UKN0	26,340.61	26,340.61	26,340.61	1
3	ERDF	013	01	07	07	04		22	UKN01	1,850,515.32	1,724,490.53	0.00	1
3	ERDF	013	01	07	07	04		22	UKN04	37,426.24	35,557.36	37,426.24	1
3	ERDF	013	01	07	07	04		24	FI1D	34,250.24	34,250.24	34,250.24	1
3	ERDF	014	01	07	07	04		10	FI1D	1,779,836.55	1,779,836.55	183,403.47	1
3	ERDF	014	01	07	07	04		10	UKM2	1,730,066.79	1,621,684.05	1,165,160.70	1
3	ERDF	014	01	07	07	04		22	FI193	30,000.00	28,500.00	30,000.00	1
3	ERDF	014	01	07	07	04		22	FI1D	45,000.00	45,000.00	45,000.00	1
3	ERDF	014	01	07	07	04		22	IE011	1,110,039.40	1,110,039.40	0.00	1
3	ERDF	014	01	07	07	04		22	IE023	35,250.80	35,250.80	35,250.80	1
3	ERDF	014	01	07	07	04		22	UKM64	39,042.50	33,542.50	0.00	1
4	ERDF	085	01	07	07	06		11	UKM6	45,000.00	45,000.00	44,999.99	1
4	ERDF	085	01	07	07	06		18	FI1D	1,282,809.61	1,282,809.61	226,897.87	1
4	ERDF	085	01	07	07	06		22	FI1D	22,890.60	22,890.60	22,890.60	1
4	ERDF	085	01	07	07	06		23	UKN0	1,311,999.00	1,311,999.00	749,148.97	1
4	ERDF	085	01	07	07	06		24	IE01	1,085,075.85	1,085,075.85	254,363.45	1
4	ERDF	087	01	07	07	06		11	FI1D	1,707,329.36	1,707,329.36	173,263.49	2
4	ERDF	087	01	07	07	06		18	FI1D	27,877.86	27,877.86	27,877.86	1
4	ERDF	087	01	07	07	06		21	UKN03	38,401.40	38,401.40	0.00	1
4	ERDF	087	01	07	07	06		22	UKM2	227,982.97	227,982.97	19,933.44	1
4	ERDF	087	01	07	07	06		22	UKN0	1,208,059.72	1,208,059.72	200,035.13	1
4	ERDF	088	01	07	07	06		22	FI1D	945,673.47	945,673.47	175,186.18	1
4	ERDF	088	01	07	07	06		22	SE11	1,277,100.24	1,277,100.24	901,847.45	1
4	ERDF	095	01	07	07	06		15	NO05	3,200.71	3,200.71	3,200.71	1
4	ERDF	095	01	07	07	06		22	NO07	838,672.39	838,672.39	83,662.26	1
4	ERDF	095	01	07	07	06		22	SE33	34,600.00	34,600.00	34,600.00	1
4	ERDF	095	01	07	07	06		22	UKM2	28,173.38	28,173.38	28,173.38	1
4	ERDF	095	01	07	07	06		22	UKM6	1,160,922.31	1,160,922.31	335,911.59	1
5	ERDF	121	01	07	07			18	SE33	5,151,536.00	5,151,536.00	1,723,366.38	1
5	ERDF	122	01	07	07			18	SE33	120,504.00	120,504.00	40,312.74	1
5	ERDF	123	01	07	07			18	SE33	753,146.00	753,146.00	251,953.30	1

Table 6: Cumulative cost of all or part of an operation implemented outside the Union part of the programme area

1. Operation (2)	2. The amount of ERDF support(1) envisaged to be used for all or part of an operation implemented outside the Union part of the programme area based on selected operations	3. Share of the total financial allocation to all or part of an operation located outside the Union part of the programme area (%) (column 2/total amount allocated to the support from the ERDF at programme level *100)	4. Eligible expenditure of ERDF support incurred in all or part of an operation implemented outside the Union part of the programme area declared by the beneficiary to the managing authority	5. Share of the total financial allocation to all or part of an operation located outside the Union part of the programme area (%) (column 4/total amount allocated to the support from the ERDF at programme level *100)
A:EYE	3,475.00	0.01%	0.00	
ADAPT Northern Heritage	227,982.97	0.45%	12,956.73	0.03%
AINNPA	5,248.90	0.01%	5,248.90	0.01%
ARCTIC CLUSTER	3,250.00	0.01%	0.00	
ARCTISEN	173,323.00	0.35%	0.00	
Adapt	18,312.70	0.04%	18,312.69	0.04%
BCE	325,869.11	0.65%	0.00	
CEREAL	13,296.84	0.03%	5,714.46	0.01%
CINE	201,425.04	0.40%	27,901.98	0.06%
Circular Ocean	198,344.00	0.40%	177,654.53	0.35%
Connected North	9,674.00	0.02%	9,673.95	0.02%
Craft Reach	147,793.92	0.29%	147,793.89	0.29%
Drifting Apart	238,300.00	0.47%	112,398.07	0.22%
EMERGREEN	159,905.20	0.32%	0.00	
FOBIA	179,899.80	0.36%	16,175.27	0.03%
FREED	260,834.00	0.52%	200,033.19	0.40%
H-CHP	109,525.00	0.22%	4,130.73	0.01%
LECo	178,093.15	0.35%	3,534.49	0.01%
Making it work	201,032.00	0.40%	48,732.63	0.10%
N-EEC	5,265.00	0.01%	0.00	
NEES2	6,463.59	0.01%	6,463.59	0.01%
Option	5,838.91	0.01%	5,838.91	0.01%
PAL	3,225.00	0.01%	0.00	

Pre-Lighthouse	4,903.57	0.01%	4,903.56	0.01%
ReewiseVillage	3,900.00	0.01%	3,900.00	0.01%
RemoAge	92,508.00	0.18%	57,876.70	0.12%
SECURE	65,991.70	0.13%	30,385.68	0.06%
SHAPE	51,368.18	0.10%	22,948.39	0.05%
SMARTrenew	120,575.00	0.24%	0.00	
Spara2020	255,341.54	0.51%	68,195.66	0.14%
WATERPRO	130,068.36	0.26%	0.00	
WaterPro, Prep	2,925.00	0.01%	2,925.00	0.01%

(1) ERDF support is the Commission decision on the respective cooperation programme.

(2) In accordance with and subject to ceilings set out Article 20 of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013.

4. SYNTHESIS OF THE EVALUATIONS

In 2018, an impact evaluation of the NPA was carried out by the European Policies Research Centre (EPRC) at the University of Strathclyde and Nathalie Wergles, an EPRC associate.

The evaluation looked into the impact of the programme for each of the 6 specific objectives, through selected case study regions and projects. Besides interviews, the evaluators also sent an online survey to NPP 2007-2013 projects that were part of the previously conducted Achievements study to follow up on what happened to their outputs. This helped inform conclusions for the current programme impacts. Finally, a focus group meeting with regional experts was held in conjunction with the NPA Annual Event in September 2018 in Inverness.

The evaluation working group EVA oversaw the process on behalf of the Monitoring Committee, from the kick-off meeting in January 2018, to the inception report, several rounds of written input, and finally a meeting in November 2018. The evaluators also provided updates at the Monitoring Committee meeting in June 2018 in Kirkenes, at the NPA Annual Conference, and via Skype at the Management Group meeting in December 2018.

Besides conclusions on the programme's impact inside the 6 specific objectives, the report "An impact evaluation of the Northern Periphery and Arctic Programme 2014-2020" also looked at the implementation of the horizontal principles, the Arctic Cooperation, macro regional and sea basin strategies, as well as preparations for post-2020. The final evaluation report was approved by the Monitoring Committee in a Written Procedure in January 2019.

