

Programme impact evaluation of Interreg V-A-Estonia-Latvia Programme 2014-2020

Final report - Annex

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Survey response rate per SO

	SO 1.1	SO 1.2	SO 2.1	SO 2.2	SO 3.1	SO 4.1
Total Call1-Call 4 project partners under the SO	38	45	102	40	23	12
Respondents in the survey	23	26	41	20	11	5
Survey response rate	60%	58%	40%	50%	48%	42%

Source: Authors own, based on survey results and partners per-SO data received from the JS on 17.08.20, 2020

Annex 2: Project partner interview sample*

Interviewee no	Country	SO	LP/PP	Notes
Interviewee 1	Estonia	1.1	LP	
Interviewee 2	Estonia	1.1	PP	
Interviewee 3	Latvia	1.1	LP	
Interviewee 4	Latvia	1.1	PP	
Interviewee 5	Estonia	1.2	LP	
Interviewee 6	Estonia	1.2	PP	
Interviewee 7	Estonia	1.2	PP	
Interviewee 8	Estonia	1.2	LP	
Interviewee 9	Latvia	1.2	LP	
Interviewee 10	Latvia	1.2	LP	
Interviewee 11	Latvia	1.2	LP	
Interviewee 12	Latvia	1.2	PP	
Interviewee 13	Estonia	2.1	LP	
Interviewee 14	Estonia	2.1	PP	
Interviewee 15	Estonia	2.1	PP	
Interviewee 16	Estonia	2.1	LP	
Interviewee 17	Latvia	2.1	LP	

Interviewee 18	Latvia	2.1	LP	
Interviewee 19	Latvia	2.1	LP	
Interviewee 20	Estonia	2.2	LP	Group interview with two interviewees from the same organization
Interviewee 21	Estonia	2.2	LP	
Interviewee 22	Estonia	2.2	LP	
Interviewee 23	Estonia	2.2	PP	
Interviewee 24	Latvia	2.2	PP	
Interviewee 25	Latvia	2.2	LP	
Interviewee 26	Latvia	2.2	LP	
Interviewee 27	Estonia	3.1	PP	
Interviewee 28	Estonia	3.1	PP	
<i>Interviewee 15</i>	<i>Estonia</i>	<i>3.1</i>	<i>PP</i>	
Interviewee 29	Latvia	3.1	LP	
Interviewee 30	Latvia	3.1	PP	
Interviewee 31	Estonia	4.1	PP	
Interviewee 32	Estonia	4.1	PP	
Interviewee 33	Latvia	4.1	PP	
Interviewee 34	Latvia	4.1	LP	
Interviewee 35	Latvia	4.1	LP	

Source: Authors own, based on interviews, 2020 *Two interviewees (marked with italics), who were active in two SOs, were interviewed from the point of view of both SOs

Questions to SO respondents

SO 1.1

Annex 3: What have been the most important achievements for your project? (By country, N=23)

		Agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	I don't know
Creation of new cross-border business connections.	Estonia (N=12)	9	3	0	0	0
	Latvia (N=11)	8	2	0	1	0
Strengthening existing business connections.	Estonia	11	0	1	0	0
	Latvia	6	4	1	0	0
Participating companies gained knowledge on the benefits of cross-border cooperation.	Estonia	10	2	0	0	0
	Latvia	7	3	0	1	0
Access to new markets has increased.	Estonia	1	9	1	0	1
	Latvia	4	5	2	0	0
Export capabilities for participating companies have increased.	Estonia	2	7	2	0	1
	Latvia	3	5	3	0	0
Participating companies gained publicity and marketing benefits.	Estonia	5	5	1	0	1
	Latvia	5	5	1	0	0
New business ideas developed between cross-border partners.	Estonia	1	6	3	0	2
	Latvia	1	8	0	2	0
Project activities have increased the number of companies who are ready for cross-border cooperation.	Estonia	5	6	0	0	1
	Latvia	4	5	1	1	0

Source: Authors own, based on survey results, 2020

Annex 4: Based on your experiences with your project, to what extent do you agree with the following statements about the impact of the Estonia-Latvia Programme? (By country, N=23)

		Agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	I don't know
Most of the entrepreneurs and SMEs we encountered will pursue cross-border cooperation opportunities.	Estonia (N=12)	7	4	1	0	0
	Latvia (N=11)	5	4	1	1	0
Most entrepreneurs and SMEs we encountered are not ready for cross-border cooperation.	Estonia	1	3	4	2	2
	Latvia	2	4	3	2	0
Most entrepreneurs and SMEs were aware of cross-border cooperation opportunities before our project.	Estonia	1	2	6	0	3
	Latvia	1	6	4	0	0
Cross-border cooperation is more valuable for older companies (more than 3 years) than it is for new businesses.	Estonia	0	2	4	2	4
	Latvia	1	7	1	2	0
Cross-border cooperation is more valuable for larger companies (over 50 employees) than it is for small businesses and entrepreneurs.	Estonia	0	1	7	2	2
	Latvia	1	3	5	2	0
There is no need to promote cross-border entrepreneurial cooperation between Estonia and Latvia.	Estonia	0	0	3	9	0
	Latvia	1	2	0	8	0
Estonian and Latvian companies cooperate on a regular basis.	Estonia	1	5	5	0	1
	Latvia	1	8	2	0	0

Source: Authors own, based on survey results, 2020

SO 1.2

Annex 5: To what extent do you agree with the statements below about the impact of the Estonia-Latvia Programme? (By country, N=26)

		Agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	I don't know
We would not have been able to develop a new service or product without the help of our partner.	Estonia (N=17)	6	8	2	0	1
	Latvia (N=9)	6	2	0	1	0
I would rather partner with a company from my own country.	Estonia	2	4	5	3	3
	Latvia	0	1	1	6	1
The Est-Lat Programme has created cooperation with other companies in different areas that are not involved with the project.	Estonia	5	2	5	1	4
	Latvia	4	3	0	0	2
The Estonian and/or Latvian markets are too small to make the creation of a joint service or product feasible without additional programme funding.	Estonia	8	5	3	0	1
	Latvia	3	3	2	0	1
Joint product or service creation was equally beneficial for all partners involved.	Estonia	8	7	2	0	0
	Latvia	8	1	0	0	0
Our jointly developed product or service can be launched in markets outside Estonia and Latvia.	Estonia	14	2	1	0	0
	Latvia	6	3	0	0	0
Jointly developed product or service will allow us to hire more employees.	Estonia	5	9	1	1	1
	Latvia	3	4	0	2	0
Export support from the programme would be more beneficial than cross border product development.	Estonia	3	4	3	0	7
	Latvia	0	3	2	0	4
Cross-border networking is more important than joint product development.	Estonia	0	4	8	1	4
	Latvia	0	5	1	2	1

Source: Authors own, based on survey results, 2020

SO 2.1

Annex 6: To what extent do you agree with the statements below? (By country, N=41)

		Agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	I don't know
Project activities have increased the number of visitors to natural and cultural heritage sites.	Estonia (N=20)	65%	30%	0%	0%	5%
	Latvia (N=21)	95%	5%	0%	0%	0%
Cross-border cooperation was essential for increasing the number of visitors to cultural heritage sites.	Estonia	55%	45%	0%	0%	0%
	Latvia	76%	24%	0%	0%	0%
We have improved communication through social media, emails, or website improvements.	Estonia	55%	35%	5%	0%	5%
	Latvia	71%	29%	0%	0%	0%
Existing infrastructure – like camp sites, trail markers, trails - has been improved.	Estonia	60%	15%	10%	0%	15%
	Latvia	91%	5%	0%	0%	5%
We have increased our services/activities – like audio/visual attractions, tour guides, etc. - offered to visitors.	Estonia	50%	45%	0%	0%	5%
	Latvia	81%	10%	5%	5%	0%
Cross-border networks to promote sites have been strengthened.	Estonia	50%	35%	10%	0%	5%
	Latvia	52%	38%	5%	0%	5%
The services we provide have become more diversified.	Estonia	60%	35%	5%	0%	0%
	Latvia	91%	5%	5%	0%	0%

