

EX-ANTE EVALUATION & STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE
2014-2020 INTERREG V CARIBBEAN
OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME

Final Report

September – December 2015

Table of Contents

[List of abbreviations 3](#_Toc436753626)

[1. Executive Summary 4](#_Toc436753627)

[2. Introduction & methodology of the ex ante evaluation (EAE) 6](#_Toc436753628)

[2.1. Objectives of the present ex ante evaluation 6](#_Toc436753629)

[2.2. The methodology for and performance of the evaluation 7](#_Toc436753630)

[3. Opinion and recommendations of the ex ante evaluation and strategic environmental assessment 8](#_Toc436753631)

[4. Analysis by criteria 14](#_Toc436753632)

[4.1. Relevance analysis 14](#_Toc436753633)

[4.1.1. The participative design of the programme 14](#_Toc436753634)

[4.1.2. Appraisal of the socio-economic analysis and needs identified 15](#_Toc436753635)

[4.1.3. Evaluation of the relevance of the OP’s strategy with respect to European objectives 18](#_Toc436753636)

[4.1.4. Relevance of the SWOT analysis 20](#_Toc436753637)

[4.1.5. Relevance of the specific regional needs identified 20](#_Toc436753638)

[4.1.6. Evaluation of the coherence of the strategy 22](#_Toc436753639)

[4.2. The Programme’s internal coherence 23](#_Toc436753640)

[4.3. The consistency of the strategy with other relevant instruments 25](#_Toc436753641)

[4.4. Appraisal of the programme’s intervention logic 26](#_Toc436753642)

[4.5. Suitability of the measures proposed to support the horizontal priorities 28](#_Toc436753643)

[4.6. Indicators and targets 30](#_Toc436753644)

[4.6.1. Reminder of the indicator system proposed by the EC 30](#_Toc436753645)

[4.6.2. Output Indicators 31](#_Toc436753646)

[4.6.3. Evaluation of programme Result Indicators and Investment Strategy 33](#_Toc436753647)

[4.7. Appraisal of the implementation of actions 38](#_Toc436753648)

[4.8. Management, monitoring and assessment 41](#_Toc436753649)

[**4.8.1.** **The programme’s administrative and management capacity** 41](#_Toc436753650)

[**4.8.2.** **Evaluation Plan** 42](#_Toc436753651)

[**4.8.3.** **Performance framework objectives** 44](#_Toc436753652)

[**4.8.4.** **Reducing the administrative burden** 45](#_Toc436753653)

[5. Consideration of the Strategic Environmental Assessment 46](#_Toc436753654)

[5.1. Elaboration of the SEA report 46](#_Toc436753655)

[5.2. Consultations 47](#_Toc436753656)

[5.2.1. Consultation de l’autorité environnementale 47](#_Toc436753657)

[5.2.2. Public consultation 47](#_Toc436753658)

[5.3. Notice of the Strategic Environmental Assessment 48](#_Toc436753659)

# List of abbreviations

**ACS** Association of Caribbean States

**AIR** Annual Implementation Report

**CARICOM** The Caribbean Community

**CARIFORUM** The Caribbean Forum

**CBC** Cross-border cooperation

**DST** Department for Territorial Surveillance

**EAE** Ex-Ante Evaluation

**EAFRD** European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development

**EC** European Commission

**EDF** European Development Fund

**EIP** European Innovation Partnerships

**ETC** European Territorial Cooperation

**ERDF-ETC** European Regional Development Fund-European Territorial Cooperation

**ESF** European Social Fund

**EU** European Union

**IP** Investment Priority

**JTS** Joint Technical Secretariat

**OECS** Organization of Eastern Caribbean States

**OCT** Overseas countries & territories

**OP** Operational Programme

**OR** Outermost Regions

**POSEI** Specific Integrated European Operational

**RIP** Regional Indicative Programme

**S3** Smart Specialisation Strategy

**SO** Specific Objective

**SWOT** Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats.

**SEA** Strategic Environmental Assessment
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# Executive Summary

This report is the sixth deliverable of the ex-ante evaluation and strategic environmental assessment for the 2014-2020 Interreg V Caribbean Operational Programme (OP).

The **ex-ante evaluation** is based on the OP dated 7 January 2015, which takes into account the modifications included the full OP of December 2014

The analysis in previous deliverables, in respect of the initial set of evaluation criteria, has been updated to take account of the modifications introduced in the successive versions of the document.

The different analytical findings for the criteria that have been reviewed can be summarised as follows:

**The Programme’s relevance**

The programme design process has been one of quality, has generated a robust needs analysis and identified relevant challenges:

* Space limitations mean that some important information has been included in Annexe D.

Regarding the translation of challenges into thematic objectives and investment priorities:

* It is difficult to distinguish the general socio-economic challenges from the specific challenges relating to cooperation: the translation of challenges into strategic objectives is not explained (annex E).
* The presentation of the priorities of (Caribbean) regional international organisations should be included in annex; only information relating to cooperation challenges should be retained.
* The SWOT should be limited to only those challenges that are germane to the strategic objectives that have been selected.

**The Programme’s Internal Coherence**

With the exception of Priority 6, the actions envisaged concern the whole Caribbean region

The complementarities between the priorities merit further development as there are opportunities to stimulate the creation of genuine action ‘task forces’ in areas such as tourism, agriculture and agri-food, and the management of natural risks.

**Strategic Coherence**

The programme reflects the realm of what is possible in terms of cooperation.

* cooperation actions can only make a modest contribution to the objectives of the ERDF, that is, to assist European territories to contribute to Europe 2020, and this is especially true in the Caribbean region.
* cooperation actions will be what partners & stakeholders are able implement; the degree of cooperation will vary considerably across different policy areas.

the programme is in line with Europe 2020 and the ERDF (ETC).

**The Programme’s ’external’ coherence with other relevant policy instruments**

Each of the programme’s priorities support actions that are complementary to the actions and mechanisms supported by the:

* ERDF,
* EDF,
* ESF, and
* the EAFRD & POSEI

The development of economic exchange (trade) is also limited by policies implemented by each of the Overseas Countries and Territories (OCT):

* Support for imports from the European Community and support for exports to third countries;
* Policies supporting local production with a view to import substitution;
* Competition between countries with different costs and regulations, which can distort competition.

**Intervention logic**

The programme’s intervention logic appears clear and coherent and is summarised in tables 1 and 2 in section 1 (Justification for the selection of investment priorities, Outline of the investment strategy for the cooperation programme)

In section 2, presented in advance of the descriptions of specific objectives, the intervention logic is also set out clearly.

**Suitability of measures proposed to promote the horizontal priorities**

Certain details could be further clarified, but the OP should meet its horizontal priority goals for:

* Sustainable development
* Protection of the environment
* Mitigation of and adaptation to climate change
* Risk prevention and management
* Equal opportunities and non-discrimination
* Equality between men and women

**Indicators & targets**

The output indicators are precisely defined and are practical to use

* To better capture programme outputs, the present ex-ante evaluation proposes additional indicators
* To better identify the contribution of programme action to the expected results, the present ex-ante evaluation proposes additional indicators

The result indicators are well-defined and described, and are all specific to the programme

* To better evaluate the expected results, additional indicators are proposed.

The performance framework objectives for mid-term are set at 15% for all the programme’s priorities

* The objectives for the priorities 1, 5 and 6 may be revised down to just 10%.

**Implementation of projects**

Some analysis and commentary on where the programme needs to remain vigilant in order to achieve the objectives are provided

**Consideration of the Strategic Environmental Assessment**

The strategic environmental assessment (SEA) has been amended following the joint opinion of the environmental authorities of the program (May 21, 2015).

The amended version of the evaluation is the final version of the Strategic Environmental Assessment. It was sumited for public consultation organized on 1 July 2015 to 1 August 2015.There was no contribution following consultation.

# Introduction & methodology of the ex ante evaluation (EAE)

## Objectives of the present ex ante evaluation

In accordance with the Regulations, the objective is to provide an opinion on the following issues:

a) the contribution to the Union strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, taking into account the objectives and thematic priorities that have been selected and taking into account national and regional needs;

b) the internal coherence of the proposed programme and its relation with other relevant policy instruments;

c) whether the financial allocation is consistent with the programme’s objectives;

d) the consistency between, on the one hand, the programme’s thematic objectives, priorities and corresponding objectives and, on the other, the Common Strategic Framework, the Partnership Agreement and the relevant country-specific recommendations under article 121(2) of the TFEU and the recommendations of the Council adopted under article 148(4) of the TFEU;

e) the relevance and clarity of the programme’s proposed specific indicators;

f) how the expected outputs will contribute to the results;

g) whether the quantified target values for indicators are realistic, having regard to the level of support from the CSF envisaged;

h) the rationale for the type of support proposed;

i) the adequacy of the programme’s human resources and management capacity;

j) the suitability of the programme’s procedures for monitoring and gathering suitable data for evaluations;

k) the suitability of the milestones selected for the performance framework;

l) the adequacy of the planned measures envisaged for supporting equal opportunities between men and women and prevent discrimination;

m) the relevance of the measures envisaged for supporting sustainable development.

## The methodology for and performance of the evaluation

The present evaluation is carried out in parallel with the design of the programme. As indicated in the introduction, the evaluation is an **interactive** and **iterative** process**.** The evaluators review the different documents as they are produced, providing opinion and recommendations. These may be taken into account by the programme drafting team in order to improve the programme.

The different work steps (see below) of the evaluation process are carried out on the basis of documents provided by the programme drafting team.

The interactive nature of the process means that the production timetable for the EAE is linked to that of the programme development process.

***Timetable updated on 16 July 2014***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Programme drafting stage | Timetable for the drafting team | Handover of EAE deliverables | Timetable for the present EAE |
| Integrated strategy | Mid-October 2013 | Report Step 1 | End October |
| Objectives and priorities | February 2014 | Report Step 2 | End February 2104 |
| Refinement of the strategy | April – July 2014 |  |  |
| Implementation system | July 2014 | Report Step 3 | End July 2014 |
| Draft OP | End August 2014 | Draft Report | Start September 2014 |
| Final official version of the OP to be uploaded to the SFC | December 2015 | Final report with final modifications | 21 January 2015 |
| Modification of the OP following consultations | Send April 2015 | Final Report completed | Send May 2015 |
| Refinement of the OP following feedback from the EC | Send May 2015 | Final report modified | Send June 2015 |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 2 – Evaluation criteria and when these are analysed during the EAE process

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation Criteria | Step 1 | Step 2 | Step 3 | Step 4 | Final Step |
| Programme relevance | 1st analysis | Refinement | Refinement | Completed | Completed |
| The internal coherence of the Programme | 1st analysis | Refinement | Refinement | Completed | Completed |
| The coherence of the programme’s strategy | 1st analysis | Refinement | Refinement | Finalisé Completed | Completed |
| The Programme’s strategic fit with other relevant instruments | 1st analysis | Refinement | Refinement | Finalisé Completed | Completed |
| Intervention logic |  |  | 1st analysis | Refinement | Completed |
| Suitability of planned measures for achieving the horizontal priorities |  | 1st analysis | 1st analysis | Refinement | Completed |
| Partnership |  |  |  | 1st analysis | Completed |
| Suitability of indicators |  |  | 1st analysis | Refinement | Completed |
| Determine baselines, milestones, and target values |  |  |  | 1st analysis | Completed |
| Implementation system |  |  | 1st analysis | 1st analysis | Completed |
| Ex-ante conditionalities |  |  |  | 1st analysis | Completed |
| Evaluation plan (continuous) |  |  |  | 1st analysis | Completed |
| Review of the environmental evaluation and the consultations |  |  |  |  | To be carried out |