In the report, a range of impacts are described: new SME links to R&D institutes/public sector supporting economic development, new business growth opportunities, improved service provision to remote communities, changing attitudes and perceptions, future oriented strategic partnerships and transnational links as well as growing local capacity to engage with macro development issues. The evaluators conclude that the NPA delivers impact for a range of beneficiaries at a variety of different levels and the transnational dimension brings a distinct added value to stakeholders.

The impacts of the programme are anticipated to grow/persist according to the impact evaluation. Results are being produced that target specific development needs on the ground as well as wider strategic issues of relevance to local and regional development in the area.

The impact evaluation also gives recommendations on further actions to be taken by the programme to maximise ongoing impact and prepare for the future. Peer learning, exploration of synergies with other programmes and funding instruments, capacity building and integration of new partners are high-lighted. In terms of a future programme recommendations include a continued focus on niche topics related to the specific geographical characteristics of the programme area, strengthening and greater definition of the Arctic dimension as well as integration of "near neighbours" and retaining sufficient flexibility for bottom-up development of projects.

Name	Fund	From month	From year	To month	To year	Type of evaluation	Thematic objective	Topic	Findings
------	------	------------	-----------	----------	---------	--------------------	--------------------	-------	----------

5. ISSUES AFFECTING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE PROGRAMME AND MEASURES TAKEN

(a) Issues which affect the performance of the programme and the measures taken

No major problems have been identified in relation to the performance of the programme and expected results. The audit authority has not highlighted any serious problems in conjunction to their procedures according to article 124.2 in EU regulation 1303/2014.

In 2018, time extensions were granted to projects from the first and second call. The main reasons for extensions were the late availability of eMS, and subsequent delays in contracting and reporting for these projects. In addition, these projects originally planned activities for 36 months, and had not foreseen that the final reporting needed to be carried out inside this period.

In order to make the extensions possible, the JS worked with projects to collect a detailed overview of project implementation, expected final results and spending. In most cases, projects received an additional 3 months for final reporting, a task originally expected to take place inside the normal 36-month project duration. The MA issued annexes to the Grant Letter, outlining new final eligibility dates and a new submission date for the final report.

Despite the additional time granted, first and second call projects did not manage to stick to the final reporting deadlines, often due to general reporting delays, but also because of First Level Controllers not sticking to the time allocated for verifications (2 months). This despite the MA and JS held a National and First Level Controller meeting in February as a back-to-back event to the Project Closure seminar for First Calls, explaining the final reporting procedure, and highlighting the importance of sticking to the 2 months.

Besides late final payments for projects, the impact of the delays can also be felt in the work load for the Joint Secretariat, Managing Authority and the First Level Controllers, with 5 calls of ongoing projects at the same time. In addition, the delays have a potential impact on the achievement of the performance framework, and programme spending.

During the year projects approved in the third call also indicated the need for a time extension. The JS and MA are assessing extension requests on a case-by-case basis and in November two projects were granted time extensions of 3 months for reporting only. For later calls, the JS has ensured that applicants fully understand the expected timelines, and that they only plan for 33 months of project implementation.

Although the extensions mean delaying project closure by a number of months, the extensions are deemed justified, because they have proven to lead to better spending and better reports. By the end of 2018, de-commitments by closing projects were smaller than feared during 2017. It can be concluded that the decision to grant 3-month extensions to 1st and 2nd Call projects has had a positive impact on the achievement of outputs as well as on the uptake of funds.

The uncertainties related to Brexit have caused concerns for the programme administration but the interest among project applicants has not decreased, nor has the uncertainties seemed to affect the implementation in existing projects in any serious way.

(b) OPTIONAL FOR LIGHT REPORTS, otherwise it will be included in point 9.1. An assessment of whether progress made towards targets is sufficient to ensure their fulfilment, indicating any remedial actions taken or planned, where appropriate.

During 2018, the programme reached what is expected to be the peak of its implementation.

Currently, progress being made towards targets is sufficient to ensure their fulfilment. The number of projects and allocation of funds in 2018 is at a satisfactory level. The quality of applications is considered to be good and the projects are expected to contribute to the programme targets.

Delays in the implementation of first and second call projects meant that final reports were submitted for the first time during the summer of 2018. In order to ensure a smooth final reporting process and to instruct projects how to provide robust evidence for the achieved project outputs, the Joint Secretariat and Managing Authority organized 3 closure seminars for the 1st, 2nd and 3rd call projects during 2018.

In relation to the performance framework, there were some delays in implementation in the early stages of the programme period, due to the low number of approved projects in priority axes 3 and 4 in the first two calls. To address this, the MC decided to hold a focused call only addressing PA 3 and 4, thereby increasing the allocation rate for these axes back in March 2016. It has taken some time for these projects to catch up but by the end of December 2018 the certified expenditure for PA3 is at 22,1% and for PA4 at 22,6% of the final target, well above the 2018 milestone of 15% (as displayed in Table 3: Information on the milestones and targets defined in the performance framework).

The milestones set for 2018 in the performance framework have been reached for all output and financial indicators. Also final targets for the year 2023 have been exceeded for PA 1-3. Particularly high are values for the output indicators *Number of enterprises receiving support* in Priority Axis 2, where 3309% of the 2023 target has been achieved, and *Number of households with improved energy consumption classifications* in Priority Axis 3, where 3025% of the 2023 target has been achieved.

The high values are explained by the fact that forecasts beneficiaries make about expected results at application stage are generally high in relation to the target values set by the programme. It has been the belief of the JS/MA that projects had been too optimistic, but that reporting on actual achievements as compared to forecasts will not show the same high values since the evidence asked for in interim reports and even more so in final reporting is more robust. The methodology has been described in closure seminars arranged by the programme in 2018.

At this point of implementation, however, there are no or little indications of the values decreasing significantly in final reporting. In Priority Axis 2 an analysis shows that it is mainly one ongoing project which reports exceptionally high values for the indicator *Number of enterprises receiving support* and it is believed that this number would decrease in final reporting. It should also be noted that no final reports in Priority Axis 3 have been assessed yet, so the number of households indicator might well go down, because it is much more difficult to evidence than enterprises supported.

6. CITIZEN'S SUMMARY (ARTICLE 50(9) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013)

A citizen's summary of the contents of the annual and the final implementation reports shall be made public and uploaded as a separate file in the form of annex to the annual and the final implementation report

You can upload/find the Citizen's summary under General > Documents

7. REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS (ARTICLE 46 OF REGULATION (EU) No 1303/2013)

8. PROGRESS IN PREPARATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF MAJOR PROJECTS AND JOINT ACTION PLANS (ARTICLE 101(H) AND ARTICLE 111(3) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013 AND ARTICLE 14(3)(B) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1299/2013)

8.1. Major projects

Table 7: Major projects

Project	CCI	Status of MP	Total investments	Total eligible costs	Planned notification/submission date	Date of tacit agreement/ approval by Commission	Planned start of implementation	Planned completion date	Priority Axis/ Investment priorities	Current state of realisation — financial progress (% of expenditure certified to Commission compared to total eligible cost)	Current state of realisation — physical progress Main implementation stage of the project	Main outputs	Date of signature of first works contract (1)	Observations
---------	-----	--------------	-------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	---	---------------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------------	--	---	--------------	---	--------------

(1) In the case of operations implemented under PPP structures the signing of the PPP contract between the public body and the private sector body (Article 102(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013).