Source: Authors own, based on survey results, 2020

SO 2.2A

Annex 7: To what extent do you agree with the statements below related to Estonia-Latvia Programme impact? (By country, N=9)

		Agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	I don't know
The contribution from Est-Lat was vital to increasing the awareness of energy saving, re-use, or sorting waste in the programme area.	Estonia (N=5)	2	3	0	0	0
	Latvia (N=4)	2	1	1	0	0
Most people in the programme area are aware of issues related to energy saving, re-use, or sorting waste.	Estonia	1	1	2	1	0
	Latvia	1	2	0	0	1
The project has been effective at changing people's habits as it relates to energy savings, re-use, or sorting waste.	Estonia	2	1	1	0	1
	Latvia	2	2	0	0	0
Communication tools for spreading awareness about environmental issues – like websites, events, social media platforms – have been improved.	Estonia	1	1	0	0	3
	Latvia	2	2	0	0	0

Source: Authors own, based on survey results, 2020

SO 2.2W

Annex 8: To what extent do you agree with the statements below related to Estonia-Latvia Programme impact? (By country, N=11)

		Agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	I don't know
The Est-Lat Programme has led to positive changes in water management.	Estonia (N=6)	4	2	0	0	0
	Latvia (N=5)	4	0	0	0	1
Project activities were beneficial for all partners involved.	Estonia	5	1	0	0	0
	Latvia	4	1	0	0	0
Project activities have created new national standards in Estonia and Latvia for the management of common water sources.	Estonia	2	1	1	0	2
	Latvia	3	2	0	0	0
National policies of either Estonia or Latvia, made it difficult to achieve the objectives for our project.	Estonia	2	2	1	0	1
	Latvia	1	1	3	0	0
The number of institutions cooperating to address water management has increased.	Estonia	2	3	0	0	1
	Latvia	3	1	0	0	1

Source: Authors own, based on survey results, 2020

SO 3.1

Annex 9: To what extent do you agree with the statements below related to Estonia-Latvia Programme impact? (By country, N=11)

		Agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	I don't know
The network of harbours along the coast of the Gulf of Riga is operative.	Estonia (N=8)	3	4	1	0	0
	Latvia (N=3)	3	0	0	0	0
The network of harbours along the coast of the Gulf of Riga is up to internationally accepted quality standards.	Estonia	4	4	0	0	0
	Latvia	2	1	0	0	0
There has been an increase in the number of visiting vessels to harbours that have benefited from the Est-Lat Programme.	Estonia	5	2	0	0	1
	Latvia	3	0	0	0	0
There has been an increase in the number of visitors for the purpose of using services associated with the harbour, like fishing, sailing charters, restaurants, etc.	Estonia	5	2	0	0	1
	Latvia	3	0	0	0	0
The number of vessels visiting harbours from outside Estonia or Latvia has increased.	Estonia	4	3	0	0	1
	Latvia	3	0	0	0	0
Interest from people who will use the harbour – e.g. measured by a higher volume of phone calls, emails, social media presence, or other forms of communication – has increased.	Estonia	5	2	0	0	1
	Latvia	1	1	0	0	1
Safety for sailors has increased because there is a higher density of functional harbours.	Estonia	7	1	0	0	0
	Latvia	2	0	0	0	1
Variety of services at each harbour - like boat rentals, sailing camps, recreational boat excursions, gas stations, restaurants, etc.- have increased.	Estonia	4	2	0	0	2
	Latvia	3	0	0	0	0
The harbours that have been benefited by the Est-Lat programme will not need further improvement for many years.	Estonia	2	3	2	0	1
	Latvia	1	2	0	0	0
Harbour improvements have attracted new businesses to the area. For example, restaurants, boat charters, fishing services etc.	Estonia	2	2	0	0	4
	Latvia	2	1	0	0	0
Additional promotional activities are needed to capitalize on the investments made during the project.	Estonia	3	5	0	0	0
	Latvia	3	0	0	0	0

Source: Authors own, based on survey results, 2020

SO 4.1

Annex 10: To what extent do you agree with the statements below about the impact of the Estonia-Latvia Programme? (By country, N=5)

		Agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	I don't know
The Est-Lat Programme has improved conditions for accessing jobs across the border.	Estonia (N=2)	1	1	0	0	0
	Latvia (N=3)	2	1	0	0	0
Cooperation between employers and vocational training or educational programmes to hire across the border has increased.	Estonia	0	1	0	0	1
	Latvia	2	1	0	0	0
The number of strategic partnerships between schools and enterprises to support cross border employment has increased.	Estonia	0	1	0	0	1
	Latvia	1	2	0	0	0
Interest in vocational/educational programmes which promote cross border employment – e.g. measured by enrolment in programmes, higher volume of emails, phone calls, and social media messages from potential participants – has increased.	Estonia	0	1	0	0	1
	Latvia	0	1	1	0	1
The number of job fairs, networking events, and employment support services which encourage cross-border employment has increased.	Estonia	1	1	0	0	0
	Latvia	1	2	0	0	0
The number of employers who have hired workers from across the border has increased.	Estonia	1	0	0	0	1
	Latvia	0	2	0	0	1
The demand for jobs in Estonia by Latvians is high.	Estonia	1	1	0	0	0
	Latvia	0	1	0	0	2
The demand for jobs in Latvia by Estonians is high.	Estonia	0	0	2	0	0
	Latvia	2	1	0	0	0
The number of Latvian clients at Estonian unemployment offices and Estonian clients at Latvian unemployment offices increased compared to the time before the project started.	Estonia	0	0	0	0	2
	Latvia	0	1	0	0	2

Source: Authors own, based on survey results, 2020

Questions to all respondents

Annex 11: Are the output indicators relevant for measuring the success of your specific objective? (By SO, N=126)

	SO 1.1 (N=23)					SO 1.2 (N=26)				
	Agree	Some what agree	Some what disagree	Disagree	I don't know	Agree	Some what agree	Some what disagree	Disagree	I don't know
Output indicators have been reasonably set	48%	48%	4%	0%	0%	39%	42%	15%	0%	4%
The content of output indicators is easy to understand	57%	44%	0%	0%	0%	35%	50%	8%	4%	4%
Output indicators are easy to report	48%	44%	9%	0%	0%	39%	39%	15%	4%	4%
Output indicators are easy to measure	30%	57%	13%	0%	0%	35%	42%	15%	4%	4%
	SO 2.1 (N=41)					SO 2.2 (N=20)				
	Agree	Some what agree	Some what disagree	Disagree	I don't know	Agree	Some what agree	Some what disagree	Disagree	I don't know
Output indicators have been reasonably set	59%	34%	5%	0%	2%	30%	55%	10%	0%	5%
The content of output indicators is easy to understand	54%	42%	0%	0%	5%	40%	45%	5%	5%	5%
Output indicators are easy to report	44%	39%	10%	0%	7%	45%	30%	20%	0%	5%
Output indicators are easy to measure	42%	37%	17%	0%	5%	40%	35%	20%	0%	5%
	SO 3.1 (N=11)					SO 4.1 (N=5)				
	Agree	Some what agree	Some what disagree	Disagree	I don't know	Agree	Some what agree	Some what disagree	Disagree	I don't know
Output indicators have been reasonably set	46%	36%	0%	0%	18%	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%
The content of output indicators is easy to understand	55%	18%	9%	0%	18%	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%
Output indicators are easy to report	36%	46%	0%	0%	18%	20%	60%	20%	0%	0%
Output indicators are easy to measure	27%	55%	0%	0%	18%	20%	80%	0%	0%	0%

Source: Authors own, based on survey data, 2020

Annex 12: Are the programme result indicators relevant for measuring the contribution of your project? (By SO, N=126)