# Opinion and recommendations of the ex ante evaluation and strategic environmental assessment

Table 3 – Ex ante opinion and recommendations

| Criteria | Ex ante Opinion | Recommendations |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a) the contribution to the EU strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, having regard to the selected thematic objectives and priorities, taking into account national and regional needs; | ***See section 1***A robust design process that identified relevant needs and challenges.The OP’s strategy is in line with the priorities of regional organisations and the OCTs. The presentation could be more succinct.The justification for choices is very detailed in table 1 on page 28, and also in annex D, which presents needs analysis for the 6 shared development challenges.The contribution to the Union strategy is very detailed in 1.2, in that each priority corresponds to a thematic objective. The justification for the choice of priorities that are specific to the 2 strands is given in the latest version of the OP. In particular, the issue of renewable energy, whose development potential is very strong small Antilles. | A1. The description of the priorities of regional organisations could be presented in annex. A summary table could be retained in the main body of the OP presenting the challenges for regional organisations and for cooperation.A2. The sole challenge selected and which does not feature as a specific objective is transport (challenge n°2). Retain this but explain why Interreg provides only very limited support, and that other programmes provide such support.A3. Explain the 2 strand architecture in the introduction (in 1.2). Then explain in priorities 9 & 10 why they concern, respectively, CBC or TC activities alone. Anticipate the choice in the presentation (1.1) of corresponding challenge (challenges 4 and 5), though the challenge 4 is dual (and could also be decomposed), and corresponds to the axes 5, 6 and 9. |
| b) the internal coherence of the proposed programme or activity and its relation with other relevant instruments; | ***See section 2***Systematic presentation in the guiding principles for the selection of operations, for each specific objective, of the consistency with other relevant programmes and instruments.No use of financial instruments.No major projects.No use of technical assistance for specific objectives.***See section 6***Coordination arrangements between the OP and the EDF and between the OP and other European programmes are detailed. | B1. The recommendation to coordinate and set out links with other European programmes (ERDF, EAFRD) was taken into account in the final version of the OP. |
| c) the consistency of the allocation of budgetary resources with the objectives of the programme; | *See section 1.3 and section 3*The budget is relatively equally distributed between the different priorities, which indicates that there is no particular hierarchy between the objectives.Actual programming under the 2007-13 OP was characterised by a relative lack of projects under priority 1, which corresponds to priorities 1 to 6 of the new OP. | C1. Criteria for prioritising specific objectives that may be more heavily subscribed than others need to be defined, particularly in light of the experience of the previous programme (SOs under priorities 2 & 3), or for SO13 for which high demand can be anticipated, due to the fact that these projects are investment-intensive. |
| d) the consistency of the selected thematic objectives, the priorities and corresponding objectives of the programme with the Common Strategic Framework, the Partnership Contract and the country-specific recommendations under Article 121(2) of the Treaty and the Council recommendations adopted under Article 148(4) of the Treaty; | ***See section 4***Chapter 4.1 indicates that the OR, which are considered to be the most disadvantaged in the EU, will benefit from the OP. In this regard, the OP contributes to reducing the gap between the most developed and most disadvantaged regions in Europe.Chapter 4.4 indicates that all the 2014-2020 Caribbean programme’s priorities contribute to both the EU’s 2020 strategy and the latter’s maritime strategy for the Atlantic.***See section 4***The contribution to horizontal principles are set out. (see points l) & m below). | No recommendation |
| e) the relevance and clarity of the indicators proposed for the programme; | **See section 2**The output and result indicators are clear, their description is precise and detailed.The output indicators are relevant and and have been defined with the referent of the Commission, but they could be developed to improve progress monitoring.of the programme as part of *in itinere* evaluation. | E1. Develop the output indicators: for SO1 and SO2 (number of cooperation actions supported); for SO1-3 and SO2-4 (number of sites supported); for SO7-9 § SO8-10 (number of visitors to sites supported, surface areas covered by supported sites) for SO13 (number of cooperation initiatives supported, production of renewable energy supported), for SO14 (expected energy savings) |
| f) how the expected results will contribute to results; | **See section 2**The area of intervention is CB and TN cooperation, the budget limited, the impact will be mainly effective and measurable in terms of development of cooperation between the outermost regions and the Caribbean area, and with great difficulty in terms of global and economic level | F1. Further develop the output and result indicators in the evaluation plan so as to better capture and understand the contribution made by actions supported to the results obtained for the different specific objectives. |
| g) whether the quantified target values are realistic, having regard to the support from the CSF funds envisaged; | **See section 2**The target values for outputs are realistic in view of the outputs achieved under the previous programme. | G1 : the target objectives need to be specified |
| h) the rationale for the form of support proposed; | ***See section 2***The funding arrangements are not specified. | H1. Specify the procedures for funding actions, including any possible modulation[[1]](#footnote-1) of co-financing rates and rules for prioritising.*Clarify these modalities in the implementation document is planned.* |
| i) the adequacy of human resources and administrative capacity for management of the programme; | ***See section 5***The OP presents arrangements for managing, coordinating and steering the programme. Programme management is ensured by the JTS and a network of local correspondents, representing the programme in in its different community and non-community territories. | I1. Technical assistance funding is not yet set out. The possible funding of local correspondents, which constitute key components in the network-based management system, could be specified.*Clarify these modalities in the implementation document is planned.* |
| j) the suitability of the procedures for monitoring the programme and collecting the data necessary to carry out evaluations; | ***See section 5***Point 5.3.2.3 presents the OP’s management, monitoring and evaluation system.The section has limited development as the (draft) programme model does not incorporate the evaluation plan.It is stated in the description of the result indicators that evaluation surveys are planned.The Managing Authority is in fact to put in place an evaluation plan which will be formally arranged at the outset of the programme. | J1. In regard to the output and especially the result indicators, the programme should specify the approach to data collection to be used in addition to the electronic management and monitoring information system (SYNERGIE CTE).J2. The recommendation regarding the summary presentation of the evaluation plan was taken into account in the final version of the OP. |
| k) the suitability of the milestones selected for the performance framework. | **See section 9.2**An implementation rate of 5% is expected at mid-term for certified expenditure and of 30% for the physical implementation rate. | K1. For the priorities 1, 5 and 6, the implementation rate for certified expenditure could be revised down to just 10%. |
| l) the adequacy of planned measures to promote equal opportunities between men and women and to prevent discrimination; | ***See section 8***The description is clear and precise.Procedures for integrating these principles are planned as part of the project appraisal process.  | L1. The measures proposed to promote these two principles should be set out in the specific objectives (section 2) and addressed in the monitoring system (section 5). It would be judicious to specify that these measures will only be implemented if the activity concerned is affected by the principles. In particular, the possibility to systemize a preliminary diagnosis can be questioned.***Taken into account in the OP***L2. The principle of promoting tangible actions to support the achievement of these priorities cannot apply to all SO. For the SO concerned it should be possible to apply modulation of co-financing rates or design criteria for prioritising the actions funded.***Taken into account in the OP*** |
| m) the adequacy of planned measures to promote sustainable development; | ***See section 8***As indicated in section 8, the programme promotes sustainable development either directly (SO 3, 4 and 7), or indirectly to the extent that the envisaged activities must demonstrate that they do not have a negative impact. | M1. The incorporation in the SO of recommendations made by the SEA will improve precision and better ensure the promotion of sustainable development by the OP. This should include the modulation of co-financing rates or the application of criteria designed to establish prioritising the actions funded. |
| n) the planned measures to reduce the administrative burden on beneficiaries | ***See section 7***The description is clear and precise.In addition to digital exchange, the use of flat rates for costs offers an attractive avenue for reducing the administrative burden for projects and beneficiaries. But this option is however difficult to implement given the diversity of currencies and economic differentials, and thereby costs, in the different territories. | N1. Requirements related to the introduction of, on the one hand, a digital exchange system for the monitoring and evaluation of the programme, and on the other, by the incorporation of horizontal principles, will make the task of preparing an application for funding, and progress reporting, more complex for projects. Contrary to the application of administrative simplification.The evaluator recommends anticipate upstream information for training, monitoring and evaluation for not burd the management while ensuring the collection of useful information. |

# Analysis by criteria

*The evaluation criteria set out in the evaluation objectives (chapter 2.1) are reiterated at the start of each analytical theme (below).*

## Relevance analysis

### The participative design of the programme

##### Refer to section 1 of the programme and to annex D.

*Evaluation criteria: for the chapters 4.1.1 to 4.14*

*a) the contribution to the Union strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth having regard to the selected thematic objectives and priorities, taking into account national and regional needs;*

The concertation undertaken is the direct fruit of that constructed during the previous programme with the now longstanding participation of the Caribbean’s 3 international organisations (ACS, OECS and CARICOM/CARIFORUM), which represent the majority of third countries in the cooperation area.

In regard to the French territories, the mobilisation of all partners and stakeholders in each of the territories around the task of preparing the 2014-2020 programme enabled the production of strategic territorial needs analyses. These laid the foundation for the analysis of the challenge of integrating the American French territories into their regional environment.

The commissioning an external service provider to draft the programme, has enabled the Managing Authority of the Caribbean OP to identify – over and above what could be identified in documentation – the different partners’ expectations and specific priorities.

##### The need for a shared cooperation policy

The programme development process enabled partners to produce a needs analysis and to identify relevant challenges that are in line with Europe 2020 objectives. But it does not stem from a pre-determined joint analysis between the French stakeholders to put in place a common cooperation policy between the 4 French territories. In fact, Interreg has become the instrument that provides the basis for transnational cooperation policy for the Caribbean region, and (the basis) for cross-border cooperation policy for Martinique and Guadeloupe, with Saint-Martin and French Guiana having their own cross-border programme. The development process for the Caribbean programme has, as a result, been a particularly sensitive process.

Though the challenges facing transnational and cross-border challenges appear identical, it was nonetheless necessary to deal with the need to concentrate action on a limited number of investment priorities. It was finally decided that four strands would share all thematic objectives (TO) with the exception of:

* TO 10 (strengthening human capital) which concerns only the TC strand;
* TO 4 (supporting a shift towards a low-carbon economy) which concerns only the CBC strand.

**The joint task for stakeholders is to:**

* **Work together in order to identify the choice of development challenges that the OP needs to address.**
* **Determine what the programme is, given its resources, able achieve through cooperation**
* **Ensure that the strategies of regional organisations and of the EDF are taken into account in order to enhance complementarity**

### Appraisal of the socio-economic analysis and needs identified

The character limits imposed the ERDF template means that some information, that would have been useful to readers, could not be included in the main sections but has been included in annexes. In particular annex D is very instructive. Here, the reader can find the justification for the strategic choices that are consistent with the socio-economic analysis and the programme documents of (i) other French overseas territories (regional ERDF programmes, RIS, S3, regional economic development plans) and (ii) the Caribbean’s international organisations (ACS, OECS, Caricom-Cariforum). The added value of transnational and cross-border cooperation for each of the ERDF’s 11 thematic objectives is also analysed.

The presentation of the needs analysis begins by setting out the seven challenges on which the strategy is based (*section 1.1*).

Information from the needs analysis is presented in support of each of these challenges.

However, the reader can only fully comprehend the relationship between the general needs analysis, the choice of the seven challenges and the priority themes selected, by referring to the annexes.

Further detail to the needs analyses for the Caribbean’s seven shared challenges is presented in annex C.

The reader will find annex D particularly instructive. It sets out the conclusions of the needs analysis that justify the selections made for the Caribbean OP from among the ERDF’s 11 thematic objectives.

Annex E includes the rational for policy action and sets out the link between the challenges and thematic objectives is set out.

**The strategy is structured so as to correspond to the ERDF’s strategic guidelines: *(see table 2 in section 1)***

*(\*) excluding technical assistance priority*

SO1 (CB) and SO3 (TN): Support the economic diversification of the territories through knowledge transfer and the commercialisation of innovative products

**Specific Objectives**

**Priority 3 (CB) and 4 (TN): Strengthen the response capacity to natural risks (TO5)**

**Priorities / TO**

SO5 (CB) SO6 (TN): Increase territories capacity to manage/respond to natural risks/disasters

 SO7 5CB) SO9 (TN):Better protect and capitalise on the Caribbean’s natural heritage through joint strategies and policy instruments

SO11 (CB) SO12 (TN): Increase territories’ response capacities in relation to emerging diseases and health risks

**Priority 5 (CB) and 6 (TN) - Protect and exploit the Caribbean’s natural and cultural assets (TO6)**

**Priority 7 (CB) and 8 (TN) : Develop a concerted Caribbean response to shared public health issues (TO9)**

**Priority 1 (CB) and 2 (TN) : Enhance in a sustainable and inclusive manner the competitiveness of Caribbean business and unlock its potential to create wealth and employment (TO3)**

 SO15: Improve foreign language skills and foster their use in the Caribbean

SO2 – (CB) SO4 (TN): Create an environment conducive to increasing the volume of trade between the Caribbean territories

 SO8 (CB) SO10 (TN): Increase the touristic appeal of the territory through the joint marketing of its natural and cultural heritage

 SO16: Increase mobility for professionals and students in the Caribbean

**Priority 9 (CB): Support the development of renewable energies in the Eastern Caribbean
(TO4)**

**Priority 10 (TN):
Strengthen human capital (TO10)**

 SO14: Reduce energy consumption in public buildings in the eastern Caribbean area

 SO13: Increase the share of renewable energies in the electricity mix with a view to a greater energy independence in the territories of the eastern Caribbean

**The needs analysis considers only the challenges that have been selected (priorities) with the exception of challenge n°2 (*Developing transport networks (maritime and air) and reducing the isolation of the territories to improve their accessibility*), which is presented but not selected. As a result, it is difficult to know from the text if there are any important challenges that may have been left out.**

**Consideration of the economic, social and environmental SWOT is implicit:**

Material from the needs analysis is presented with each of the 6 selected challenges (in section 1, page 9 and subsequent pages, and in annex C)

Further material from the needs analysis is presented in the sections covering investment priorities (section1) and specific objectives (actions) (section 2)

Four thematic objectives (TO) concern the both strands, cross border (CB) and transnational (TN), therefore corresponding to two different programme priorities. Two TO only concern each of them one component and therefore only one priority (priority9 / TO4 strand CB only and priority 10/TO10 only on strand TN).