Significant problems encountered in implementing major projects and measures taken to overcome them

Any change planned in the list of major projects in the cooperation programme

8.2. Joint action plans

Progress in the implementation of different stages of joint action plans

--

Table 8: Joint action plans (JAP)

Title of the JAP	CCI	Stage of implementation of JAP	Total eligible costs	Total public support	OP contribution to JAP	Priority axis	Type of JAP	[Planned] submission to the Commission	[Planned] start of implementation	[Planned] completion	Main outputs and results	Total eligible expenditure certified to the Commission	Observations
------------------	-----	--------------------------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------------	---------------	-------------	--	-----------------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	--	--------------

Significant problems encountered and measures taken to overcome them

--

9. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME (ARTICLE 50(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1303/2013 AND ARTICLE 14(4) OF REGULATION (EU) NO 1299/2013)

9.1 Information in Part A and achieving the objectives of the programme (Article 50(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013)

Priority axis	1 - Using Innovation to Maintain and Develop Robust and Competitive Communities
---------------	---

By the end of 2018, 13 main projects have been funded in priority axis 1 Innovation, bringing the commitment rate for the PA to 80%. At this point in programme implementation, the milestones in the performance framework have been met and final targets set for the Priority Axis have been exceeded by almost 700 percent (as displayed in table 3).

There are two specific objectives in the Priority axis:

- 1.1 “Increased innovation and transfer of new technology to SMEs in remote sparsely populated areas”
- 1.2 “Increased innovation within public service provision in remote, sparsely populated areas”.

The Specific objectives’ intervention logic is based on the assumption that transnational cooperation can help overcome challenges related to the lack of innovation support to SMEs and challenges related to access to public services.

The common output indicators that measure the progress in the Priority axis are:

- Number of enterprises receiving support (C1)
- Number of enterprises cooperating with research institutions (C26)

To avoid inflated indicator values and to ensure that they are based on robust evidence, extensive guidance was provided to closing projects on the expected documentation for each of the indicators. In the case of enterprises receiving support, the project is required to provide the name of the enterprise receiving support, the relationship to a specific project output, a short description of the support, the activity period the support occurred in, and indicate if a state aid tool was used. Often, SMEs also feature among those providing a testimonial. Similar information is required in the case of enterprises cooperating with research institutions, in which case, the name of the research institution should also be detailed, as well as an outline of the cooperation and relevant dates.

Compared to 2017, the achievement of output indicators has increased noticeably, which can be explained by the fact that more projects are now contributing to these indicators and the fact that the contributing projects have matured since the previous year, thereby reporting higher interim or final values than in the previous year.

The impact evaluation conducted in 2018 identifies a number of impacts ranging from stronger SME and R&D links and awareness of business opportunities to wider impacts on policy influence at government

agencies in particular.

Through case studies conducted within the framework of the impact evaluation, the evaluators conclude that the cooperation between SMEs and R&D institutes resulted in significant new research. The information provided as a result of this has allowed existing and new companies to better exploit the opportunities available. The programme interventions have resulted in the production of durable know-how and capacity not only in the businesses but also in the research institutes and government agencies.

There are two result indicators in the Priority axis, which aim to measure the achievement of the specific objectives in the programme area as a result of programme interventions as well as outside factors.

- 1.1 Degree of transnational collaboration between SMEs and R&D
- 1.2 Awareness and attitudes among health professionals towards the use of eHealth technologies

When reviewing the progress in relation to the two result indicators in the Priority axis, it can be concluded that result indicator 1.1 fell short of the 2019 target. Access to finance is one of the main barriers identified, and in Scotland, Brexit is causing uncertainty. When it comes to result indicator 1.2, this scored well above the 2019 target, mainly due to the availability of better, more affordable technology for eHealth, and better connectivity. Citizens are also more used to video call technology from social apps.

Priority axis	2 - Promoting Entrepreneurship to Realise the Potential of the Programme Area's Competitive Advantage
---------------	---

By the end of 2018, 14 main projects have been funded in priority axis 2 Entrepreneurship, bringing the commitment rate for the PA to 89%. At this point in programme implementation, the milestones in the performance framework have been met and final targets set for the Priority Axis have been exceeded by almost 2 600 percent (as displayed in table 3).

There are two specific objectives in the Priority axis:

- 2.1 “Improved support systems tailored for start-ups and existing SMEs in remote and sparsely populated areas”
- 1.2 “Greater market reach beyond local markets for SMEs in remote and sparsely populated areas”.

The Specific objectives' intervention logic is based on the assumption that transnational cooperation can contribute to an improved entrepreneurial climate by facilitating the transfer and development of business support strategies and solutions to overcome challenges faced and widening market access by supporting the development of marketing concepts and models.

The common output indicators that measure the progress in the Priority axis are:

- Number of enterprises receiving support (C1)

- Number of enterprises supported introducing new to the market products (C28)

To avoid inflated indicator values and to ensure that they are based on robust evidence, extensive guidance was provided to closing projects on the expected documentation for each of the indicators. In the case of enterprises receiving support, the project is required to provide the name of the enterprise receiving support, the relationship to a specific project output, a short description of the support, the activity period the support occurred in, and indicate if a state aid tool was used. Often, SMEs also feature among those providing a testimonial. Similar information is required in the case of enterprises introducing new to the market products. Here it is important that the presented aggregated information is able to confirm that the support of enterprise directly led to new to the market products as a result of the project.

Compared to 2017, the achievement of output indicators has increased noticeably, which can be explained by the fact that more projects are now contributing to these indicators and the fact that the contributing projects have matured since the previous year, thereby reporting higher interim or final values than in the previous year.

The impact evaluation conducted in 2018 points out that the impacts are felt locally, nationally and transnationally through, for example, new services and markets, business growth and wider impacts in terms of area marketing and resources and capacity within national-level service providers.

Through case studies conducted within the framework of the impact evaluation, the evaluators conclude that project interventions have led to business growth and sustainability, new facilities and services marketed and used, increased capacity and skills within SMEs, development of new markets and capacity in business development.

There are two result indicators in the Priority axis, which aim to measure the achievement of the specific objectives in the programme area as a result of programme interventions as well as outside factors.:

- 2.1 Conditions for start ups in remote and sparsely populated areas
- 2.2 Awareness of the business opportunities beyond local markets

When reviewing the progress in relation to the two result indicators in the Priority axis, it can be concluded that indicator 2.1 slightly exceeded the 2019 target. The panel of regional experts in the three sample regions who were asked to describe and assess the progress towards the achievement of objectives describe that more initiatives for business support are now available or more mature in all 3 regions.

When it comes to result indicator 2.2, the achievement is slightly below the 2019 target. Limiting factors are a decrease in available finances, and Brexit. However, conditions for internationalization such as through e-commerce, should result in improvements in the future.

Priority axis	3 - Fostering Energy-Secure Communities through Promotion of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency
---------------	---

By the end of 2018, 7 main projects have been funded in priority axis 3 Renewables and Energy

Efficiency, bringing the commitment rate for the PA to 82%. At this point in programme implementation, the milestone in the performance framework has been met and the final target set for the Priority Axis has been exceeded by over 3 000 percent (as displayed in table 3).

There is one specific objectives in the Priority axis:

- 3 “Increased use of energy efficiency and renewable energy solutions in housing and public infrastructures in remote, sparsely populated areas”

Regions in the NPA programme area are facing similar challenges of climate and geographic dispersion. At the same time, there are significant disparities between the levels of development of renewable energies and energy-efficiency due to differences in endowment with renewable energy resources, but also regarding public awareness of existing opportunities and technologies suitable for the specific climatic conditions. Transnational cooperation can raise awareness through the transfer and development of models to help communities access and use renewable energy solutions as well as energy efficient concepts for housing and public infrastructure.

