**Dear HUSKROUA Beneficiaries/ Stakeholders,**

The following questions represent the survey that would help the HUSKROUA Programme do the following:

- set-up the current awarded project **baseline and final values** for the Programme’s result indicator **Thematic Objective 6 Priority 1 “Increased capacity in environmental protection and climate change mitigation”**

- aggregate data from all the awarded projects of the 1st and 2nd call and estimate the mentioned indicator’s **baseline**, **mid-term and** **final value.**

1. **Please allocate a score from 1 to 5 (1- insufficient; 5 –exceptional) to the situations that best describe the current capacity of your institution.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Current capacity of your institution – please allocate a score from 1 to 5 | Please make notes if you consider necessary |
| a | Funding of the organization |  |  |
| b | Human resources capacity - number |  |  |
| c | Expertise of organization’s own staff |  |  |
| d | Long lasting partnerships with institutions from the Programme area |  |  |
| e | Better coordination of strategies partnerships with institutions from the Programme area |  |  |
| f | Improved interinstitutional communication with institutions from the Programme area |  |  |
| g | Previous cooperation with institutions and organisations from the area |  |  |
| h | Others |  |  |

*Qualitative indicator revealing the self-assessment of the organizational capacity along several lines, prior to project’s start and by the project’s closure. The variable aims at measuring the perceived impact of the project on the organizational capacity of the beneficiaries.*

1. **According to your knowledge, with how many organizations/institutions from the programme area[[1]](#footnote-1) did you cooperate in the past 3 years in the field of environmental protection and climate change mitigation? What are your expectations by the closure of the project?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Current situation | By project’s closure |
| a | None |  |  |
| b | One |  |  |
| c | Two |  |  |
| d | Three |  |  |
| e | More than three |  |  |

*Quantitative indicator revealing the geographical coverage of the beneficiaries’ cooperation networks within the programme eligible area. An increase in the number of countries part of the beneficiaries’ network is expected by project’s end.*

1. **How would you define the cooperation with your partners from Hungary, Slovakia, Romania, Ukraine? What are your expectations by project’s closure?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Current situation | By project’s closure |
| a | Not relevant |  |  |
| b | Limited relevance |  |  |
| c | Fairly relevant |  |  |
| d | Relevant |  |  |
| e | Very successful |  |  |

*Qualitative indicator revealing the perception of the professional relevance of the cooperation actions with the partners from the Participating Countries in the relevant topics. Increase in the perception of the professional relevance of the cooperation actions will indicate a stronger professional coherence of the joint actions in the field of environmental protection and climate change mitigation.*

1. **What in your opinion what hinders the cooperation with partners from the Programme area on the subject of environmental protection and climate change mitigation? Please mark with an “X” where the case. Also please assess with a score from 1 to 5 if the project helps you on any of the problematic cooperation issues (1 – insignificant; 5 – very consistent assistance).**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Please mark with an “X” where the case | Facilitated through the project |
| a | Lack of funding |  |  |
| b | Low human resources capacity - number |  |  |
| c | Low of expertise of organization’s own staff |  |  |
| d | Lack of political engagement in the countries concerned |  |  |
| e | Different mind sets when it comes to settling long lasting partnerships |  |  |
| f | Lack of opportunities to coordination of strategies partnerships with institutions from the Programme area |  |  |
| g | Missing sustainable interinstitutional communication with institutions from the Programme area |  |  |
| h | Others |  |  |

*Qualitative indicator aiming at identifying the main hurdles of cross border cooperation in the Programme area and on the topic within their jurisdiction. Additionally, data on whether the awarded project facilitates these hurdles are collected.*

1. **Did you participate in any event organized within the HUSKROUA 2014-2020 Programme in the past 3 years?**

A – No, I have not participated in any Programme event.

**B- Yes.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| If “yes”, please rate how useful was the information gained during the Programme events in the day-to-day activity of your organization/institution? | 1. Not useful at all | 2 – Limited usefulness | 3 – Fairly useful | 4 - Useful | 5 – Very useful |
|  |  |  |  |  |

*Qualitative indicator revealing the level of applicability of the information exchange/best practice facilitated by the Programme. The increase in this value indicates a higher level of contribution of the Programme to the professional competence of the personnel, and implicitly of the organizations.*

1. **How does the investments – if any foreseen in the project- impact the work of your organization/institution?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 – No impact whatsoever | 2 – Limited impact | 3 – Fairly useful | 4 – Positive impact | 5 – Strong positive impact |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Qualitative indicator revealing the perception of the utility of the infrastructural developments supported by the Programme in the eligible area, from the perspective of the organizations active in the field of environmental protection and climate change mitigation. Increase in the value of the perception will indicate a spill-over effect and added-value of the investments supported by the Programme.*

**7. Please allocate a score from 1 to 5 (1 - insufficient; 5 – exceptional) to the situations that best describe the capacity of your institution by the end of the project and further on; please also include your answers that describes your expectations by project’s closure.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | By the end of the project and further on | Please make notes if you consider necessary |
| a | Funding of the organization |  |  |
| b | Human resources capacity - number |  |  |
| c | Expertise of organization’s own staff |  |  |
| d | Political engagement and understanding of the topic of environmental protection among stakeholders at national level |  |  |
| e | Long lasting partnerships with institutions from the Programme area |  |  |
| f | Better coordination of strategies partnerships with institutions from the Programme area |  |  |
| g | Improved interinstitutional communication with institutions from the Programme area |  |  |
| h | Others |  |  |

*Qualitative indicator revealing the expected self-assessment of the organizational capacity along several lines, prior to project’s start and by the project’s closure. The variable aims at measuring the perceived impact of the project on the organizational capacity of the beneficiaries.*

1. Core regions: UA: Ivano-Frankivsk, Zakarpattia; HU: Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg; SK: Košice, Prešov; RO: Maramureş, Satu Mare

   Adjoining regions: UA: Chernivtsi; HU: Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén; RO: Suceava

   National and regional capitals: Kyiv, Budapest, Debrecen, Eger, Bratislava, Bucharest, Cluj-Napoca [↑](#footnote-ref-1)