By integrating the priorities corresponding to technical assistance (priority 11 for CB and priority 12 for TN, the programme has 12 priorities.

Specific Objectives (SO) of a split priority because opened in both TF and TN strands are also split. These are the SO1 to 12 priorities 1-8, corresponding to TO3, TO6 and TO9.

The SO corresponding to priorities 9 and 10 not split, aren’t split (SO13 and SO14 for priority 9 (TO14), and SO12 for priority8).

The SO split, with similar content, assigned to different strands, will be analysed together. The 16 OS consist of 6 SO split (6 time 2SO, ie 12 SO) and of 4 SO not split.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Priority 1 (CB) et 2 (TN) | SO1 (TF) -3 (TN)SO2 (TF) -4 (TN) | SO1-3SO2-4 |
| Priority 3 (CB) et 4 (TN) | SO5 (TF) - 6 (TN) | SO5-6 |
| Priority 5 (CB) et 6 (TN) | SO7 (TF) -9 (TN)SO8 (TF) - 10 (TN) | SO7-9SO8-10 |
| Priority 7 (CB) et 8 (TN) | SO11(TF) -12 (TN) | SO11-12 |
| Priority 9 (CB) | SO13 (TF)SO14 (TF) | SO13SO14 |
| Priority 10 (TN) | SO15 (TN)SO16 (TN) | SO15SO16 |

### Evaluation of the relevance of the OP’s strategy with respect to European objectives

As the OP is based on a selection of thematic objectives set out by the ERDF, the OP’s strategy is in line with European goals.

**The SWOT analysis for the cooperation area in relation to the EU 2020’s 3 overall objectives: smart, sustainable and inclusive growth (in annex to the OP). The SWOT analysis confirms that the strategy is in line with Europe 2020.**

**The analysis of the 11 thematic objectives (TO) (**in annex D to the OP**), is the only place where the needs analysis is presented in a comprehensive way for each TO.**

For each Thematic Objective:

Key points covered:

* Consistency with other ERDF programmes and S3 strategies
* Consistency with the priorities/challenges facing the Caribbean’s international organisations

Good analysis of the added value of cooperation; provides a clear analysis of the rationale for cooperation action.

Presents the key messages stemming from the interviews

Analysis of the 2007-2013 programme, extremely instructive

Opinion on the relevance of the selection of the TO

**The challenges presented in the programme are challenges 1 to 6, including challenge n°2, which is not selected:**

**Challenge n°1: Creating wealth and employment by diversifying the Caribbean economies and increasing their competitiveness:**

***TO 1) strengthening research, technological development and innovation;***

***TO 3) enhancing the competitiveness of SMEs, in the agricultural sector (under EAFRD) as well as in the aquaculture and fisheries industries (under FEAMP);***

The presentation focuses on the development of new agricultural and agri-food business as part of a diversification drive, although there is in this regard no mention that the local and regional markets do themselves constitute a good opportunity for such diversification.

The challenge of promoting innovation as a means of enhancing competitiveness is explicitly articulated. Moreover, challenge n°1 also contributes to achieving the innovation goal of thematic objective 1.

**Challenge n°2: Developing transport networks (maritime and air) and improving the accessibility of certain territories to reduce their isolation**

*This challenge relates to TO7 (promoting sustainable transport and removing bottlenecks in key network infrastructures) which was not retained in the strategy.*

The challenge is clearly presented as a key enabler for developing a Caribbean-wide trade zone, and essential in particular for numerous island territories. **However, the programme contains no response as its budget is insufficient to effectively support cooperation actions requiring significant investment.**

**Challenge n°3: Strengthening disaster risk management and prevention capacities**

***TO 5) promoting climate change adaptation, risk prevention and management***

The acute vulnerability of the Caribbean region is rightly highlighted, and this risk is common to all the territories in the area. It is also a common priority.

Cooperation can be useful in order to pool information, monitoring/surveillance, research and lessons learnt.

**Challenge n°4: Protecting the environment and implementing the energy transition**

This challenge is divided into two specific strands.

***TO 6) protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency***

Protecting the environment and the sustainable management of resources are also highlighted, with protecting the rich yet fragile environment entailing many challenges, not least dealing with the effects of industrial and urban pollution.

The Caribbean’s very high dependence on oil while there is significant potential to develop renewable energies is also evoked.

*Observation: Challenge n° 4 should integrate the goal of exploiting cultural heritage, which is developed in Priority 3, TO 6 and IP6C*

***TO4) Supporting a shift towards a low-carbon economy in all sectors***

This dimension of Challenge n°4 relates to the need for the Caribbean islands, which are heavily reliant on oil, to develop the production of renewable energies by exploiting the rich and diverse natural sources available, as well as to reduce the use of fossil fuel.

In the programme, this thematic objective is retained only for the CBC strand. *Observation: the presentation in the OP could have a more explicit focus on the cross-border zone.*

**Challenge n°5: Strengthening human capital**

***TO 10) investing in education, skills and lifelong learning;***

This challenge is addressed only partially, highlighting only student and teaching staff mobility needs rather than the poor foreign language skills in the French territories or the poor grasp of French in non-francophone third countries, despite the fact the programme has a specific objective for this topic.

Moreover, this objective (and corresponding TO 10) concerns only the transnational strand.

*Observation: in the text detailing the challenge there could be a more explicit focus on the transnational area of the Caribbean region.*

**Challenge n°6: Social inclusion, reducing poverty and improving living conditions**

***TO 9) promoting social inclusion and tackling poverty;***

The social and economic disparities between the countries of the Caribbean are the cause of serious tensions especially in the French territories which are among the most attractive.

The challenges facing cooperation are certainly numerous. The presentation does not evoke the possibility of cooperation in the field of public health.

**The priority areas selected are a reflection of the aspirations of the Interreg programmes for cooperation:**

* **to innovate, connect & structure, to invest,**
* **to comply with the ERDF’s goal of supporting fewer objectives,**
* **to be in line with the objectives of Europe 2020**
* **tp operate within a limited budget**
* **to build on the experience gained by previous programmes.**

### Relevance of the SWOT analysis

The SWOT analysis is presented in annex C, and is structured around Europe 2020’s three priorities: smart, sustainable, and inclusive growth.

As it is currently presented, it does not clearly describe the relationship between the needs analysis and the selection of thematic objectives and investment priorities that make up the OP’s strategy.

The presentation around three criteria can be retained as it has the merit of highlighting the thematic objectives and the 7 strategic challenges:

* Smart growth: TO 1, 3 & 7 – Challenges 1 & 2
* Sustainable growth: TO 4, 5 & 6 – Challenges 3 & 4
* Inclusive growht: TO 9 & 10 – Challenges 5 & 6

So as to clarify the summary of the needs analysis and strategic choices, the SWOT could be included in the report at the end of section 1.1., keeping only the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats relating to the thematic objectives selected as specific regional needs. This option was not retained by the OP’s drafting team in accordance with the SFC encoding requirements.

### Relevance of the specific regional needs identified

##### Refer to sections 1 & 2 of the programme

*Evaluation criteria*

*d) the consistency of the selected thematic objectives, the priorities and corresponding objectives of the programmes with the Common Strategic Framework, the Partnership Agreement*

The region’s specific needs are not formulated precisely. They relate, *de facto*, to the selected investment priorities.

Section 1.2 presents the justification for the selection of thematic objectives and related investment priorities, and table 1 presents a summary overview of this information.

The number of investment priorities has been reduced to 7.

*This is in line with the new regulatory requirement to concentrate resources.*

IP3D – Developing and implementing new business models for SMEs, in particular to help them internationalise their activities

IP4A – Promoting the production and distribution of renewable energy

IP4C – Supporting energy efficiency and renewable energy use in public infrastructures, including public buildings and in the housing sector

IP5B – Promoting investment to address specific risks, ensuring disaster resilience and developing disaster management systems

IP6C – Protecting, promoting and developing cultural and natural heritage

IP9A – Investing in health and social infrastructure, thereby contributing to national, regional and local development, reducing inequalities in terms of health status

IP10A – Investing in education, skills and lifelong learning by developing education and training infrastructure

Table 4 - Linkage challenges-priorities, set out in the presentation of the priorities (p.20 and following pages)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Challenge** | **Priority** | **Thematic Objective** | **Investment Priority** |
| Challenge 1 - Creating wealth and jobs by diversifying the Caribbean economies and increasing their competitiveness  | Priority 1 – (CB) Priority 2 (TN) Enhance inclusively and sustainably the competitiveness of Caribbean business and unlock its potential to create wealth and employment | (TO3) Enhancing the competitiveness of SMEs | IP3D – Developing and implementing new business models for SMEs, in particular to help them internationalise their activities |
| Challenge 2 - Developing transport networks (both on the sea and in the air) and improving the accessibility of certain territories to reduce their isolation : *not selected**However, SO2-4, relating to Challenge 1, may support cooperation actions aiming to coordinate and regulate transport services between the territories in the region.* |
| Challenge 3 - Strengthening disaster risk management and prevention capacities  | Priority 3 (CB) Priority 4 (TN) – Strengthen the response capacity to natural risks  | TO5 - Promoting climate change adaptation, risk prevention and management | IP5B – promoting investment to address specific risks, ensuring disaster resilience and developing disastermanagement systems |
| Challenge 4 - Protecting the environment, capitalising on cultural and natural heritage and implementing the energy transition | Priority 5 (CB) Priority 6 (TN) – Protect and exploit the Caribbean’s natural and cultural assets | TO6 – Protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency | IP6C – protecting, promoting and developing cultural and natural heritage |
| Priority 9 (CB) – Support the development of renewable energies in the Eastern Caribbean  | TO4 - Supporting the shift towards a low-carbon economy in all sectors | IP14a – promoting the production and distribution of renewable energy sources |
| IP14c – supporting energy efficiency and renewable energy use in public infrastructures, including public buildings and in the housing sector |
| Challenge 5 - Strengthening Human Capital  | Priority 610 (TN) – Foster closer ties between the peoples of the Caribbean (CBC) | TO10 - Investing in education, skills and lifelong learning | IP10A – Investing in education, skills and lifelong learning by developing education and training infrastructure |
| Challenge 6 –Social inclusion, health and improving living conditions  | Priority 7 (CB) Priority 8 (TN) – Develop a concerted Caribbean response to shared public health issues | TO9 Promoting social inclusion and tackling poverty  | IP9A – investing in health and social infrastructure, thereby contributing to national, regional and local development, reducing inequalities in terms of health status |

### Evaluation of the coherence of the strategy

**The core of the OP’s strategy is made up of 4 priorities, which relate to 4 Thematic Objectives and 4 Investment Priorities, all delivered through both transnational and cross-border cooperation:**