The common output indicator that measure the progress in the Priority axis is:

- Number of households with improved energy consumption classification (C31)

To avoid inflated indicator values and to ensure that they are based on robust evidence, extensive guidance was provided to closing projects on the expected documentation for each of the indicators. In the case of households with improved energy consumption classification, the project is required to provide evidence of the baseline energy consumption classification of the household, and at conclusion, the project is required to produce an energy performance certificate detailing the improved energy classification for each assisted household.

Compared to 2017, the achievement of output indicators has increased noticeably, which can be explained by the fact that more projects are now contributing to these indicators and the fact that the contributing projects have matured since the previous year, thereby reporting higher interim or final values than in the previous year.

The impact evaluation conducted in 2018 identifies both tangible impacts (e.g. additional renewable energy generation) and intangible impacts (e.g. changed attitudes, increased awareness and enhanced capacities).

Through case studies conducted within the framework of the impact evaluation, the evaluators conclude that project interventions have led to increased awareness on technical and economic feasibility of renewable energy generation in cool climates, increased local capacity to act on opportunities deriving from renewable energy generation and energy saving and renewable energy generation.

There is one result indicator in the Priority axis, which aim to measure the achievement of the specific objectives in the programme area as a result of programme interventions as well as outside factors:

- 3 Awareness of energy efficiency opportunities and renewable solutions in housing sector and public

infrastructures in remote and sparsely populated areas.

When reviewing the progress in relation to the result indicator in the Priority axis, it can be concluded that result indicator 3 has decreased since 2017, and has therefore moved further away from the 2019 target. The main cause for the negative number is the apparent increase in household energy consumption. However, looking closer at the data, the 2017 numbers were mostly extrapolated from previous years. It is also noted that the data is not as complete in each year, for example the baseline year 2015, and therefore it is possible that the energy consumption in 2017 was underestimated. In addition, natural weather variations were not taken into account in this calculation. In conclusion, the increase in energy consumption between 2017 and 2019 can largely be explained by the data availability and weather variations.

Priority axis	4 - Protecting, promoting and developing cultural and natural heritage
---------------	--

By the end of 2018, 10 main projects have been funded in priority axis 4 Protecting, developing and promoting natural and cultural heritage, bringing the commitment rate for the PA to 78%. At this point in programme implementation, the milestones for 2018 in the performance framework have been met (as displayed in table 3).

There is one specific objective in the Priority axis:

- 4 “Increased capacity of remote and sparsely populated communities for sustainable environmental management”

Transnational cooperation can build local capacities to deal with environmental, economic and social impacts resulting from large-scale investments. To handle this is often beyond the ability of individual communities but by facilitating good practice transfer, developing decision making tools to help identify sustainable solutions and by pooling expertise through strategic partnership, the local level can become better prepared.

The common and programme specific output indicators that measure the progress in the Priority axis is:

- Number of research institutions participating in cross-border, transnational or interregional research projects (C42)

- Number of organisations introducing a decision-making tool or governance concept facilitating sustainable environmental management

To avoid inflated indicator values and to ensure that they are based on robust evidence, extensive guidance was provided to closing projects on the expected documentation for each of the indicators. In the case of research institutions participating in transnational research projects, the project is required to provide the name of the research institution participating in the project. In the case of the number of organisations introducing a decision-making tool or governance concept, the project is required to list the organisation

and indicate if the organisation is introducing a decision making tool or a governance concept facilitating sustainable environmental management. The project is required to indicate which output the tool or concept relates to.

Compared to 2017, the achievement of output indicators has not increased, because no additional projects were approved in this priority axis.

The impact evaluation conducted in 2018 identifies a number of impacts, mostly of a more intangible nature, such as changes in capacities to handle land use conflicts and attitudes, e.g. towards public participation. Direct project results ultimately contribute to more sustainable and resilient communities.

Through case studies conducted within the framework of the impact evaluation, the evaluators identify impacts such as increased capacities in small communities for mitigating adverse effects of (large-scale) economic activity and infrastructure development, increased awareness in local authorities of the importance of active stakeholder involvement, community and trust building as preparation for constructive co-planning and preservation of traditional livelihoods of indigenous population.

There is one result indicator in the Priority axis, which aim to measure the achievement of the specific objectives in the programme area as a result of programme interventions as well as outside factors:

- 4 Preparedness of responsible authorities in remote, sparsely populated areas for environmental management in relation to climate change and impacts of new investment in exploitation of natural resources.

When reviewing the progress in relation to the result indicator in the Priority axis, it can be concluded that the achievement exceeds the 2019 target. This is mainly due to that important steps have according to the panel of regional experts been taken in one of the three sample regions concerning international cooperation in relation to climate change adaptation.

Priority axis

5 - Technical Assistance

Please see section 3.1 Overview of the implementation.

9.2. Specific actions taken to promote equality between men and women and to promote non-discrimination, in particular accessibility for persons with disabilities, and the arrangements implemented to ensure the integration of the gender perspective in the cooperation programme and operations (Article 50(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 and Article 14(4), subparagraph 2, (d) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

An assessment of the implementation of specific actions to take into account the principles set out in Article 7 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 on promotion of equality between men and women and non-discrimination, including, where relevant, depending on the content and objectives of the cooperation programme, an overview of specific actions taken to promote equality between men and women and to promote non-discrimination, including accessibility for persons with disabilities, and the arrangements implemented to ensure the integration of the gender perspective in the cooperation programme and operations

On a programme body level, horizontal principles are practiced for example by the JS and MA in their personnel profile. Programme partner countries have a specific remit to ensure equal representation of men and women in the MC.

On a project level, the NPA Programme manual outlines for Lead partners and partners their expectation regarding horizontal principles and their incorporation at all stages, design, and delivery through to evaluation of their projects life. The assessment of specific actions is conducted by JTS Desk officers through periodic project progress reports, and determination is made, if expectations are being met as approved by the Monitoring Committee.

At a Lead Partner seminar in September 2018, the JS dedicated a session to horizontal principles, with a project example from the RYE project, which had carried out a sustainable development project workshop based on the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Not only did it make the project partners more aware of what they could contribute to sustainability on a day-to-day basis; having established joint values on sustainability also benefitted other aspects of the project.

The NPA impact evaluation high-lights examples of how projects address the horizontal themes of inclusion, diversity and equality. For example:

- working directly with third sector (E-lighthouse)
- addressing youth entrepreneurship (RYE Connect)
- supporting communities to better absorb and develop immigrant and guest workers' skills, (REGINA)
- involving young people aged 16-25 (Secure)
- using virtual tools improving accessibility amongst all groups (Drifting apart)

- supporting the development of the tradition-based economies, especially those run by indigenous peoples (REGINA).
- Providing digitalized health care services to a vulnerable sector, in particular to older and vulnerable people (RemoAge)
- Considering equal opportunities and access in dissemination materials and events (E-lighthouse)

Project example:

Building Shared Knowledge capital to support natural resource governance in the Northern periphery - BuSK

The “BuSK” project lists all partners are equal opportunity employers, which is typical of all approved NPA projects. All employees recruited to work through the BuSK project were selected under equal opportunities policies.

Development of planning methods as well as decision making and governance concepts that enable bottom-up and collaborative planning, improve the elucidation of issues important for local communities is at the core of the BuSK project. As such, local communities strive to better maintain traditional livelihoods and develop new nature based economics that alleviate e.g. gender segregated migration from areas and thus balance both gender opportunities to work. BuSK has an equal representation and active roles of both men and women in all levels of project organization.

The selection of participants in “BuSK” focuses on developing and providing tools, methods and practices that enhance the use of indigenous local knowledge in land-use planning and tourism. Their aims are not only to participate with local people, but rather to develop methods that empower local communities to actively make initiatives and communicate their traditional and local knowledge, to a further extend the Arctisen project is collaborating with World Indigenous Tourism Alliance located in New Zealand.