	SO 1.1 (N=23)					SO 1.2 (N=26)				
	Agree	Some what agree	Some what disagree	Disagree	I don't know	Agree	Some what agree	Some what disagree	Disagree	I don't know
Result indicators have been reasonably set	52%	39%	9%	0%	0%	39%	42%	8%	8%	4%
The content of result indicators is easy to understand	52%	44%	4%	0%	0%	35%	35%	23%	4%	4%
Result indicators are easy to report	44%	52%	4%	0%	0%	39%	31%	15%	12%	4%
Result indicators are easy to measure	48%	44%	9%	0%	0%	35%	35%	15%	12%	4%
	SO 2.1 (N=41)					SO 2.2 (N=20)				
	Agree	Some what agree	Some what disagree	Disagree	I don't know	Agree	Some what agree	Some what disagree	Disagree	I don't know
Result indicators have been reasonably set	49%	51%	0%	0%	0%	25%	50%	10%	5%	10%
The content of result indicators is easy to understand	44%	44%	7%	0%	5%	20%	50%	10%	10%	10%
Result indicators are easy to report	42%	44%	5%	0%	10%	35%	40%	15%	5%	5%
Result indicators are easy to measure	37%	37%	20%	2%	5%	20%	40%	20%	10%	10%
	SO 3.1 (N=11)					SO 4.1 (N=5)				
	Agree	Some what agree	Some what disagree	Disagree	I don't know	Agree	Some what agree	Some what disagree	Disagree	I don't know
Result indicators have been reasonably set	46%	36%	9%	0%	9%	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%
The content of result indicators is easy to understand	55%	18%	9%	0%	18%	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%
Result indicators are easy to report	36%	46%	0%	0%	18%	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%
Result indicators are easy to measure	27%	46%	0%	0%	27%	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%

Source: Authors own, based on survey data, 2020

Annex 13: To what extent has the Covid-19 crisis impacted your ability to carry out activities as planned? Please select the most relevant option. (By SO, N=126)

	SO 1.1 (N=23)	SO 1.2 (N=26)	SO 2.1 (N=41)	SO 2.2 (N=20)	SO 3.1 (N=11)	SO 4.1 (N=5)
Causes delays in our project activities	9%	35%	17%	35%	27%	20%
Has not impacted our ability to carry out our project activities	35%	23%	42%	20%	18%	60%
I don't know	9%	0%	5%	10%	0%	0%
Project is finished but our future plans for this project, beyond the scope of the Est-Lat Programme, will be impacted	35%	31%	17%	30%	46%	0%
The crisis will prevent us from carrying out some of our activities	13%	12%	20%	5%	9%	20%

Source: Authors own, data based on survey results, 2020

Annex 14: To what extent has the Covid-19 crisis influenced your results? Please select the most relevant option. (By SO, N=126)

	SO 1.1 (N=23)	SO 1.2 (N=26)	SO 2.1 (N=41)	SO 2.2 (N=20)	SO 3.1 (N=11)	SO 4.1 (N=5)
Has not /will not influence our results	52%	42%	44%	50%	9%	60%
Has somewhat influenced our results	13%	23%	32%	15%	18%	0%
I don't know	9%	4%	7%	10%	0%	0%
It will have a negative influence on our results, but we will still meet our result indicators	0%	12%	5%	15%	27%	20%
Too soon to tell	22%	15%	10%	5%	27%	20%
We will not meet our project result indicators because of the Covid-19 crisis	4%	4%	2%	5%	18%	0%

Source: Authors own, data based on survey results, 2020

Annex 15: What has helped you the most to reach your objectives during project implementation? Please select up to 3 most relevant options. (By SO, N=126)

	SO 1.1 (N=23)	SO 1.2 (N=26)	SO 2.1 (N=41)	SO 2.2 (N=20)	SO 3.1 (N=11)	SO 4.1 (N=5)
Good knowledge about the target group needs	61%	42%	24%	30%	55%	20%
Successful set-up of the partnership	65%	62%	66%	70%	64%	60%
Previous cooperation experience with partners	26%	12%	34%	15%	9%	20%
Experienced leadership	39%	42%	49%	65%	46%	0%
Sufficient budget	26%	19%	20%	30%	27%	40%
Cross-border cooperation	22%	12%	22%	20%	18%	80%
Good marketing	0%	15%	22%	0%	9%	0%
Good communication and dissemination of project results	9%	23%	39%	35%	18%	0%
I don't know	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other	0%	8%	2%	10%	9%	0%