Challenge 1 – Priorities 1 (CB) and 2 (TN) – TO 3 – Pl3d

Challenge 3 – Priorities 3 (CB) and 3 (TN) – TO5 – Pl5b

Challenge 4 - Priorities 5 (CB) and 6 (TN) – OT6 – Pl6c

Challenge 6 – Priorities 7 (CB) and 8 (TN) – TO9 – Pl9a

**In order to respect the concentration principle but also in order to provide a coherent policy response to the specific needs of the cross-border cooperation area, Priority 5 is devoted to cross-border cooperation and Priority 6 to transnational cooperation.**

**Cross-border cooperation focuses on the following intervention:**

Challenge 4, Priority 5, TO4, IP4A and IP4C

Renewable energy is a key challenge/opportunity for the Lesser Antilles (p22)

Limited land available in Guadeloupe, Martinique and OECS countries

**Transnational cooperation focuses on the following intervention:**

Challenge 5, Priority 6, TO10, IP10A

Key challenge, and key to the development of cooperation in the wider Caribbean region (p22)

*Evaluator’s remarks:*

*No mention is made in the needs analysis of a geographic (territorial) limitation applying either to the energy challenge (Priority 5) or to the human capital challenge (Priority 6). Strategic choices had nonetheless to be made in order to respect the concentration principle in the two strands.*

*It was decided that the cooperation programme could most effectively address the energy challenge through the CBC strand because the potential of renewable energies in the Lesser Antilles is considerable (wind, solar, tidal and geothermal). Similarly the Lesser Antilles share the need to reduce their dependence on fossils fuels. In addition, cooperation in this area has already been initiated with support from Interreg (e.g. The ‘Géothermie’ project in the 2007-2013 programme). For these reasons the partners in the CBC strand desired the selection of TO4 on renewable energies in order to pursue cooperation in this area, in view, moreover, of the long-term prospects offered by renewable energies.*

*On the other hand, as the human capital challenge (especially in regard to education & training) is both acute and shared across the entire cooperation area, the TC strand was selected for TO10 (which in any case includes the programme’s CBC strand).*

## The Programme’s internal coherence

##### Refer to sections 1 and 2 of the programme

*Evaluation criteria*

*c) the consistency of the allocation of budgetary resources with the objectives of the programme;*

Table 6 – Breakdown of the cooperation programme’s budget according to the strands and investment priorities and corresponding strategic challenges

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Challenge | Thematic Objective | Investment Priority | BudgetERDFCB | BudgetERDFTN |
| Challenge 1 - Creating wealth and jobs by diversifying the Caribbean economies and increasing their competitiveness | (TO3) Enhancing the competitiveness of SMEs | IP3D – Developing and implementing new business models for SMEs, in particular to help them internationalise their activities  | 7.453 M€18.1% | 4.362 M€18.8% |
| Challenge 3 - Strengthening disaster risk management and prevention capacities | TO5 - Promoting climate change adaptation, risk prevention and management | IP5B – promoting investment to address specific risks, ensuring disaster resilience and developing disastermanagement systems | 8.631 M€21.0% | 5.452 M€23.5% |
| Challenge 4 - Protecting the environment, capitalising on cultural and natural heritage and implementing the energy transition | TO6 – Protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency | IP6C – protecting, promoting and developing cultural and natural heritage | 9.042 M€22.0% | 5.452 M€23.5% |
| TO4 - Supporting the shift towards a low-carbon economy in all sectorsCROSSBORDER (CBC) | IP4A – promoting the production and distribution of renewable energy sources | 7.795 M€19.0% | - |
| IP4C – supporting energy efficiency and renewable energy use in public infrastructures, including public buildings and in the housing sector |
| Challenge 5 - Strengthening Human Capital   | TO10 - Investing in education, skills and lifelong learning TRANSATIONAL | IP10A – Investing in education, skills and lifelong learning by developing education and training infrastructure | - | 3.271 M€14.1% |
| Challenge 6 – Social inclusion, health and improving living conditions | TO9 Promoting social inclusion and tackling poverty | IP9A – investing in health and social infrastructure, thereby contributing to national, regional and local development, reducing inequalities in terms of health status | 5.795 M€14.1% | 3.271 M€14.1% |

Technical assistance is allocated 5.9% of the budget for each strand, amounting to 3.77 M€ of the overall OP budget.

The overall consistency of the programme’s distribution between the cross-border and transnational strands is in the equivalence of the shares of the budgets of each strand committed to the different challenges.

The distribution between the challenges is very similar, with a greatest focus on the first 3 challenges, and in particular on challenge 4, the most ‘environmental’ challenge, which is allocated 32% of the overall budget, including the two strands (CBC and TC).

The distribution of ERDF funding to the three dimensions of sustainable development is as follows:

Economic Dimension Challenge 1 TO3 23%

Environmental Dimension Challenge 3 & 4 TO4, 5 & 6 57%

Social Dimension Challenge 5 & 6 TO9, 10 20%

The environmental dimension has the largest allocation.

The challenges that the envisaged cooperation actions address fall principally under the environmental dimension of sustainable development. The actions planned under thematic objective 6 also have an economic goal of developing sustainable tourism.

The support to cooperation actions planned for economic development (priority 1) is not direct aid for economic (business) activity, which would have needed much more significant levels of funding. The intervention logic is based on more indirect support, requiring more modest levels of funding, with actions principally under the category of R&D, which does not require significant investments.

Although the social challenges facing the Caribbean are significant, the programme’s planned action in this area are limited to health and education/training. The theme and the challenges are vast yet the resources are limited and the choice of needs to address was limited to the types of action/cooperation that had worked well during the previous programming period, and where the leverage potential of the programme was considered to be very high, which is the case in particular of language education and student mobility. Health is also considered to be an important area since, through their integration in European health systems, the European OR, particularly of France, have a major role to play in the health system of the Caribbean region, which is evident in the cooperation actions already undertaken with Interreg support.

## The consistency of the strategy with other relevant instruments

##### Refer to sections 1 and 6 of the programme

*Evaluation criteria*

*b)* the internal coherence of the proposed programme or activity and its relationwith other relevant instruments*;*

**The Interreg programme has been ‘linked’ with the other relevant programmes as follows:**

* **EDF**
* **ERDF-ESF (p87)**
* **EAFRD**
* **The French Guiana and Saint-Martin cross-border programmes**
* **POSEI**
* **Regional policies in the area of trade in the Caribbean area**

The text presenting the specific objectives (section 2) states in the selection of operations the programme will prioritise complementary between the strategies of the French overseas territories (ERDF, ESF, SRDEII, S3) and those of their regional partner organisations (Wider Caribbean RIP, EDF), OCTs, and other member states in regional organisations.

In particular SO2-4 will prioritise themes from the S3 strategies of the European territories of the programme (the S3 of Guadeloupe, Martinique, French Guiana and Saint-Martin). These themes are also being pursued by these territories’ ERDF and EAFRD programmes.

The relationship/complementarity between operations under SO5-6 and SO7-9 on the preservation and exploitation of natural and cultural heritage with the EARFD and similarly between operations under SO14 and SO15 on language training and student mobility with the ESF could usefully be clarified.

Section 4 addresses the integrated approach to territorial development. But the text does not set out the linkage between the Caribbean programme and the EU’s strategy for the Atlantic Area.

Section 6 addresses the issue of inter-programme coordination. The text announces the creation of a technical liaison body for regional cooperation, the **Caribbean/Amazon ERDF/EDF Technical Committee** which will meet in order to study opportunities to co-finance projects (for the Caribbean ETD programme with the EDF/ERDF, but also with the OP ETC programmes for Saint-Martin/Sint Maarten and Amazon/Guiana Shield). The arrangements and procedures for coordination with other programmes implemented in each EU territory are not however specified.

It is important to point out that the goal of developing economic activity and trade in the Caribbean needs to balance against a set of potentially conflicting objectives stemming from competition between countries having significantly different costs and regulatory contexts. Every local authority must keep in review; to the extent that their policy mandates require/allow, the consistency between the cooperation policy driven by the Caribbean ETC programme, and their other policies on, in particular:

* Import controls (standards, taxes and in particular the management of dock dues by the OR);
* The promotion of exports (import/export support under the Specific Supply Arrangements financed by POSEI);
* Local or ‘place-based’ (endogenous) development (aid for local production versus aid for export support);
* The issue of migration flows;
* The health care system (access to which is limited for foreigners);
* General and vocational education provision (in particular, support for student and professional mobility, which essentially relates to Europe and mainland France).

## Appraisal of the programme’s intervention logic

##### Refer to sections 1 & 2 of the programme

*Evaluation criteria*

*f) how the expected outputs will contribute to results;*

Tables 1 and 2 help the reader to understand:

* The justification for the selection of the investment priorities
* The investment strategy (summary overview)

A detailed description of the intervention logic for each specific objective is set out in section 2 of the OP.

| Investment Priority | Specific Objective | Expected Results | Challenge |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IP3D – Developing and implementing new business models for SMEs, in particular to help them internationalise their activities | SO1-3 : Support the economic diversification of the territories through knowledge transfer and the commercialisation of innovative products | Innovation projects (excluding scientific cooperation), pooling of equipment, networking. | Challenge 1 - Creating wealth and jobs by diversifying the Caribbean economies and increasing their competitiveness |
| SO2-4 – Create an environment conducive to increasing the volume of trade between the Caribbean territories | Actions to develop entrepreneurship among young peopleDevelopment of business & economic development stakeholder networksTraining for business leaders, company directorsHarmonisation of technical standards and company lawRegulation of maritime and air transport |
| IP5B – promoting investment to address specific risks, ensuring disaster resilience and developing disaster | SO5-6 – Increase territories capacity to manage/respond to natural risks/disasters | Improved understanding about the impacts of natural risksIntroduction of joint risk management systems | Challenge 3 - Strengthening disaster risk management and prevention capacities  |
| IP6C – protecting, promoting and developing cultural and natural heritage | SO7-9 – Better protect and capitalise on the Caribbean’s natural and cultural heritage through joint strategies and policy instruments | Improved knowledge about the environmentDesign of joint strategies to protect the environmentJoint instruments to protect biodiversityInitiatives in the carbon trading markets | Challenge 4 - Protecting the environment,and implementing the energy transition |
| SO8-10 – Increase the touristic appeal of the territory through the joint marketing of its natural and cultural heritage | Development of joint sustainable tourism productsAction to enhance/market the Caribbean’s natural and cultural heritageDevelopment of multi-destination tourism | Challenge 4 - Protecting the environment,and implementing the energy transition |
| IP4A – promoting the production and distribution of renewable energy sources*(CBC)* | SO13 – increase the share of renewable energies in the electricity mix with a view to a greater energy independence in the territories of the eastern Caribbean | R&D, experimentation, training and exchange of experience.Prospection and exploration for new energy sourcesStudies on the inter-connection between energy gridsStandardisation of norms and governance |
| IP4C – supporting energy efficiency and renewable energy use*(CBC)* | SO14 – Reduce energy consumption in public buildings in the eastern Caribbean area | R&D, experimentation, training, networking, exchange of experience | Challenge 4 - Protecting the environment, and implementing the energy transition |
| IP10A – Investing in education, skills and lifelong learning by developing education and training infrastructure*(TNC)* | SO15- Improve foreign language skills and foster their use in the Caribbean | Language training in general and professional educationStaff (teacher) exchangesCooperation with the ‘*Alliances françaises*’, in particular regarding joint qualifications | Challenge 5 - Strengthening Human Capital  |
| SO16 – Increase mobility for professionals and students in the Caribbean | Improve mobility for students and professionals in the Caribbean |
|  IP9A – investing in health and social infrastructure, thereby contributing to national, regional and local development, reducing inequalities in terms of health status | SO11-12 – Increase territories’ response capacities in relation to emerging diseases and health risks | Research projects on significant diseasesSurveillance and vigilance for epidemics affecting people and animalsJoint management plans for health crisesCooperation actions in the field of health | Challenge 6 –Social inclusion, health and improving living conditions  |

**The ‘intervention logic’ or rationale for intervention and the expected results are clearly described in section 2 in the presentation of specific objectives.**

**The examination of the selected strategic objectives and challenges (see table), indicates a robust alignment between strategy and actions.**

**It is important to bear in mind that the amount of funding available constrains the scope of intervention. The impact of programme actions in the areas of the selected investment priorities will therefore be limited.**

**Since policy intervention is through cross-border and transnational cooperation, its impact will moreover principally be measurable in terms of the development of cooperation between the OR and the surrounding Caribbean region; its impact in a generally sense and in terms of the economy would be very difficult to quantify.**

In addition, as noted in Chapter 4.6 (below), the output indicators will allow the programme to monitor the development of cooperation in all the programme’s areas of intervention, although it will not be possible to link the outputs with the expected results. The contribution of cooperation actions to the results will too often be indirect or marginal for it to be possible to measure the wider impact on the scale of the individual territories concerned.