9.3.Sustainable development (Article 50(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 and Article 14(4), subparagraph 2, (e) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

An assessment of the implementation of actions to take into account the principles set out in Article 8 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 on sustainable development, including, where relevant, depending on the content and objectives of the cooperation programme, an overview of the actions taken to promote sustainable development in accordance with that Article

The programme manual gives guidance to applicants and project partners on how to integrate the aspect of sustainable development into operations. Some of the projects implemented in the NPA programme have a direct aim to promote sustainability but all projects are obliged to consider sustainability as a horizontal theme, even though this is not the main objective of the project.

The impact evaluation carried out in 2018 highlights a number of concrete ways in which the NPA projects contribute to a sustainable development in the NPA regions:

- Practical actions to address issues of marine waste and awareness raising (Circular Ocean)
- Training, pilot plans and awareness raising and climate change mitigation and adaptation through local climate projects (Recent)
- Reduction in energy consumption and CO2 emissions (E-lighthouse)
- Environmental management plans (Ascent)
- Addressing issues of global climate change (Waterpro)
- Developing a model of sustainable management of geological and heritage areas (Drifting Apart)
- Knowledge and information on how to avoid or reduce the effects of large-scale investments in extraction of mineral resources, oil and gas (Regina)
- Collaborative land use planning in a way that helps to preserve and protect sensitive environment in the Arctic (BusK)

Projects also describe how they implement the horizontal principle of sustainable development into their day-to-day operations by the use of green ethos embedded into project planning and activities, through the use of green procurement, investigating low carbon transport opportunities, avoiding travel and focusing on sustainable methods of communication.

Project example:

Building Shared Knowledge capital to support natural resource governance in the Northern

periphery(BuSK)

BuSK uses as its central focus on developing collaborative land use planning which can aid directing and delineating investments in a way that helps to preserve and protect sensitive environment in the Arctic. By developing collaborative planning methods like participatory GIS utilized over the Internet, the project in the same time as enhancing the opportunities for a wider audience to participate in land use planning and reducing for example CO2 emissions by decreasing physical movement of people in sparsely populated areas.

During the course of BuSK project the possibilities of Internet based collaboration via video conferences and common data banks will be utilized, which reduces the need for physical traveling.

9.4. Reporting on support used for climate change objectives (Article 50(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013)

Calculated amount of support to be used for climate change objectives based on the cumulative financial data by category of intervention in Table 7

Priority axis	Amount of support to be used for climate change objectives (EUR)	Proportion of total allocation to the operational programme (%)
1	1,135,436.91	8.02%
2	652,025.27	4.60%
3	7,825,696.54	82.90%
4	3,060,695.01	32.42%
Total	12,673,853.73	25.24%

--

9.5 Role of partners in the implementation of the cooperation programme (Article 50(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 and Article 14(4), subparagraph 1, (c) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

Assessment of the implementation of actions to take into account the role of partners referred to in Article 5 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013, including involvement of the partners in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the cooperation programme

Involvement of partners was a central component through the development of the Cooperation Programme and the emphasis has been placed on ensuring both national and regional –level participation in the drafting process.

The involvement of the partners in the assessment, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the operational programme covers various stages from the assessment of projects by Regional Advisory Groups (RAG), which are typically experts (public and private sector) from a thematic field addressed by the NPA. RAG's have been involved in the regional appraisal of the 5th call projects in 2018.

At the implementation stage, mainly programme bodies: Programme Joint Secretariat, Managing Authority and to some extent Regional Contact Points are involved.

At the monitoring and evaluation stage, the Monitoring Committee as “partners” are typically public servants from National and regional bodies from the 9 programme partner countries. Observers on the Monitoring Committee come from Non-Governmental Organisations such as the Indigenous People's Secretariat. Besides that, there is a permanent observer from Russia in the Monitoring Committee.

On behalf of the Monitoring Committee, an evaluation working group (EVA) consisting of stakeholders from the programme area oversaw the process, and gave input on the methodology and to draft reports from the evaluation team. The EVA group met twice during 2018 with the evaluators and the programme management and also provided written input to the draft and final reports.

In 2018 ongoing discussions and contacts have taken place with the Scottish Government on behalf of both Scotland and Northern Ireland to make contingency planning in relation to Brexit

The geographical distribution of project Lead Partners/Partners is shown in Figure below. Divided into the three geographical zones, the partners are very well distributed across the programme area; 129 partners in Finland, Sweden and Norway, 120 partners in Scotland, Ireland and Northern Ireland and 50 partners in Greenland, Iceland and Faroe Islands, and other countries 14. Compared to the geographical distribution of Lead Partners, the distribution between the three zones is more uneven.

10. OBLIGATORY INFORMATION AND ASSESSMENT ACCORDING TO ARTICLE 14(4), SUBPARAGRAPH 1 (A) AND (B), OF REGULATION (EU) No 1299/2013

10.1 Progress in implementation of the evaluation plan and the follow-up given to the findings of evaluations

At its meeting in December 2017, the Management Group agreed for the purpose of the impact evaluation to accept the bid from the European Policies Research Centre (EPRC) at the University of Strathclyde and Nathalie Wergles, an EPRC associate.

In January 2018, the evaluation (EVA) group met with the evaluators for a kick-off meeting in Copenhagen. This meeting allowed the EVA group members to fine-tune the evaluation questions per specific objective, to provide suggestions for the selection of the case studies and regions, and to express any other areas that should be covered by the evaluators.

The kick-off meeting was followed by an inception document in February 2018, in which the evaluators outlined the final scope of the evaluation as agreed at the kick-off meeting.

In May 2018, the evaluators circulated a selection of papers to the JS and the EVA group, to agree on a final selection of case studies and regions to be included in the evaluation. In parallel, the evaluators published an online survey targeting Lead Partners and partners from NPP 2007-2013 projects that were part of the Achievements report evaluation.

The EVA group feedback allowed the evaluators to present a draft evaluation report, containing a complete overview of the evaluation activities and a final proposal for the selection of case studies at the Monitoring Committee meeting on 12th June in Kirkenes, Norway. Here, the evaluators also presented some preliminary findings with regards to the horizontal principles.

The case study interviews mostly took place during the summer months.

In September, the evaluators organized a focus group meeting with regional indicator experts and the RAG chairs as a side-event to the NPA Annual Conference in Inverness. The focus group provided the evaluators with an additional regional perspective, and a confirmation whether their findings were in line with regional expectations. The evaluation was also presented at the conference itself, looking back at the different generations of NPP/NPA programmes.

On 1st November, a second EVA group meeting took place in Copenhagen, where the evaluators presented a draft evaluation report (long version), an analysis of the survey results, and a reading note. During the meeting, the discussion centered around the findings so far, but also on how the EVA group wanted to prioritise the information in the final evaluation report (short version). It was mentioned that some information could be presented as separate papers, such as the online survey, and the Arctic Cooperation.

At its meeting on 5th December, the Management Group was informed about the draft evaluation report

by the evaluators via Skype.

The Monitoring Committee approved the report in a Written Procedure in January 2019.

Status	Name	Fund	Year of finalizing evaluation	Type of evaluation	Thematic objective	Topic	Findings (in case of execution)	Follow up (in case of execution)
--------	------	------	-------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-------	---------------------------------	----------------------------------

10.2 The results of the information and publicity measures of the Funds carried out under the communication strategy

Halfway into the programme's lifetime with the number of funded projects peaking during 2017 and 2018, the NPA put considerable efforts into achieving tangible results and measurable changes at programme area level. The Communication Strategy played a crucial role in obtaining these results.

In 2017 activities focused on providing tools and training to enable key actors to play their part in the communication strategy. Secondly, the collaboration between EU Arctic Programmes stepped up with joint initiatives taking place.