Source: Authors own, based on survey results, 2020

Annex 16: What has helped you the most to reach your objectives during project implementation? Please select up to 3 most relevant options. (By SO, N=20)

	SO 2.2A (N=9)	SO 2.2B (N=11)
Good knowledge about the target group needs	4	2
Successful set-up of the partnership	5	9
Previous cooperation experience with partners	0	3
Experienced leadership	6	7
Sufficient budget	3	3
Cross-border cooperation	2	2
Good marketing	0	0
Good communication and dissemination of project results	4	3
I don't know	0	0
Other	2	0

Source: Authors own, based on survey results, 2020

Annex 17: Partner satisfaction with programme activities (N=19 final reports)

	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low
Engagement of partners in the project implementation	11	7	1	0	0
Project outputs	13	6	0	0	0
Project results	11	8	0	0	0
Financial flow	1	6	7	3	2
eMS	1	13	3	2	0
Programme rules	3	6	7	3	0

Source: Authors own, based on project partner final reports (answers to question 7), received from JS, 2020

Annex 18: Have funds been sufficient to meet the project's intended objectives? Please select the most relevant option. (By SO, N=126)

	SO 1.1 (N=23)	SO 1.2 (N=26)	SO 2.1 (N=41)	SO 2.2 (N=20)	SO 3.1 (N=11)	SO 4.1 (N=5)
Funds were sufficient	74%	73%	51%	70%	36%	40%
Not sufficient	17%	19%	42%	15%	64%	0%
We had left-over funding from the programme	9%	8%	7%	15%	0%	60%

Source: Authors own, based on survey data, 2020

Annex 19: Did you need to make changes to your original idea to fit the project with programme criteria? Please select the most relevant option. (By SO, N=126)

	SO 1.1 (N=23)	SO 1.2 (N=26)	SO 2.1 (N=41)	SO 2.2 (N=20)	SO 3.1 (N=11)	SO 4.1 (N=5)
Minor changes were made to the original idea	57%	0%	10%	10%	0%	0%
No changes were needed	43%	35%	39%	60%	64%	60%
Significant changes were made to the original idea	0%	65%	51%	30%	36%	40%

Source: Authors own, based on survey data, 2020

Annex 20: In the case you made changes to your original idea, which statement most closely matches your experience? (By SO, N=66)

	SO 1.1 (N=13)	SO 1.2 (N=9)	SO 2.1 (N=20)	SO 2.2 (N=14)	SO 3.1 (N=7)	SO 4.1 (N=3)
Adjusting our idea to Est-Lat Programme rules and pre-conditions improved our idea	77%	56%	80%	43%	43%	100%
Our original idea was better than what it was changed to	23%	44%	20%	57%	57%	0%

Source: Authors own, based on survey data, 2020

Annex 21: Why did you apply for Estonia-Latvia Programme? Please select all that apply. (By SO, N=126)

	SO 1.1 (N=23)	SO 1.2 (N=26)	SO 2.1 (N=41)	SO 2.2 (N=20)	SO 3.1 (N=11)	SO 4.1 (N=5)
Est-Lat was the only programme which fully matched with the activities we were planning	35%	15%	29%	25%	36%	20%
We were asked to join the project and it suited our plans	57%	42%	71%	70%	82%	60%
Appealing co-financing rate	13%	46%	29%	45%	36%	40%
We were unsuccessful in applying for other funding schemes, so we adapted our project to fit the priorities outlined in the Est-Lat programme	0%	4%	0%	5%	0%	0%
We were already working with cross-border partners (Estonian or Latvian), and this was a convenient way to receive additional funding for our ideas	22%	23%	29%	20%	27%	40%
We saw funding as an opportunity for our idea and wanted to give it a try	30%	69%	27%	40%	46%	20%
Other	4%	8%	0%	10%	0%	0%

Source: Authors own, based on survey data, 2020

Annex 22: How important is cross-border cooperation for your organization? Please select the most relevant option. (By SO, N=126)