## Suitability of the measures proposed to support the horizontal priorities

##### Refer to section 8 of the programme

*Evaluation criteria*

*l) the adequacy of planned measures to promote equality of opportunity between men and women and to prevent discrimination;*

*m) the adequacy of planned measures to promote sustainable development;*

*n) the planned measures for reducing the administrative burden*

Section 8 sets out how OP will make a contribution to certain of the EU’s cross-cutting priorities, known as ‘horizontal principles’:

* Sustainable development
* Equal opportunities and non-discrimination
* Gender equality

Sustainable development is a strategic challenge that is addressed by 7 to 10 of the programme: priorities1-2 (Increase the Caribbean economies competitiveness inclusively and sustainably) 3-4 (Strengthen the capacity to respond to natural risks), 5-6 (Protect and capitalise on the Caribbean’s natural and cultural environments) and 9 (Support the development of renewable energies in the eastern Caribbean). It is directly tackled through SO1-3 (innovative products), SO5-6 (natural risks), SO7-9 (natural heritage), SO13 (renewable energies) and SO14 (energy efficiency).

The ex-ante evaluation notes that if the social dimension of sustainable development is included in the analysis, not only the strict environmental dimension, then it could be argued that all the programme’s priorities promote sustainable development.

In addition, in order to avoid adverse environmental impacts, projects seeking co-financing will be required to demonstrate that they will not have any such adverse impact. Projects will also be required to undertake an assessment of the existing (baseline) situation as well as to set out indicators for sustainable development.

The principle of equality of opportunity is addressed through SO5-6 (natural risks), SO11-12 (health risks) and SO15 (language practice).

The principle of gender equality is addressed through SO15 (language practice).

Potential project leaders will also be required to incorporate the principles of equality of opportunity, non-discrimination and gender equality, to undertake an assessment of the existing (baseline) situation as well as to set out indicators for the themes in question.

Some of Europe 2020’s other horizontal priorities are operationalised in a concrete way in the OP:

* Protecting the environment
* Efficient use of resources
* Climate change adaptation and mitigation
* Risk prevention and management.

These are in practice covered by the programme’s response to the challenge of sustainable development, which encompasses them.

## Indicators and targets

##### Refer to section 2 of the programme

*Evaluation criteria*

*e) the relevance and clarity of the programme’s proposed indicators;*

*f) how the expected outputs will contribute to the results;*

*g) whether the quantified target values are realistic, having regard to the support from the CSF Funds envisaged;*

### Reminder of the indicator system proposed by the EC

In the Regulations for the 2014-2020 programming period, the EC places emphasis on the rational for policy intervention and on the importance of the selection of result and output indicators to ensure a robust measurement and monitoring of impacts on the ground. The following diagram, published by the EC, describes the intervention logic of an operational programme[[2]](#footnote-2):



For each priority (excluding technical assistance) the Regulation (EU) 1299/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013, specifies:

* For each specific objective: the corresponding result indicators, with a baseline value and a target value, where appropriate, quantified;
* For each investment priority: the common and specific output indicators (including a quantified target value), which should contribute to the results.

The OP deploys result indicators for each specific objective.

It also deploys output indicators for each investment priority.

Article 16 of the abovementioned Regulation specifies in relation to output indicators that the baseline values (2014 values) shall be set at zero, whereas for programme-specific result indicators, baselines shall use the latest available data and targets shall be set for 2023. Target values may be expressed in quantitative or qualitative terms.

### Output Indicators

Table 8 – Output Indicators for each specific objective

| Investment Priorities | Output Indicators for the OS | Target Objective 2023 CB | Target Objective 2023 TN |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IP3D – developing and implementing new business models for SMEs, in particular to help them internationalise their activities | Total public expenditure through IP3D (in M€) | 7.45 | 4.36 |
| Number of cooperation actions (1) |  |  |
| Number of enterprises receiving a grant (direct aid)  | 7 | 4 |
| Number of enterprises receiving non-grant aid (indirect aid) | 242 | 112 |
| Number of active persons benefitting from support (training) (2) |  |  |
| IP5B – promoting investment to address specific risks, ensuring disaster resilience and developing disaster | Total public expenditure through IP5B (in M€) | 8.63 | 5.45 |
| Number of persons having participated in risk awareness actions | 923 | 583 |
| Number of observation, management and response systems for natural risks put in place | 12 | 7 |
| IP6C – protecting, promoting and developing cultural and natural heritage | Total public expenditure through IP6C (in M€) | 9.04 | 5.45 |
| Nombre d'aires d'écosystèmes forestiers, agricoles et d'aquaculture bénéficiant de mesures de gestion commune et de conservation | 14 | 8 |
| Number of sites supported (3) |  |  |
| Area covered by supported sites (4) |  |  |
| Nombre de dispositifs de suivi et d'évaluation du développement du tourisme durable | 26 | 16 |
| Number of supported tourist sites benefiting from a quality label (5) |  |  |
| Number of sites supported (6) |  |  |
| Increase in expected number of visits to supported recognised heritage sites | +5% | +5% |
| IP9A - investing in health and social infrastructure, thereby contributing to national, regional and local development, reducing inequalities in terms of health status | Total public expenditure through IP9A (in M€) | 5.80 | 3.27 |
| Number of persons benefitting from implemented health projects | 404 | 228 |
| Number of schemes put in place to address public health challenges | 6 | 3 |
| IP4A – promoting the production and distribution of renewable energy sources PI | Total public expenditure through IP4A (in M€) | 5.45 |  |
| Amount of investment in the production of renewable energy | (5.45 M€) |  |
| Number of cooperation initiatives supported (7) |  |  |
| Production of renewable energy supported (8) |  |  |
| IP4C – supporting energy efficiency and renewable energy use in public infrastructures, including public buildings and in the housing sector | Total public expenditure through IP4c (in M€) | 2.33 |  |
| Level of investment made in energy efficiency for public buildings | (2.33 M€) |  |
| Energy savings expected as a result of the investment (9) |  |  |
| IP10A –investing in education, skills and lifelong learning by developing education and training infrastructure | Total public expenditure through IP10A (in M€) |  | 3.27 |
| Number of persons benefitting from supported language projects |  | 3077 |
| Number of persons benefitting from supported mobility projects |  | 457 |
| TA - Ensure the optimal delivery of the programme and its projects | Total public expenditure (in M€) | 2.41 | 1.35 |
| Number of information meetings for project leaders | 2 | 1 |
| Number of training sessions for project leaders (selected projects) | 6 | 3 |
| Nombre d'équivalent temps plein affecté à la gestion du programme | 6 | 3 |
| Number of training sessions for JTS & EU RCP staff | 14 | 9 |

The cells in blue are ‘not applicable’.

**The present EAE proposes additional indicators with a view to obtain information that is necessary for the monitoring and evaluation of the programme:**

(1) This indicator allows the measurement of the contribution of the actions supported to the expected result of SO1-3 which is the number of cooperation initiatives whether or not supported by the programme. This output indicator allows the measurement of the impact of actions supported under SO1-3.

(2) This indicator can measure the effort undertaken to ‘roll out’ innovations and enhance workforce skills.

(3)(4) For SO7-9 & SO8-10, operations concern one or several sites that need to be counted. For each operation project leaders could be asked to count visitors in such a way as to determine if their numbers increase as a result of the promotional actions supported. A given site (that is supported under SO7-9/SO8-10) should only be required to undertake the measurement of visitor numbers once.

 (4) The programme’s proposed output indicator is the increase in the expected number of visitors, which is the common indicator set down in the Regulation. This is set on a provisional basis by the project leaders of supported projects. The in itinere and ex-post evaluation should check a posteriori this outcome. It could ask beneficiaries to provide data on the number of visitors to sites affected by the project funded in the balance of achievements for the payment of the grant sale.

(5) Project leaders should be able to supply information regarding the (surface) areas covered by the sites that are supported. This will make it possible to obtain a value for the result indicator for this SO, which is not required by the Caribbean programme but is required by other programmes (notaby by the EAFRD) that pursue the same strategic objective of preserving natural sites.

(6) This indicator can measure the contribution of actions to the expected result of SO8-10, which relates to the number of sites in the Caribbean benefiting from a quality label.

(7) This indicator can measure the contribution of actions to the expected result of SO13, which relates to the number of cooperation initiatives aiming to increase the production of renewable energy.

 (8) The present evaluation recommends that consideration be given not only to the amount of ERDF-ETC funding programmed through projects, which is a mere financial measure, but also to the total investments made as part of the supported projects including both public and private funding, which is a requirement in other investment programmes (ERDF or EAFRD). The aim being to measure the output in terms of the final investments in projects to produce renewable energy or reduce the use of fossil fuels.

(9) With a view to better capturing the contribution of actions to the expected results for SO13, which relate to the production of renewable energies, as well as to SO14, which concerns reducing the use of fossil fuels, and alongside the amount of investment made by project leaders, the reductions in energy use stemming from the investments made as part of the projects should also be measured and recorded.

**These indicators are proposed in order to better monitor and evaluate the programme. They do not need to be incorporated into the performance framework.**

**They are not programme indicators but suggestions of indicators for the *in itinere* assessment.**

### Evaluation of programme Result Indicators and Investment Strategy

The result indicators reflect the programme’s investment strategy. Their purpose is to indicate the expected results from the funding mobilised.

Table 9 – The result indicators deployed by the programme’s strategic investment plan

| Priority  | Union Support% of total support | Thematic Objective | Investment Priorities | Specific Objectives | Result Indicators (1) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CB Strand | TN Strand |
| Priority 1 (CB) Priority 2 (TN)Enhance the competitiveness of Caribbean business, and unlock its potential to create wealth and employment | 7.45 M€18.1% | 4.36 M€18.8% | TO3 - Enhancing the competitiveness of SMEs  | IP3D – developing and implementing new business models for SMEs, in particular to help them internationalise their activities; | SO 1-3- Support the economic diversification of the territories through knowledge transfer and the commercialisation of innovative products  | RI1 Increase in the number of cooperation agreements between innovation stakeholders from across the Caribbean (unit: number) |
| SO 2-4 - Create an environment conducive to increasing the volume of trade between the Caribbean territories  | RI2 Increase in the volume of trade between the OCT and the countries of the Caribbean (unit : €) |
| Priority 3 (CB) Priority 4 (TN)Strengthen natural disaster risk management capacity (prevention and response capacity) | 8.63 M€21.0% | 5.45 M€23.5% | TO5 - Promoting climate change adaptation, risk prevention and management | IP5B – promoting investment to address specific risks, ensuring disaster resilience and developing disastermanagement systems; | SO 5-6 - Increase the capacities of territories to manage/respond to natural risks (disasters) | RI3 increase in the capacity of Caribbean territories’ to respond to risk (unit : score on a scale from 1 to 5 based on electronic survey) |
| Priority 5 (CB) –Priority 6 (TN)Protect and capitalise on the Caribbean’s natural and cultural heritage | 9.04 M€22.0% | 5.45 M€23.5% | TO6 - Protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency | IP6C – protecting, promoting and developing cultural and natural heritage | SO 7-9 - Better protect and capitalise on the Caribbean’s natural heritage through joint strategies and policy instruments  | RI4 Increase in the number of transnational/cross-border initiatives to protect animal and plant biodiversity (unit : number) |
| SO8-10- Increase the touristic appeal of the territory through the joint marketing of its natural and cultural heritage  | RI5 Increase in the number of Caribbean tourist sites with a quality label (unit: number) |
| Priority 9 (CB)Support the development of renewable energies in the Eastern Caribbean | 7.80 M€19.0% | - | TO4 – Supporting the shift towards a low-carbon economy in all sectors | IP4A – promoting the production and distribution of renewable energy sources  | SO13 – Increase the share of renewable energies in the electricity mix with a view to a greater energy independence in the territories of the eastern Caribbean  | RI7 Number of cross-border initiatives aiming to increase the production of renewable energy in the Caribbean (unit: number) |
| IP4C – supporting energy efficiency and renewable energy use in public infrastructures, including public buildings and in the housing sector  | SO14 – Reduce energy consumption in public buildings in the eastern Caribbean area  | RI8 Number of territories and countries having adopted thermal regulations comparable to the French Thermic, Acoustic and Ventilation Regulations for the Overseas Departments (French abbreviation, RTAA) |
| Priority 7 (CB) – Priority 8 (TN)Develop a concerted Caribbean response to shared public health issues | 5.80 M€14.1% | 3.27 M€14.1% | TO9 - promoting social inclusion and combating poverty | IP9A - investing in health and social infrastructure, thereby contributing to national, regional and local development, reducing inequalities in terms of health status | SO11-12 - Increase the capacities of territories to respond to/manage emerging diseases and health risks | RI6 Increase in the response capacity in relation to health risks facing Caribbean territories (unit: rating on a scale of 1 to 5 on the basis of an electronic survey) |
| Priority 10 (TN)Foster closer ties between the peoples of the Caribbean | - | 3.27 M€14.1% | TO10 –Investing in education, skills and lifelong learning by developing education and training infrastructures  | IP10A –investing in education, skills and lifelong learning by developing education and training infrastructure | SO15- Improve foreign language skills and foster their use in the Caribbean | RI9 Number of students enrolled on language courses in Caribbean universities |
| SO16 - Increase student and professional mobility in the Caribbean | RI10 Number of international cooperation agreements with the Caribbean signed between Caribbean universities and regional vocational/professional training providers |

(1) The Regulation (EC 288-2014) stipulates that this column should include the common and specific programme indicators for which objectives have been set. All of the programme’s proposed indicators are programme-specific. The objectives are not indicated as the indicators selected require specific surveys to determine their values.