In 2018 communication activities were geared to communicate the programme results and impact towards key stakeholders and people living in the NPA area. The plan consisted increasingly of joint transnational communication activities and cooperation, the main directions for these being the Arctic Cooperation and the Transnational Communications network.

*A public survey has been held among the users, mainly focused on satisfaction with the information provision of the NPA 2014-2020. The survey addressed three areas: NPA online presence, NPA events and, assistance from the programme. There is generally a very high level of satisfaction with the **NPA online presence** (website, newsletter and social media platforms). The programme is strong in providing relevant information which is easily accessible and clear. On the other hand, it is encouraged to increase visibility of the projects both via the website and social media. It is also asked to publish news more frequently and give more visibility to projects on social media.*

Concerning **NPA events**, it is noticeable that the participants to the Annual Events, selected the following three most important reasons to join the event: Network, Feel part of a transnational community, Learn about the programme achievements. This indicates that the programme is reaching further than its objectives: beyond raising awareness and building capacity, the programme is contributing to creating a community feeling across partner countries and organisations. Such a sense of belonging and ownership amongst the programme beneficiaries, potential beneficiaries and staff is a fertile ground for delivering the change sought by the programme.

As for the **assistance from the programme**: 86% of the respondents contacted a programme body and were for the large majority very satisfied with the answers they received.

To conclude, the survey was also the opportunity to test the programme success in communicating its messages to the different target groups, as listed in the Communication Strategy. Respondents were asked to state their agreement level with each of the specific messages. There is a high level of agreement with all the statements across all categories of respondents. Such a consistent support to the programme objectives is also in line with what has been observed by the evaluators, i.e. that the programme is well on track towards meeting its objectives. As far as the communication strategy is concerned, it can be concluded that the programme has been effective in communicating its messages, these answers confirm that the intentions expressed by the objectives have translated into recognizable facts.

Main communication measures

Visual identity: finalised with the creation of a poster template

Online platforms: Besides the website, Basecamp and Facebook are effective platforms for instant communication with respectively Lead Partners and RCP; and the projects and general public. According to the survey results, 96% of the respondents could find the information they were looking for.

Conferences and seminars: In the training events organised in 2017 and 2018 the programme emphasized the role of communication in projects. This generation of projects sees more qualified communication managers involved from the onset, as shown from the proactive use of social media and high number of videos being produced by each project.

The NPA Annual Event 2018 “*People of the North - Across the Generations*” focused on how the NPA projects impact the everyday lives of the people and generations living in the programme area. The Conference gathered more than 120 participants. A short documentary filmed at 3 different peripheral locations brought to life the stories behind the projects (<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC8jZrI92OKy1M5AoGTfWlaw/videos>). The event included an exhibition where the audience could experience virtual and augmented reality solutions developed by NPA projects.

Monitoring system: thanks to a continuous collaboration with interact, the users, the IT support and the other programmes, the experience with eMS has been constantly improving. Survey respondents also confirmed they were satisfied with the eMS helpdesk. The number of tickets received at the eMS helpdesk significantly decreased during 2018.

Joint transnational communication activities:

Since April 2017, the NPA has participated in meetings between the transnational Heads of Secretariat and Communication Officers to coordinate preparations for post-2020 and coordinate efforts to promote the results of the transnational programmes. From these discussions several collaborations followed: the publication '**10 Things to Know About Transnational Cooperation**' about the role and achievements of Interreg transnational/interregional programmes across Europe; #**MadewithInterreg** Joint exhibition and social media campaign. During the EWRC the exhibition featured outstanding Interreg project examples showcasing how transnational cooperation strengthens EU Cohesion by providing tangible results and benefits to the people.

Monitoring and evaluation

In order to measure and evaluate the effectiveness of the communication strategy, a set of indicators was defined in the communication strategy. Due to the limited resources available at the programme, it was not possible to proceed with this plan as originally foreseen.

Website statistics: due to the technical setup of the CMS platform and in connection with the requirements of the GDPR regulations, it was decided not to make use of Google Analytics and thus not to have web statistics. For the size and purpose of the programme it was agreed that information collected via surveys would suffice for the purposes of the evaluation.

Result indicators

A set of result indicators was proposed in the communication strategy. The plan was to carry out surveys at different years, however, the staff resources available at the Secretariat in the years from 2015 to 2018 were insufficient for carrying out baseline surveys and thereby populate the set of result indicators.

The first survey was carried out in early 2019 and used as a base for assessing the communication strategy in the current Annual Report. The survey will be relaunched in 2021 and 2023.

Communication statistics

Number of news articles: 43

Major information activity: Annual Conferences (2017 Ireland), (2018 Scotland), EWRC 2018

Social media posts: 108

Publications: 2

11. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION WHICH MAY BE ADDED DEPENDING ON THE CONTENT AND OBJECTIVES OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME (ARTICLE 14(4), SUBPARAGRAPH 2 (A), (B), (C) AND (F), OF REGULATION (EU) No 1299/2013)

11.1. Progress in the implementation of the integrated approach to territorial development, including integrated territorial investments, sustainable urban development, and community led local development under the cooperation programme

--

11.2 Progress in implementation of actions to reinforce the capacity of authorities and beneficiaries to administer and to use the ERDF

--

11.3 Contribution to macro-regional and sea basin strategies (where appropriate)

As stipulated by the Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013, recital 19, article 8(3)(d) on the "Content, adoption and amendment of cooperation programmes" and article 14(4) 2nd subparagraph (c) "Implementation reports", this programme contributes to MRS(s) and/or SBS:

The NPA lies at the fringes of the EUSBSR, thereby links to the EUSBSR are limited by the different territorial features specifically addressed in the Northern Periphery and Arctic. The areas of shared interest between the NPA and EUSBSR, as identified in the cooperation programme, are innovation and management of natural resources. However, the programme did not preclude projects from identifying other areas for contribution.

On the other hand, the programme chose not to select further EUSBSR objectives and horizontal actions in its Cooperation programme. The reason for this is to encourage projects to focus on NPA territorial features, thereby concentrating NPA funding towards relevant actions.

The programme links to the EUSBSR via its projects who state their direct link with the macro-regional strategy at the application and closure stage. As part of the project development support activities for the generation of high quality projects, the Joint Secretariat (JS) informs the potential applicants about the EUSBSR objectives and policy areas. At the selection stage, the Joint Secretariat's assessment criteria include an analysis of the proposals' alignment with the EUSBSR.

The programme built in a coordination mechanism in its selection procedure: each proposal is assessed by a group of regional representative (RAGs) who are informed about EUSBSR as well as mainstream operations in their region and therefore include this dimension to the NPA transnational assessment carried out at the Joint Secretariat.

At closure, projects are requested to complete the Typology report, a document describing the type of results achieved (tangible vs intangible) as well as the type of impact they have had/ are likely to generate. In this report they also specify the connection with the EUSBSR .

The Northern Periphery and Arctic programme has an interest in the Action Plan for a Maritime strategy for the Atlantic. As for the EUSBSR, the NPA is supporting this strategy mainly at project level and mainly where these projects cover the coastal parts of the programme area. It is to be noted that at this stage of implementation, the programme did not finance projects with a specific focus on coastal territories , however some projects addressed the marine economy especially looking into introducing innovation into some niche industries such as seaweed, sea urchin and fish labelling technologies.

The NPA took the same approach as for the EUSBSR strategy , with the addition of the organisation of an event addressing Blue Growth opportunities, which took place in Galway in 2017. The conference addressed such topics as entrepreneurship and innovation related to fisheries and aquaculture, environmental protection and maritime and coastal tourism.

- EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR)
- EU Strategy for the Danube Region (EUSDR)
- EU Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region (EUSAIR)
- EU Strategy for the Alpine Region (EUSALP)
- Atlantic Sea Basin Strategy (ATLSBS)

Objective(s), policy area(s) and horizontal action(s) that the programme is relevant to:

	Objectives
<input type="checkbox"/>	1 - Save the Sea
<input type="checkbox"/>	2 - Connect the Region
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 - Increase Prosperity
	Policy areas
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.1 - Bioeconomy
<input type="checkbox"/>	4.2 - Culture
<input type="checkbox"/>	4.3 - Education
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.4 - Energy
<input type="checkbox"/>	4.5 - Hazards
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.6 - Health
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4.7 - Innovation
<input type="checkbox"/>	4.8 - Nutri
<input type="checkbox"/>	4.9 - Safe
<input type="checkbox"/>	4.10 - Secure
<input type="checkbox"/>	4.11 - Ship
<input type="checkbox"/>	4.12 - Tourism
<input type="checkbox"/>	4.13 - Transport
	Horizontal actions
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5.1 - Capacity
<input type="checkbox"/>	5.2 - Climate
<input type="checkbox"/>	5.3 - Neighbours
<input type="checkbox"/>	5.4 - Spatial planning

Actions or mechanisms used to better link the programme with the EUSBSR

A. Are macro-regional coordinators (mainly National Coordinators, Policy Area Coordinators, Horizontal Action Coordinators, or members of the Steering Committees/Coordination Groups) participating in the Monitoring Committee of the programme?

Yes No

B. In selection criteria, have extra points been attributed to specific measures supporting the EUSBSR?

Yes No

C. Has the programme invested EU funds in the EUSBSR?

Yes No

Does your programme plan to invest in the EUSBSR in the future? Please elaborate (1 specific sentence)

Nothing besides the allocated funding to projects that are in line with the strategy.

D. Obtained results in relation to the EUSBSR (n.a. for 2016)

To date, 8 projects concluded their activities; among these, 2 have specifically indicated a direct link with the EUSBSR in the Policy Areas of Innovation and Health. IMPROVE increased the level of innovation in six NPA peripheral regions in the field of technology-driven public service solutions, with a focus on health and spatial planning. The project Remoage further connects to the EUSBSR Policy Area of Health with services developed and implemented in the project to improve access to health and care services for older people ageing in remote and sparsely populated areas. The services include methods to remotely support vulnerable older persons living at home based on their individual needs and thereby providing greater access to personalized health and care services as well as providing family support.

E. Does the programme address the EUSBSR sub-objectives (with corresponding to specific targets and indicators) as stated in the "EUSBSR Action Plan"? (Please specify the target and the indicator)

Not applicable

Priority(s) and objective(s) that the programme is relevant to:

	Priority	Objective
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 - Promote entrepreneurship and innovation	1.1 - Sharing knowledge between higher education organisations, companies and research centers
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 - Promote entrepreneurship and innovation	1.2 - Enhancement of competitiveness and innovation capacities in the maritime economy of the Atlantic area
<input type="checkbox"/>	1 - Promote entrepreneurship and innovation	1.3 - Fostering adaptation and diversification of economic activities by promoting the potential of the Atlantic area
<input type="checkbox"/>	2 - Protect, secure and develop the potential of the Atlantic marine and coastal environment	2.1 - Improving maritime safety and security
<input type="checkbox"/>	2 - Protect, secure and develop the potential of the Atlantic marine and coastal environment	2.2 - Exploring and protecting marine waters and coastal zones
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 - Protect, secure and develop the potential of the Atlantic marine and coastal environment	2.3 - Sustainable management of marine resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	2 - Protect, secure and develop the potential of the Atlantic marine and coastal environment	2.4 - Exploitation of the renewable energy potential of the Atlantic area's marine and coastal environment
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 - Improve accessibility and connectivity	3.1 - Promoting cooperation between ports
<input type="checkbox"/>	4 - Create a socially inclusive and sustainable model of regional development	4.1 - Fostering better knowledge of social challenges in the Atlantic area
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4 - Create a socially inclusive and sustainable model of regional development	4.2 - Preserving and promoting the Atlantic's cultural heritage

Actions or mechanisms used to better link the programme with the Atlantic SBS

A. Are the Sea Basin Strategic coordinators (mainly National Coordinators, Priority Area Coordinators or members, and/or Objective coordinators or members) participating in the Monitoring Committee of the programme?

Yes No

B. In selection criteria, have extra points been attributed to specific measures supporting the ATLSBS?

Yes No

C. Has the programme invested EU funds in the ATLSBS?

Yes No

Does your programme plan to invest in the EUSAIR in the future? Please elaborate (1 specific sentence)

Nothing besides the allocated funding to projects that are in line with the strategy.

D. Obtained results in relation to the ATLSBS (n.a. for 2016)

Amongst the closed projects, none indicated a direct link to the ATLSBS, but five of them addressed themes which are of shared interest, namely: shared knowledge, cultural heritage, marine resources, enhanced competitiveness and diversification of the economy. The projects URCHIN and CEREALS developed new food& drink products based on local resources. The two mentioned projects and CRAFT REACH, additionally provided business models for higher efficiency, support and marketing to enhance the competitiveness and attractiveness of small business and artisans. The projects SAINT and DRIFTING APART pooled shared knowledge to create two distinctive products: a label for sustainable local tourism and a transnational geopark trail.

11.4 Progress in the implementation of actions in the field of social innovation

--

13. SMART, SUSTAINABLE AND INCLUSIVE GROWTH

Information and assessment of the programme contribution to achieving the Union strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.

The targets set up within the framework of the Union strategy for smart, sustainable and Inclusive growth are the basis for the cohesion policy, which the Northern Periphery and Arctic Programme is a part of.

The NPA programme has an important task in bringing together the Europe 2020 strategy with national planning and regional and local development plans in the programme area. The priority axes and the programme strategy are well in line with and contribute to the targets of the Europe 2020 strategy on smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. But due to the relatively small scale of the NPA's budget and large programme area, the programme cannot be expected to make a substantial, direct, easy-measurable contribution to Europe 2020 as a whole but has to be selective in its' focus, by considering where the programme can effect positive change and where it can retain its distinct identity and links to the needs and challenges of the programme area.

The evaluators carrying out the impact evaluation of the NPA during 2018 concluded in their draft final report that *“The emerging impacts from the NPA programme are in line with Europe 2020, feeding in directly in some cases, and more generally to the overall goals and targets of the strategy. Links can be cross sectoral with interventions in one area supporting another. Given the scale and scope of the Programme, direct contributions to Europe 2020 targets will be slight. Due to thematic concentration, contributions will be weaker in some areas, such as education, than others, such as R&D. Looking to the future, these strategic links are important for the Programme to identify its value and role in addressing strategic goals and capacity to engage with future ETC objectives.”*

According to the evaluators, NPA impacts on SMART GROWTH are new businesses in sustainable sectors, new and tested/trailed products in sustainable sectors, as well as investment in R&D in area specific fields. For example, the Smart Fish project, which used R&D in the Blue Growth sector to develop a prototype for smart labelling of fish to monitor temperature swings during transport to the customer. The aim is to make small northern entrepreneurs more competitive. In addition, impacts include support to young entrepreneurs, and new tested technologies for public service provision in remote areas. One example is the Rye Connect project focusing on increasing youth entrepreneurship among young people in remote, sparsely populated areas in the north. Another example is the RemoAge project, which uses eHealth technology and other approaches to support frail older people in remote communities. Besides receiving testimonials that the project was life changing for a number of frail, older people, the project helped increase awareness and learning of digitalised health care delivery options and reduced scepticism among care givers.