	SO 1.1 (N=23)	SO 1.2 (N=26)	SO 2.1 (N=41)	SO 2.2 (N=20)	SO 3.1 (N=11)	SO 4.1 (N=5)
Cross-border cooperation is not necessary to achieve our strategic goals	0%	0%	2%	5%	0%	0%
If Est-Lat funding were not available, we would not seek cross-border cooperation	35%	39%	56%	10%	9%	40%
We would cooperate internationally, but not necessarily with Estonian or Latvian partners	39%	54%	29%	70%	55%	20%
We would have cooperated without the programme	26%	8%	12%	15%	36%	40%

Source: Authors own, based on survey data, 2020

Annex 23: How important is cross-border cooperation for your organization? Please select the most relevant option. (By country, N=126)

	We would have cooperated without the programme	We would cooperate internationally, but not necessarily with Estonian or Latvian partners	If Est-Lat funding were not available, we would not seek cross-border cooperation	Cross-border cooperation is not necessary to achieve our strategic goals
Estonia	21%	50%	27%	1%
Latvia	13%	38%	48%	2%

Source: Authors own, based on survey data, 2020

Annex 24: How important is cross-border cooperation for your organization? Please select all that apply. (By organization, N=126)

	Non-profit (NGO) (N=25)	Other (N=9)	Private company (N=38)	Public entity – like a city, regional, or national authority (N=54)
Cross-border cooperation is not necessary to achieve our strategic goals	0%	0%	0%	4%
If Est-Lat funding were not available, we would not seek cross-border cooperation	48%	0%	40%	35%
We would cooperate internationally, but not necessarily with Estonian or Latvian partners	44%	67%	42%	43%
We would have cooperated without the programme	8%	33%	18%	19%

Source: Authors own, based on survey data, 2020

Annex 25: How satisfied are you with the cooperation among project partners? Please select the most relevant option. (By SO, N=126)

	SO 1.1 (N=23)	SO 1.2 (N=26)	SO 2.1 (N=41)	SO 2.2 (N=20)	SO 3.1 (N=11)	SO 4.1 (N=5)
Satisfied	65%	58%	56%	60%	46%	40%
Somewhat satisfied	30%	39%	39%	35%	46%	60%
Somewhat dissatisfied	0%	0%	0%	5%	9%	0%
Dissatisfied	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%
I don't know	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	0%

Source: Authors own, based on survey data, 2020

Annex 26: How satisfied are you with the cooperation among project partners? Please select the most relevant option. (By organization, N=126)

	Private company (N=38)	Public entity – like a city, regional, or national authority (N=54)	Non-profit (NGO) (N=25)	Other (N=9)
Satisfied	61%	61%	52%	33%
Somewhat satisfied	37%	35%	36%	67%
Somewhat dissatisfied	0%	0%	8%	0%
Dissatisfied	3%	2%	0%	0%
I don't know	0%	2%	4%	0%

Source: Authors own, based on survey data, 2020

Annex 27: How satisfied are you with the cooperation among project partners? Please select the most relevant option. (By country, N=126)

	Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	I don't know
Estonia (N=70)	44%	50%	3%	1%	1%
Latvia (N=56)	73%	23%	0%	2%	2%

Source: Authors own, based on survey data, 2020

Annex 28: How likely is it that you will continue to work with the partner organizations within your project in the future? Please select the most relevant option. (By SO, N=126)

	SO 1.1 (N=23)	SO 1.2 (N=26)	SO 2.1 (N=41)	SO 2.2 (N=20)	SO 3.1 (N=11)	SO 4.1 (N=5)
Likely	57%	50%	59%	70%	55%	60%
Somewhat likely	44%	39%	27%	25%	36%	40%
Somewhat unlikely	0%	0%	5%	5%	9%	0%
I don't know	0%	12%	10%	0%	0%	0%

Source: Authors own, based on survey data, 2020

Annex 29: How did you find your crossborder cooperation partner? Select all that apply. (By SO, N=126)