Table 10 – Analysis of result indicators

| Result Indicators | Evaluator’s Remarks |
| --- | --- |
| RI1 Increase in the number of cooperation agreements between innovation stakeholders from across the Caribbean (unit: number) | The expected result of SO1 is increased innovation initiatives undertaken by enterprises and more effective technology transfer between research and enterprises with the goal of developing and commercialising innovation. The RI1 allows the measurement of an enabling output of the programme, that is, the intensity of cooperation in the field of innovation between Caribbean countries. It will not measure the result of cooperation, whether or not it is supported by the programme.It would be useful to develop the survey of organisations leading cooperation projects in order to capture numerical data on the results obtained and expected from projects in relation to the number of participating enterprises and the volume of production of innovations commercialised. |
| RI2 Increase in the volume of trade between the OCT and the countries of the Caribbean (unit : €) | This indicator is technically straightforward and is a good measure of the SO’s expected results.However, it does not measure the economic impact of the actions supported by the programme, an impact that it would be reasonable to assume , having regard to the multiple external factors that govern economic activity and trade, will be marginal and only apparent in the longer-term.The mid-term and ex post evaluations will need to assess the scale of the economic impact, so as to determine the effectiveness of the actions supported by the programme. |
| RI3 Increase in the Caribbean territories’ capacities to respond to risk (unit : score on a scale from 1 to 5 based on electronic survey) | The indicator is an effective measure of the SO’s expected results.It is however less effective for assessing the impact of the actions. A comparison over a set timeframe of sufficient duration, that is at the time and as part of the ex post evaluation, between the scores obtained by territories benefitting from support and those not benefitting will give an indication of the impact of the programme’s actions, taking into account any factors or events having an effect during the period concerned and that may affect the result. |
| RI4 Increase in the number of transnational/cross-border initiatives to protect animal and plant biodiversity (unit : number) | The result measured concerns the intensity of cooperation in the field of protecting natural sites but does not identify the impact in terms of preservation *per se*.The continuous (*in itinere*) evaluation could deploy the common output indicator identified for the investment priorities relating to the protection and exploitation of natural sites, i.e. an inventory of natural sites that are supported and their surface areas and deploy, as the common result indicator, the rate of geographical area supported based on the area receiving support divided by the total surface area of natural sites in beneficiary territories. |
| RI5 Increase in the number of Caribbean tourist sites with a quality label (unit: number) | The expected result of SO5, to which SO4, which comes under the same thematic objective (TO6) also contributes, is not the number of sites benefitting from a sustainable development quality label (as indicated in the OP) but instead relates to an increase in tourist numbers to sites benefitting from such a label.The continuous (*in itinere*) evaluation could seek to gather the tourist visitor statistics for supported sites (and possibly the statistics for non-beneficiary sites, although this is more difficult to organise) with a view to measuring the increase in visitor numbers. |
| RI6 Increase in the response capacity in relation to health risks facing Caribbean territories (unit: rating on a scale of 1 to 5 on the basis of an electronic survey) | In a similar manner as RI3, the indicator RI6 allows the measurement of the results expected under SO6.Similarly also, it will not measure the impact of the programme’s actions. As part of the ex post evaluation, it would be useful to compare the scores obtained by the territories benefitting from actions supported by the programme with those of non-beneficiary territories in order to assess the impact of the programme’s actions, taking into account any factors or events having an effect during the period concerned and that may affect the result. |
| RI7 Number of cross-border initiatives aiming to increase the production of renewable energy in the Caribbean (unit: number) | As for RI5, the result measured is the intensity of cooperation, whether supported or not by the programme.The expected result of the investment priority is a rise in renewable energy production. Also, the continuous (*in itinere*) evaluation could seek to capture the results of actions supported in terms of the production of renewable energy measured in equivalent tonnes of oil. The survey method for RI5 will also allow to measure renewable energy production within cross-border initiatives. By making a distinction between actions supported and those not, it will be possible to measure the increase in renewable energy production obtained through the support of the programme. An additional survey targeting the public authorities of the territories involved will allow the measurement of the total energy production (energy mix), which will in turn make it possible to estimate the share of production supported by the programme in the total production in the territories concerned. |
| RI8 Number of territories and countries having adopted thermal regulations comparable to the French Thermic, Acoustic and Ventilation Regulations for the Overseas Departments (French abbreviation, RTAA) | The expected results of actions supported under SO8 are the joint development and transfer of construction techniques and increase in local capabilities and skills enabling the roll-out and use of these techniques.The introduction of a regulatory norm for construction presupposes that the local capabilities exist to build in line with the new norm. RI8 is also a direct indicator for the expected results. Yet the correlation between regulation and the development of new construction techniques is neither perfect nor simultaneous. The risk is measuring only the capacity of OECS countries to adopt French regulatory logic, but not the actual development of more energy efficient buildings.Via the survey of construction industry stakeholders implementing cooperation actions to develop new construction techniques, the continuous (*in itinere*) evaluation will identify the impact of supported actions in terms of planned investment and consequential expected energy efficiency gains. |
| RI9 Number of students enrolled on language courses in Caribbean universities | The indicator measures the result based on the premise that the number of students enrolled on (foreign) language courses reflects the language practice of the general population.As well as the fact that actions envisaged for this investment priority are modest compared with the challenges, it is difficult to establish a simple and realistic indicator that would capture the impact of student mobility actions on human capital in general, or even on the linguistic skills of populations.The ex post evaluation could seek to measure in a more fine-grained manner the development of (foreign) language practice in the countries of the Caribbean, for example by questioning the authorities responsible for initial education to provide information about the change in the number of students following foreign language courses in primary and secondary education as well as in higher education. |
| RI10 Number of international cooperation agreements with the Caribbean signed between Caribbean universities and regional vocational/professional training providers | The indicator measures the intensity of cooperation in the field of initial higher education and vocational/executive training.The expected result of SO16 is of course not only to strengthen the schemes that support student and professional mobility, but also to increase mobility *per se*. The mid-term and ex post evaluations could add to RI10 a measure of the number of working persons having benefitted from identified international agreements in this area. |

## Appraisal of the implementation of actions

##### Refer to section 2 of the programme.

*Evaluation criteria*

*h) the justification for the form of support proposed;*

##### SO1-3 – Support the economic diversification strategies of the eligible territories through joint research and innovation, knowledge transfer and the commercialisation of innovative products

The aim is to increase the number of cooperative research programmes as well as maximise the number of scientists taking part in them.

In terms of results, the expectation is an increase in the number of networks.

Two other potentially useful indicators could be the number of partner SMEs and the number of research, innovation or knowledge transfer projects. The participation of SMEs is essential to achieve the qualitative goal (business investments) and the objective of the priority (create jobs).

Actions will not be limited to research projects involving SMEs. It is clear from the proposed types of action that this specific objective mainly addresses challenge n°1; nevertheless it also addresses challenge n°3 (environment) and to a lesser extent and in an indirect way challenges n°5 and n°6.

Points requiring vigilance:

* Involvement of SMEs; innovation in R&D not only in research
* The programme should not limit its scope to only those innovation themes that are included in smart specialisation (S3) strategies, other themes may be suitable for cooperation, such as for example, agriculture or waste management.

##### SO2-4 - Create an environment that is conducive to increasing the volume of trade between the Caribbean territories.

The scope of the objective’s title is a quite wide one given the types of action that are proposed, which are quite specific.

The focus on boosting activities that capitalise on shared potential is a promising approach (e.g. tourism and exploitation of natural, historic and cultural heritage).

The indicator that is envisaged (number of SMEs) would not reflect the diversity of the actions. It is nonetheless simple and fairly to the point. For some actions, such as harmonising technical standards, it could not be used.

In light of the low level of economic exchange (trade) between the overseas territories and the other countries in the Caribbean, would it not be more effective than indirect support for entrepreneurship or joint initiatives to put in place a simple incentive to undertake trade activities in partnership with other businesses from the area?

The Chambers of Commerce are not listed as potential project lead partners. This is a little surprising in light of their active support for international trading and exchange.

Point requiring vigilance:

* Take an open approach in order to finance projects that may have an immediate impact in terms of economic activity and job creation.
* The harmonisation of standards in order to facilitate import-export in particular in agriculture and agri-food

##### SO5-6 – Through cooperation, increase territories’ capacities to manage/respond to natural risks/disasters

It is quite natural to focus on the constant and serious risks that affect the Caribbean: volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, cyclones and tsunami. Such risk are shared and are good subjects for cooperation.

The result indicator is the number of people benefiting from the actions. It would be a good idea – in order to amplify the impact of cooperation across the population – to prioritise actions that involve ordinary people (For example, local emergency relief networks and/or training in what to do, including basic specific relevant skills, in an emergency situation).

##### SO7-9 –Better protect and capitalise on the Caribbean’s natural and cultural heritage through joint strategies and policy instruments

The OP observes that there are already numerous initiatives in this area and that the programme’s goal is to focus on facilitation and strengthening and creating networks. This would seem to be both appropriate and a good way to increase policy effectiveness.

The result indicator that uses the land area of habitats benefiting from support is appropriate.

##### SO8-10 - Increase the touristic appeal of the territory through the joint marketing of its natural and cultural heritage

There are many types of action. The main needs in terms of cooperation are tangible and intangible investments in sites themselves. The cooperation actions, which are described in a relatively open way, are however of second order importance – i.e. they do not include investment – in terms of the priorities of tourist site managers. This said, the joint tourism marketing objective of the cooperation programme probably does need to be built on a foundation of a shared awareness/understanding of common heritage.

The types of action principally concern knowledge, research, or preservation but there are almost no actions that would have a direct impact on developing tourism.

Points requiring vigilance:

* Do not neglect cultural heritage, which is less well known than natural heritage (performing arts for example)
* Prioritise actions that have a direct impact on tourism development

The result indicator that uses the number of visitors to sites is not always easy to measure when sites are open access.

##### SO11-12 – Increase territories’ response capacities in relation to emerging diseases and health risks

This is an important area for cooperation, with actions, such as HIV programmes, already being undertaken.

The issue of health management in the context of natural disasters, possibly in connection with the risk management cooperation theme (priority 2), can be a worthwhile issue to tackle.

Although the production of medicinal plants is supported by the EARDF and POSEI, cooperation action could be envisaged in order to increase knowledge about tradition pharmaceutical plants in the Caribbean area.

##### SO13 – Increase the share of renewable energies in the electricity mix with a view to a greater energy independence in the territories of the eastern Caribbean

This measure comes under the cross-border strand.

Cooperation in the field of renewable energy already exists although its scale could be increased in light of the significant productive potential and diverse sources that are present (wind, solar, geothermic, tidal, etc.) and in the context of the dependence of the island economies concerned on imported oil.