Examples of NPA impacts on SUSTAINABLE GROWTH are innovation in new sustainable products, energy efficiency solutions for remote areas, reduced emissions, and capacity building for renewable energy and energy efficient solutions for sparsely populated communities. For example, the RECENT project, which through a community-owned group water scheme in Ireland increased the local capacity to act on opportunities deriving from renewable energy generation. Important savings in CO2 emissions were also achieved through the IMPROVE and REMOAGE projects which introduced remote IT solutions for providing healthcare assistance. In both cases the projects offer assistance to people who are not in need for hospitalisation, but require constant monitoring due to the elderly age or chronic conditions. By adopting remote IT based solutions, the care can be provided without covering long distances by car or boat in case of small islands eg. Scotland. Given the average population density of 8 inhabitants per sqKm in the NPA area, such solutions represent a concrete improvement.

Examples of NPA impacts on INCLUSIVE GROWTH are training/teaching of youth entrepreneurship,

connections and capacity building in indigenous populations, and services for youth mental health care in remote areas. For example, the eCAP project, children and adolescents requiring psychiatric services, their families and psychiatrists and specialists providing these services in remote and sparsely populated areas. The project helped change attitudes and influenced policy with regard to digitalised healthcare. Another example is the BusK project, focused on land use planning, developing and providing tools, methods and practices that enhance the use of indigenous and local knowledge; methods that empower local communities.

**14. ISSUES AFFECTING THE PERFORMANCE OF THE PROGRAMME AND MEASURES TAKEN
— PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK (ARTICLE 50(2) OF REGULATION (EU) No 1303/2013)**

Where the assessment of progress made with regard to the milestones and targets set out in the performance framework demonstrates that certain milestones and targets have not been achieved, Member States should outline the underlying reasons for failure to achieve these milestones in the report of 2019 (for milestones) and in the final implementation report (for targets).

Milestones and targets have been met.

DOCUMENTS

Document title	Document type	Document date	Local reference	Commission reference	Files	Sent date	Sent By
NPA Citizens summary 2018	Citizens' summary	24-Jun-2019		Ares(2019)4031561	NPA Citizens summary 2018	25-Jun-2019	nnystste

LATEST VALIDATION RESULTS

Severity	Code	Message
Info		Implementation report version has been validated
Warning	2.48.1	Annual value entered in table 1 is below the baseline value and moving away from the target for priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3a, specific objective: 2.1, indicator: 2.1 , year: 2016 (99.20 < 100.00). Please check.
Warning	2.48.1	Annual value entered in table 1 is below the baseline value and moving away from the target for priority axis: 3, investment priority: 4c, specific objective: 3, indicator: 3 , year: 2018 (97.40 < 100.00). Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 1,500.00% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 1, investment priority: 1b, indicator: CO26, year: 2017. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 1,500.00% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 1, investment priority: 1b, indicator: CO26, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 1,806.00% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 3, investment priority: 4c, indicator: CO31, year: 2016. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 1,899.20% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 3, investment priority: 4c, indicator: CO31, year: 2017. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 1,911.20% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 3, investment priority: 4c, indicator: CO31, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 118.18% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 4, investment priority: 6c, indicator: 4, year: 2016. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 156.25% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 1, investment priority: 1b, indicator: CO01, year: 2015. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 156.25% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 1, investment priority: 1b, indicator: CO01, year: 2016. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 156.25% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 1, investment priority: 1b, indicator: CO01, year: 2017. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 156.25% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 1, investment priority: 1b, indicator: CO01, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 177.27% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 4, investment priority: 6c, indicator: 4, year: 2017. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 177.27% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 4, investment priority: 6c, indicator: 4, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 218.75% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3d, indicator: CO01, year: 2015. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 218.75% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3d, indicator: CO01, year: 2016. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 218.75% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3d, indicator: CO01, year: 2017. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 254.55% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 4, investment priority: 6c, indicator: CO42, year: 2016. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 287.50% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3d, indicator: CO28, year: 2017. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 3,187.50% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3a, indicator: CO01, year: 2015. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 3,187.50% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3a, indicator: CO01, year: 2016. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 3,556.25% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3a, indicator: CO01, year: 2017. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 3,775.00% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3a, indicator: CO01, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 306.25% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 1, investment priority: 1b, indicator: CO26, year: 2015. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 409.09% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 4, investment priority: 6c, indicator: CO42, year: 2017. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 409.09% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 4, investment priority: 6c, indicator: CO42, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 425.00% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3d, indicator: CO01, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 493.75% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 1, investment priority: 1b, indicator: CO26, year: 2016. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 550.00% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3a, indicator: CO28, year: 2017. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 612.50% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3a, indicator: CO28, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 837.50% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3a, indicator: CO28, year: 2015. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 837.50% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3a, indicator: CO28, year: 2016. Please check.
Warning	2.52.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 912.50% of the total target value for "S", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3d, indicator: CO28, year: 2018. Please check.

Severity	Code	Message
Warning	2.53.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 1,212.50% of the total target value for "F", priority axis: 1, investment priority: 1b, indicator: CO26, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.53.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 1,326.40% of the total target value for "F", priority axis: 3, investment priority: 4c, indicator: CO31, year: 2017. Please check.
Warning	2.53.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 1,462.50% of the total target value for "F", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3d, indicator: CO28, year: 2017. Please check.
Warning	2.53.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 1,462.50% of the total target value for "F", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3d, indicator: CO28, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.53.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 1,550.00% of the total target value for "F", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3d, indicator: CO01, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.53.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 175.00% of the total target value for "F", priority axis: 1, investment priority: 1b, indicator: CO01, year: 2017. Please check.
Warning	2.53.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 2,668.75% of the total target value for "F", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3a, indicator: CO01, year: 2017. Please check.
Warning	2.53.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 225.00% of the total target value for "F", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3a, indicator: CO28, year: 2017. Please check.
Warning	2.53.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 3,024.80% of the total target value for "F", priority axis: 3, investment priority: 4c, indicator: CO31, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.53.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 440.63% of the total target value for "F", priority axis: 1, investment priority: 1b, indicator: CO01, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.53.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 6,618.75% of the total target value for "F", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3a, indicator: CO01, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.53.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 881.25% of the total target value for "F", priority axis: 1, investment priority: 1b, indicator: CO26, year: 2017. Please check.
Warning	2.53.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered is 937.50% of the total target value for "F", priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3a, indicator: CO28, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.54.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered for "F" (implemented) is 112.00% of the annual total value entered for "S" (forecast from selected) for priority axis: 1, investment priority: 1b, indicator: CO01, year: 2017. Please check.
Warning	2.54.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered for "F" (implemented) is 153.06% of the annual total value entered for "S" (forecast from selected) for priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3a, indicator: CO28, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.54.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered for "F" (implemented) is 158.27% of the annual total value entered for "S" (forecast from selected) for priority axis: 3, investment priority: 4c, indicator: CO31, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.54.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered for "F" (implemented) is 160.27% of the annual total value entered for "S" (forecast from selected) for priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3d, indicator: CO28, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.54.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered for "F" (implemented) is 175.33% of the annual total value entered for "S" (forecast from selected) for priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3a, indicator: CO01, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.54.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered for "F" (implemented) is 282.00% of the annual total value entered for "S" (forecast from selected) for priority axis: 1, investment priority: 1b, indicator: CO01, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.54.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered for "F" (implemented) is 364.71% of the annual total value entered for "S" (forecast from selected) for priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3d, indicator: CO01, year: 2018. Please check.
Warning	2.54.1	In table 2, the annual total value entered for "F" (implemented) is 508.70% of the annual total value entered for "S" (forecast from selected) for priority axis: 2, investment priority: 3d, indicator: CO28, year: 2017. Please check.