	SO 1.1 (N=23)	SO 1.2 (N=26)	SO 2.1 (N=41)	SO 2.2 (N=20)	SO 3.1 (N=11)	SO 4.1 (N=5)
We cooperated with them during the previous Est-Lat programme (2007-2013)	22%	12%	32%	20%	36%	20%
We have known them from a previous (non-Est-Lat) joint projects	44%	46%	39%	30%	36%	40%
Information/networking events organised by the Est-Lat programme	13%	0%	20%	5%	46%	40%
One of the project partners (previously not known) invited us to join this project	30%	23%	24%	40%	27%	20%
We were interested in participation and were searching actively for suitable project proposals/partners through different channels	22%	35%	24%	30%	55%	20%
Other	0%	8%	15%	10%	0%	40%

Source: Authors own, based on survey data, 2020

Annex 30: Has interest in crossborder cooperation increased amongst project target groups and/or participants during your project? Please select the most relevant option. (By SO, N=126)

	SO 1.1 (N=23)	SO 1.2 (N=26)	SO 2.1 (N=41)	SO 2.2 (N=20)	SO 3.1 (N=11)	SO 4.1 (N=5)
I don't know	4%	12%	7%	0%	9%	0%
Interest has increased	17%	4%	39%	40%	36%	20%
Interest has somewhat increased	70%	58%	51%	50%	46%	80%
There has been no change	9%	27%	2%	10%	9%	0%

Source: Authors own, based on survey data, 2020

Annex 31: What would have happened had you not received support from the Estonia-Latvia programme? Please select up to 3 most relevant options. (By SO, N=126)

	SO 1.1 (N=23)	SO 1.2 (N=26)	SO 2.1 (N=41)	SO 2.2 (N=20)	SO 3.1 (N=11)	SO 4.1 (N=5)
We would not have done such project/activities	70%	46%	49%	55%	82%	60%
We would have done a similar project, but on a smaller scale	30%	46%	34%	25%	46%	20%
We would have done a similar project but started later	8%	42%	27%	25%	9%	0%
We would have tried to implement the project with local partners	22%	23%	22%	10%	27%	0%
Someone else would have done a similar project	22%	45%	10%	15%	0%	0%
Other	0%	4%	7%	15%	9%	0%
The project has been so important that we would have implemented it in the same amount and time anyway	0%	0%	10%	10%	0%	0%

Source: Authors own, based on survey data, 2020

Annex 32: Would it be relevant to continue your cooperation between project partners after the project termination? (By SO, N=126)

	SO 1.1 (N=23)	SO 1.2 (N=26)	SO 2.1 (N=41)	SO 2.2 (N=20)	SO 3.1 (N=11)	SO 4.1 (N=5)
Yes	48%	39%	42%	55%	36%	40%
Yes, to some extent	52%	54%	59%	40%	64%	60%
No	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%
I don't know	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Source: Authors own, based on survey data, 2020

Annex 33: Would it be possible to continue your project operations after the project termination? Please select the most relevant option. (By SO, N=126)

	SO 1.1 (N=23)	SO 1.2 (N=26)	SO 2.1 (N=41)	SO 2.2 (N=20)	SO 3.1 (N=11)	SO 4.1 (N=5)
Yes	26%	46%	42%	30%	36%	36%
Yes, to some extent	60%	50%	49%	55%	64%	64%
No, this is not very likely	13%	0%	2%	10%	0%	0%
No, there is no need to continue the activities	0%	4%	5%	0%	0%	0%

Source: Authors own based on survey results, 2020

Annex 34: How are the continuation of the initiatives and/or benefits from your project ensured? Please select all that apply. (N=126)

	SO 1.1 (N=23)	SO 1.2 (N=26)	SO 2.1 (N=41)	SO 2.2 (N=20)	SO 3.1 (N=11)	SO 4.1 (N=5)
A framework or policy was agreed upon to ensure the continuation of this project	13%	19%	29%	20%	18%	40%
The result, product, service or tool was designed to be used for many years	65%	96%	76%	80%	100%	40%
The result of the activities establishes a joint methodology or programme that will be used between Estonian and Latvian authorities/organisations	22%	15%	5%	60%	9%	20%
Project activities and the benefit from those activities will end at the conclusion of the project	9%	4%	2%	5%	0%	40%
Other	13%	8%	2%	10%	18%	0%

Source: Authors own, based on survey results, 2020