##### SO14 – Reduce energy consumption in public buildings in the eastern Caribbean area

This measure comes under the cross-border strand.

##### SO15 – Improve foreign language skills and foster their use in the Caribbean

This is another case where the thematic scope is much reduced relative to the investment priority. The wording of the priority title is suggestive of a wider range of actions, and the objective could also be part of the policy response to investment priorities other than the one(s) selected.

Of course this does not detract from the usefulness of such action, which has already demonstrated its value, and which undeniably constitutes a practical way to bring the peoples of the Caribbean closer together. What makes this even more relevant is the fact that the populations of the French territories, in particular those of Martinique and Guadeloupe, are culturally, economically and institutionally ‘connected’ to the French mainland and therefore more difficult facing the Caribbean.

##### SO16 – Increase mobility for professionals and students in the Caribbean

Cooperation actions in general and professional education already exist and can be boosted.

* 1. **Management, monitoring and assessment**

***Refer to sections 5, 6 & 7 of the programme.***

*Evaluation criteria*

*i) the adequacy of the human resources and administrative capacity for management of the programme;*

*j) the suitability of the procedures for monitoring the programme and collecting the data necessary to carry out evaluations;*

*k) the suitability of the milestones selected for the performance framework*

* + 1. **The programme’s administrative and management capacity**

The programme does not specify the resources to be committed although drawing on the experience of previous programmes and the increase in cooperation experience that followed, the programme does set out the arrangements for management and strategic management.

Section 5 describes the Programme’s different management and control bodies:

* The managing authority: the Regional Council of Guadeloupe
* The joint technical secretariat (JTS) in Guadeloupe and the regional contact points (RCP): 3 in the other French regions and 4 in the Caribbean’s international organisations that are partners in the programme
* The certifying authority
* The audit authority and the group of auditors
* The monitoring committee is responsible for the strategic management of the programme. It is made up of : representatives from the 4 French regional authorities, representatives from the *préfectures* of these regions, representatives from the 4 international organisations in the Caribbean, a territorial authorising officer of the EDF, a representative of the EC, 1 representative of the certifying authority, 1 representative of the JTS, 1 representative of the French Ministry of Overseas France the Ambassador Delegate for regional cooperation in the French West Indies and French Guiana.
* The selection committee, which is set up under the authority of the monitoring committee
* The programme’s technical committee which brings together representatives from the programme’s co-financing organisations and provides a technical opinion on project applications

Project appraisal is carried out by the JTS which consults the technical committee then submits applications for approval to the selection committee.

* + 1. **Evaluation Plan**

Evaluation of the programme is briefly addressed in section 5 (chapter 2.3)

The first method is programme monitoring which records values for the output indicators and provides the basis for annual financial reporting that is presented to the monitoring committee and is reported in the programme’s AIR that is submitted to the EC.

The JTS is responsible for implementing the programme. To fulfil this role, it will use new management, monitoring, control, analysis and evaluation tools for the programme overall and for projects (Synergie CTE).

The programme indicates, although without elaborating on the detail, that the managing authority will draw up a programme evaluation plan which will be submitted to the monitoring committee at its first meeting. In particular, the plan will set out arrangements for carrying out and the content of the full evaluations that will be undertaken at mid-term in 2018 (not compulsory) and ex post in 2023 (compulsory).

In the light of the above analysis (voir en 4.6.3) of the programme’s result indicators, the present ex-ante evaluation offers a number of observations regarding the data gathering methods for the evaluation indicators that could be considered for the programme’s evaluation plan:

***Table 11 – Analysis of the evaluation plan for each result indicator***

| Result indicators (1) | Evaluation Plan | Evaluator’s Remarks |
| --- | --- | --- |
| RI1 Increase in the number of cooperation agreements between innovation stakeholders from across the Caribbean (unit: number) | Programme-specific indicator.Electronic survey (conducted at the outset, at mid-term and ex post) aimed at innovation support organisations in the EU territories, with a view to compiling a list of cooperation agreements in place (with or without support from the OP ETC) | As already observed in 4.6.3, in the analysis of result indicators, it would be useful to expand the electronic survey to organisations running cooperation projects, and to quantify the obtained and expected results in terms of the number of participating enterprises, innovative products & services and the latters’ volume of production. |
| RI2 Increase in the volume of trade between the OCT and the countries of the Caribbean (unit : €) | Programme-specific indicator.Annual collection of import/export statistics of the EU territories. | The measurement is straightforward.It would be useful to make a distinction between goods and services produced locally and those originating outside of the Caribbean and re-exported.Tourist numbers should also be recorded, taking care not to count the tourism movements around the EU territories as exports. |
| RI3 Increase in the capacity of the Caribbean territories to respond to risk (unit : score on a scale from 1 to 5 based on electronic survey) | Programme-specific indicator.Electronic survey in all the territories of the Caribbean at the start, mid-term and ex post targeting bodies responsible for natural risk management regarding their risk response capacity at the time of the survey and in the future. | The measurement is original, to be robust, the survey will need to be carried out identically for the three surveys.The effect of supported actions is not immediate and the utility of a mid-term survey is very low.To measure the programme’s impact, it will be necessary to discern within the results of the mid-term and ex post surveys, those that relate to territories having benefitted from a project supported by the programme and those that did not.  |
| RI4 Increase in the number of transnational/cross-border initiatives to protect animal and plant biodiversity (unit : number) | Programme-specific indicator.Electronic survey at the start, mid-term and ex post targeting bodies responsible for protecting biodiversity in the EU territories with a view to establishing an inventory of cooperative initiatives for biodiversity protection whether supported or not by the programme. | The measurement is original, to be robust, the survey will need to be carried out identically for the three surveys, and should aim for exhaustivity while avoiding double counting.The indicator measures more the result in terms of the intensity of cooperation than in terms of impact on the protection of biodiversity. The indicator should also make an inventory of the sites of biodiversity value that are affected by cooperation projects. And to be closer to the EU indicator, the surface area of such sites will also need to be recorded. As for the number of actions, double counting should be avoided.In addition, it will be possible to make a distinction, at mid-term and at the end of the programme the sites having benefitted from an action supported by the programme and those that did not. |
| RI5 Increase in the number of Caribbean tourist sites with a quality label (unit: number) | Programme-specific indicator.Survey at the start, then at 3 year intervals, targeting organisations responsible for awarding labels | For the purposes of optimising implementation of the evaluation plan, and even if the survey would not be onerous, it would be sufficient that the evaluation be carried out at mid-term and ex post, rather than at 3 year intervals.The measure does not include an inventory of the labelled tourist sites having benefited from a cooperation project supported by the programme, only the overall effect (increase) in the number of labelled sites is measured. As a result, a mid-term measurement would be of limited utility as the effect of actions is indirect. |
| RI6 Increase in the response capacity in relation to health risks facing Caribbean territories (unit: rating on a scale of 1 to 5 on the basis of an electronic survey) | Programme-specific indicator.Electronic survey at the start, mid-term and ex post targeting all the bodies in the Caribbean territories responsible for managing health risks for the purpose of determining their response capacity to risk both at the time of the survey and in the future. | Same observation as for RI3, which is similar.The measurement is original, to be robust, the survey will need to be carried out identically for the three surveys.The effect of supported actions is not immediate and the utility of a mid-term survey is very low.To measure the programme’s impact, it will be necessary to discern within the results of the mid-term and ex post surveys, those that relate to territories having benefitted from a project supported by the programme and those that did not (counterfactual). |
| RI7 Number of cross-border initiatives aiming to increase the production of renewable energy in the Caribbean (unit: number) | Programme-specific indicator.Electronic survey at the start, mid-term and ex post targeting organisations responsible for renewable energies in Martinique and Guadeloupe, for the purpose of drawing up an inventory of cooperation initiatives undertaken with equivalent organisations in the OECS countries (countries concerned by the cross-border strand), whether or not supported by the programme. | As already observed in 4.6.3, in the analysis of result indicators, it would be useful to measure the results of supported actions in terms of the production of energy (Equivalent tonnes of oil). The survey methodology for RI5 should allow measurement of the production of renewable energy in the context of cross-border initiatives. By making a distinction between actions supported from those not, it is possible to measure the increase in production of renewable energy. An additional survey targeting the leaders of identified projects would allow the evaluation to determine the total production in the electric power mix in the territories covered.This measurement could be made at three stages: start, mid-term and ex post. |
| RI8 Number of territories and countries having adopted thermal regulations comparable to the French Thermic, Acoustic and Ventilation Regulations for the Overseas Departments (French abbreviation, RTAA) | Programme-specific indicator.Electronic survey at the start, mid-term and ex post targeting the countries of the area covered by the cross-border strand (OECS) on the thermal regulations introduced. | At the time of writing only Guadeloupe possesses regulations that are specific to tropical climate conditions. The baseline value is therefore 1 with the target objective being 3, on the basis that 2 other territories will adopt similar legislation. The impact will be indirect, so the usefulness of mid-term evaluation is very limited.In order to measure the results in terms of reduced energy consumption, it would be necessary to carry out a survey of organisations leading cooperation action in the field of new building technologies asking them to indicate the number of buildings built and the energy economies made as part of the cooperation activity, whether already observable or expected. |
| RI9 Number of students enrolled on language courses in Caribbean universities | Programme-specific indicator.Survey at the start, then at 3 year intervals, targeting universities in the EU territories and the University of the West Indies regarding the number of students enrolled on foreign (spoken in the Caribbean) language courses. | As for RI5, for the purposes of optimising implementation of the evaluation plan, and even if the survey would not be onerous, it would be sufficient that the evaluation be carried out at mid-term and ex post, rather than at 3 year intervals.As noted in the analysis of result indicators in section 4.6.3, it would be useful that the mid-term and ex post evaluations measure the attendance on language courses of students in initial education and not only that of university students. |
| RI10 Number of international cooperation agreements with the Caribbean signed between Caribbean universities and regional vocational/professional training providers |  | As for RI5, for the purposes of optimising implementation of the evaluation plan, and even if the survey would not be onerous, it would be sufficient that the evaluation be carried out at mid-term and ex post, rather than at 3 year intervals.As noted in the analysis of result indicators in section 4.6.3, it would be useful to supplement RI10 with the number of employed persons having benefitted from the international agreements identified. |

* + 1. **Performance framework objectives**

The performance framework is set out in section 2 for each priority, in other words for each thematic objective and its corresponding investment priority (with the exception of IP4A and 4C which are grouped together).

The approach to determining the objectives (milestones) to reach by mid-term is the same for each priority: 30% for physical outputs and 15% for certified expenditure.

These targets were established on the basis of outputs achieved under the previous programme, and assume that the 2014-2020 programme will only begin to build up progressively from the second half of 2015.

The 2013 AIR indicates that projects implemented by economic agents, and especially by enterprises, are difficult to set up and see through to fruition. This problem affects SO1-3 and SO2-4 (priority 1). It would seem reasonable to assume that this problem also affects projects that involve investment and that require long lead-in times such may be supported under SO15 and SO16 (priority 5). Actions under SO13 and SO14 (priority6) led by universities, may sometimes be ‘out of step’ in terms of implementation due to the annual nature of their financing and spending arrangements vis-à-vis teaching programmes.

**In addition, this evaluation recommends to lower the expenditure objectives for priorities 1, 5 and 6, to 10% and the objectives for physical outputs to 20%.**

* + 1. **Reducing the administrative burden**

Section 7 addresses the goal of reducing the administrative burden on beneficiaries, in accordance with article 8 of Regulation EU 1299/2013.

The key to simplification is the shift to digital data exchange with the beneficiaries. Digital exchange will limit delays in processing applications and other interactions between projects and the programme’s managing body as well as the volume of paper documents requiring archiving.

The use of the Synergie CTE system should facilitate management and project monitoring. The systematic use of flat rates for costs will also reduce the administrative burden associated with different levels of control.

A more systematic use of Harmonised Programme Implementation Tools (HIT) developed by the INTERACT programme in collaboration with the whole of the European territorial cooperation programmes should also simplify procedures and reduce the administrative burden on beneficiaries.

The specific result indicator for technical assistance is the average time taken to process requests for payment, the time between, specifically, the submission of the (progress) report by the project lead partner and the issuance of the payment order. It is again necessary to calculate the baseline value. Annual measurement will be sufficient to capture the improvement in the processing of payments during the lifetime of the programme. The indicator only measures the reduction of the burden in relation to the managing and payment authorities’ processing of payments, but does not cover the processing of applications by the project lead partners or administrative management on their part. This evaluation recommends that an evaluation question on this subject is included in the mid-term evaluation in order to assess whether the provisions in the OP have in practice reduced the administrative burden on beneficiaries.

# The contribution of the SEA to the OP

## Production of the SEA report

**The environmental assessment is drawn up concurrently with the operational programme**.Its purpose is to contribute to the design of the programme at each stage of its development, enabling a progressive and iterative incorporation of its findings.

The SEA aims to:

* Provide programme designers with relevant and useful environmental information/data;
* Inform programme design choices, including vis-à-vis content
* Contribute to the transparency of the choices made and report on their impact;
* Propose options for monitoring programme implementation (impact on environment).

The results of the SEA should, in accordance with Article 5 of the SEA Directive, be presented in a report on the environmental impact of the programme. This report should help to improve the overall quality of the operational programme’s documents and a better consideration of environmental issues in them.

A preliminary environmental report was produced in January 2014 (deliverable 1). This described the ‘baseline’ state of environmental areas and was presented to the Steering Committee in February 2014. An English version dated March 2014 was communicated to Anglophone partners.

The environmental report of July 25, 2014 (deliverable 2) presented a first analysis of the programme’s environmental impacts.

Further more complete versions were produced on: 7 September 2014 (deliverable 3); October 2014 (deliverable 4); January 2015 (deliverable 5), the latter being submitted to the environmental authorities for comment.

Further modifications were made to integrate the joint opinion of the environmental authorities and the comments of the European Commission with a new SEA produced at the end June 2015 (deliverable 6). The changes between the January and June versions are presented in an explanatory note. This latest version was submitted to public consultation in July / August 2015.

The final report meets the criteria set out in the Community Regulation and includes:

* A review of the baseline state of the environment and outlook, covering 6 major issues;
* An environmental impact assessment for all programme measures and sub-measures;
* The design/formulation of corrective measures, environmental conditionalities and the monitoring system

## Consultations

### Consultation of environmental authorities

The competent environmental authorities are the three Environment, Planning and Housing (DEAL) Directorates of Guadeloupe, Martinique and French Guiana. On May 21, 2015, the DEAL produced a joint opinion on the SEA interim report dated 19 January 2015 and the third version of the OP dated January 7, 2015.

The opinion found that the programme’s implementation would have no major negative environmental impacts.

It stressed the need to establish environmental selection criteria (for projects) as well as a monitoring and evaluation system. The is in line with the opinion of the present strategic environmental assessment.

In the opinion of the environmental authorities the draft operational programme incorporates the environmental dimension in a satisfactory way, both in terms of the objectives it sets and the environmental assessment methodology.

Nevertheless, the environmental authority recommended to deepen the analysis on the following main points:

* Check, complement and / or consolidate the information on the baseline state of the environment;
* Contrast the likely significant effects of the OP on the environment w.r.t geography, type of area and budget allocated;
* Define the preventive or remedial actions precisely, particularly with regard to their expected impacts;
* Propose measures to monitor the OP’s impact on the environment.

### Public consultation

#### Organisation of the consultation

In accordance with regulations, the INTERREG V Caribbean European Territorial Cooperation Operational Programme held a public consultation from 1 July to 1 August 2015 as part of the strategic environmental assessment.

The consultation package included the following documents:

* An explanatory note;
* The draft operational programme INTERREG V Caribbean 2014-2020;
* The interim report of the strategic environmental assessment (deliverable 6);
* The joint opinion of the competent environmental authorities.

An advertisement for the consultation was published in the local press (in the French Antilles, Guadeloupe and Martinique and French Guiana) covering the 4 territories of Guadeloupe / St Martin, Martinique and Guyana.

The public consultation was organised via the Programme website (documents and opinions were downloadable from the Programme's website). The public was invited to provide their comments via the programme’s email address.

#### Summary of contributions

No contribution was received during the public consultation period.

It should be noted that the managing authority had conducted a first public consultation in August / September 2014 concerning only the operational programme itself.

## The findings of the Strategic Environmental Assessment

The non-technical summary presents the opinion of the SEA in summary form.

The SEA’s finding is that any positive or negative effects on the environment will mostly result from the conditions applied to the selection and implementation of projects. The evaluator therefore recommends the use of eco-conditionality and / or **environmental criteria in the selection of projects to reduce identified risks and promote projects and sectors of activity that have a lesser or even positive impact on the environment**.

Several strategies could be pursued, for example:

* coordination between and use of different modes of transport (passenger and freight);
* promoting alternative business models (intermediate and short circuits, etc.);
* in the light of the significance of this sector in the economy of the territories concerned –

greening the tourism development model. **The OP does give certain guarantees in this regard by referring systematically to the concept of sustainable tourism.**

Table 12 – Opinions and recommendations of the evaluator and and how the OP has taken them into account

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluator’s Opinion | Initial Recommendations |
| SO1-3 – Diversify territories’ economies through knowledge transfer and commercialising innovative products:The environmental impact will be limited in view of the nature of the activities (primarily intangible in nature and magnitude) and more positive. | * Use the selection process to introduce **eco-conditionality and / or environmental criteria** to avoid projects that carry risks, raise to educate stakeholders and / or promote projects and sectors of activity with positive effects on the environment or on the well-being of the population
* In the same vein, consider a bonus system exclusively for exemplary projects that explicitly take environmental issues into consideration.
 |
| Response in OP version 25/11/2014 | Review of Recommendations SEA 9/12/2014 |
| P.37 sets out the guiding principles for project selection; however, the guidelines indicate that selection criteria for projects will be specified in the text of each call for projects | * The recommendation remains valid; the integration of environmental criteria in calls for projects remains vital.
* *Where appropriate, award additional funding to projects that have positive environmental impacts (bonus system; see environmental report).*
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluator’s Opinion | Initial Recommendations |
| SO2-4 - Create a business context that stimulates trade between the territories of the Caribbean region:The potential environmental impact of SO2-4 would generally be negative insofar as economic development and tourism growth tends to increase energy consumption and pressure on resources. Any such impact under this OP would however be limited. | * Use environmental criteria and / or eco-conditionality to both avoid potentially risky projects and / or educate stakeholders so that they take greater account of environmental issues in their projects.
* Encourage project lead partners operating in the field of cross-border economic activity to carry out an impact study **w.r.t sustainability looking at the effects of increasing transport & trade (people + goods);**
* Project selection should give preference to sectors and projects that have a reduced or even positive impact on the environment.
 |
| Response in OP version 25/11/2014 | Review of Recommendations SEA 9/12/2014 |
| As above, P.41 sets out the guidelines for the selection of operations; the selection criteria will be specified in the text of each call for projects. | * The guiding principles contain no specific environmental criteria nor any item related to the environment.
* The recommendation remains valid: it is important that environmental criteria be incorporated in project calls.
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluator’s Opinion | Initial Recommendations |
| SO5-6 - Increase territories’ response capacity to natural disasters:A potentially positive impact on the "population health" parameter. | * **Incorporate studies on the fragility and/or resilience of local ecosystems** to inform preventative and/or management strategy in relation to natural disasters, while continuing to prioritise saving human lives;
* Develop a plan and operational measures to ensure that immediate post-crisis and/or subsequent reconstruction work respects the principles of sustainable development.
 |
| Response in OP version 25/11/2014 | Review of Recommendations SEA 9/12/2014 |
| The OP will support actions (pp. 45) that aim to improve understanding of the risks as well as improve prevention / preparedness. | * As the PO already seeks to support research and innovation projects aimed at creating new knowledge on the Caribbean, the SEA recommends introducing the topic of the fragility and/or resilience of local ecosystems as a research theme, in order to better prevent and especially to better manage the effects of natural disasters/threats.
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluator’s Opinion | Initial Recommendations |
| SO7-9 - Protect and enhance the Caribbean’s natural heritage through the implementation of strategies and tools:The likely effects on the environment of this OS are inherently positive. | * Ensure that environmental issues are incorporated in a horizontal and integrated manner by the tourism sector in relation to the intensification of flows of people and goods *(via the attractiveness SO 5 in particular).*
 |
| Response in OP version 25/11/2014 | Review of Recommendations SEA 9/12/2014 |
| P.51-52 Taking environmental issues into account as a horizontal goal is explicit in the guiding principles for the selection of projects | * Recommendation taken into account
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluator’s Opinion | Initial Recommendations |
| SO8-10 - Increasing the touristic appeal of the cooperation area through the joint development of its natural and cultural heritage:The projects under this SO may induce a potentially adverse impact on the ‘Climate Change’ and ‘Biodiversity’ parameters – and to a lesser extent on the soil, air and landscape parameters due to the expansion of tourism, which will be tempered if sustainable tourism approach is supported. | * Introduce eco-conditionality criteria for beneficiaries of investments under this objective.
* Support may be conditional on the signature of a strict Charter of sustainable tourism *(existing or to be introduced)* by operators in this sector. Adherence to such a Charter would standardize practices for sustainability and respect for the environment, as well as support place marketing for these destinations.
 |
| Response in OP – version 25/11/2014 | Review of Recommendations SEA 9/12/2014 |
| P.55 Environmental issues are explicitly mentioned in the guiding principles for the selection of operations. | * Recommendation taken into account
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluator’s Opinion | Initial Recommendations |
| SO11-12 – Improve territories’ response capacity w.r.t threats from emerging diseases and other health risks:The impacts of these SO will mainly be positive due to the improved health and well-being through more effective disease prevention and treatment. | * Address the issue of the disposal of hazardous medical waste and consider introducing a reward scheme / showcase the exemplary projects that propose innovative solutions in this field.
 |
| Response in OP version 25/11/2014 | Review of Recommendations SEA 9/12/2014 |
| p.59 Most actions are "intangible" and involve surveillance, research, exchanges, communication tools, etc. The recommendation applies to tangible actions (or action plans) that address te issue of medical waste. | * The recommendation applies to tangible actions (or action plans) to manage the disposal of dangerous medical waste. It should be applied to this type of action where they are supported (in principle will constitute a minority of the actions supported).
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluator’s Opinion | Initial Recommendations |
| SO13 - Increase the share of renewables in the electricity mix to increase the energy autonomy of Eastern Caribbean territories:This SO, with its focus on increasing the share of renewable energies in energy production, will have positive effects mainly for the climate change parameter, but also for air quality and for the population by limiting emissions of substances that are harmful for the environment. | * Put in place the necessary arrangements to ensure that the technologies used and the conditions applied to implementation are the most favourable possible to the environment.
 |
| Response in OP version 25/11/2014 | Review of Recommendations SEA 9/12/2014 |
| P.67 The link with the *Schéma Régional Climat Energie* is mentioned in the guiding principles for the selection of operations. | * Recommendation taken into account
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluator’s Opinion | Initial Recommendations |
| SO14 - Reducing energy consumption in public buildings in the Eastern Caribbean area:The effects of this SO will be positive, but limited in scale, on climate change, air quality and by limiting GHG emissions through reducing energy consumption.  | * Given the fact that this SO focuses on public buildings, it would be useful to showcase exemplary projects and their results. This could have a ‘multiplier’ effect by encouraging wide take-up of new systems.
 |
| Response in OP version 25/11/2014 | Review of Recommendations SEA 9/12/2014 |
| P.70 Coordination with the *Schéma Régional Climat Energie* is mentioned among the guiding principles for the selection of operations | * Recommendation taken into account
 |
| SO15 - Strengthen foreign language skills and encourage their use ​​in the Caribbean:This objective will result in a positive effect on cultural integration & social inclusion through the stimulation of intercultural exchanges. | * Nothing to report
 |
| SO16 - Increase student and professional mobility in the Caribbean region:Student mobility will lead to increased mobility in the area, but the effect will be marginal. The positive effect of this objective is to improve the socio-economic prospects and employability of its beneficiaries. | * Nothing to report
 |

1. Art 121 EC Regulation 1303/2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Diagram taken from the EC Guidance on the monitoring and evaluation of European Cohesion policy for the period 2014-2020 - http://ec.europa.eu/regional\_policy/sources/docoffic/2014/working/wd\_2014\_en.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-2)