



Partnership without borders

The Carpathian Euroregion Strategy 2020 & Beyond

Annex II – Public & Experts Survey on the Future Functioning of the Carpathian Euroregion



Edited by: Vladimír Benč

Authors & experts that realized the survey: Martin Angelovič, Vladimír Benč, Branislav Cibík, Adina Dumitru, Oksana Fentsyk, Andrea Geszteredi, Ivan Gevtci, Tibor Ičo, Béla Kézy, Gabriel Kiss, Tetyana Kulyk, Oleh Luksha, Mónika Komádi, Brigitta Majorné László, Mária Naďová, Nataliya Nosa-Pylypenko, Carmen Olah, Vadym Pylypenko, Sergii Savarin, Katarína Sirá, Katerina Stankevych-Koval, Oksana Stankevych-Volosyanchuk

Note: Without English language proofreading

© Carpathian Euroregion & Authors

Public & Experts Survey on Future Functioning of the Carpathian Euroregion

Content

PUBLIC & EXPERTS SURVEY ON FUTURE FUNCTIONING OF THE CARPATHIAN EUROREGION	2
1. METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLE OF RESPONDENTS.....	2
2. PUBLIC OPINION POLL	3
<i>The Carpathian Euroregion</i>	3
<i>Hungary</i>	6
<i>Romania</i>	9
<i>Slovakia</i>	12
<i>Ukraine</i>	16
3. EXPERTS INTERVIEWS.....	23
<i>Hungary</i>	23
<i>Romania</i>	25
<i>Slovakia</i>	26
<i>Ukraine</i>	29

1. Methodology and sample of respondents

Public and expert opinion poll on the visibility and future functioning of the Carpathian Euroregion (CE) was conducted from September 2014 till February 2015 in these CE member regions:

- Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén, Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg, Hajdú-Bihar, Heves, Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok (Hungary)
- Satu Mare, Maramures, Harghita, Salaj, Botosani (Romania)
- Košice and Prešov regions (Slovakia)
- Zakarpattya and Ivano-Frankivsk oblast (Ukraine)

The first target group consisted of general public that had opportunity to present their views on five questions related to:

- Visibility of the CE and knowledge of its existence,
- Influence of the CE on everyday life of the CE territory inhabitants,
- Priority areas of future cooperation in the CE
- Higher involvement of regional administrations into the CE cooperation
- Possible establishment of the EU based Programme for the territory of the CE

Questionnaires were anonymous. Respondents were approached by e-mails, web questionnaire and in some cases also by regular post. Some questionnaires were distributed personally at universities or at public places, esp. to approach young people.

Questionnaires survey among general public / stakeholders

Representatives of	Number of collected / returned questionnaires				
	Overall / CE	SK	HU	RO	UA
public authority or local self-governments	74	15	17	18	24
educational or scientific organizations	63	10	10	9	34
other organizations (medical, social, youth, environmental, etc.).	48	10	10	9	19
companies / small and medium businesses	55	10	16	14	15
civil organization, charitable organization and others. ("Third sector")	51	10	10	9	22
other social groups (pensioners, students, unemployed, etc.).	63	15	10	15	23
Overall	354	70	73	74	137

The second target group was represented by experts on cross-border cooperation such as researchers & academicians, founders and members of the initiative the IA CE, representatives of board of directors of the national parts of the IA CE, its current and former employees and public activists. The interviews conducted were personal, however, data resulting from the interviews were elaborated anonymously. In total, 101 experts were interviewed, 6 of them in Hungary, 44 in Romania, 7 in Slovakia, and 44 in Ukraine.

2. Public opinion poll

The Carpathian Euroregion

General conclusion from the first question is that the visibility of the CE is very low. The highest awareness of the CE from the public opinion poll was in Zakarpattya (76% of respondents), followed by Slovak regions (70%) and Hungarian counties (66%). Surprisingly low awareness of the CE is in the Romanian part of the CE, while only 38% of respondents are aware of the existence of the CE. Not such surprise is only 23% awareness of the CE in Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, while it has no direct border with some EU region and therefore is excluded from many CBC programs. Activities of the IA CE were also very limited in Ivano-Frankivsk oblast in the last years ...

Question 1	answer	SK	HU	RO	UA_ZAK	UA_IFR
		%	%	%	%	%
Are you aware about the existence and activities of the "Carpathian Euroregion" and/or are you involved in some form of cross-border cooperation within the "Carpathian Euroregion" (not necessarily only grant projects).	yes	58,6	40,7	16,2	53,2	7,7
	perhaps	11,4	25,4	21,6	22,8	15,4
	not sure	11,4	18,6	8,1	11,0	26,9
	rather not	7,1	10,2	35,1	7,6	26,9
	not at all	11,5	5,1	18,9	5,5	23,1

Because of special "status" of the Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, we are providing results for Ukraine divided for Zakarpattya and Ivano-Frankivsk.

The second question brought even more pessimistic results on the visibility and impact of the activities of the IA CE on the CE inhabitants' life. Higher numbers for Zakarpattya is reasonable while Zakarpattya was key region for the ENPI HU-RO-SK-UA 2007-2013 CBC Programme and many projects

were realised there, while in case of Slovak regions (Košice, Prešov), the similar impact can be assumed while several bilateral CBC programs overlapped in the Slovak territory and special CBC programme SK-UA co-financed by the Norwegian Financial Mechanism was recently implemented.

Very low impact of the IA CE activities is seen in Hungary and Romania, which is in some contradiction to the activities realised by national parts of the IA CE, where HU part is one the most active.

Question 2	answer	SK	HU	RO	UA_ZAK	UA_IFR
		%	%	%	%	%
Do the activities of the Interregional Association (IA) "Carpathian Euroregion" influence your life?	yes	34,3	8,5	6,8	24,1	3,8
	perhaps	12,8	8,5	10,8	35,4	15,4
	not sure	10,1	6,8	17,6	11,4	7,7
	rather not	25,7	11,9	32,4	13,9	42,3
	not at all	17,1	64,4	32,4	15,2	30,8

Question 3> "In which sectors must the International Association of Carpathian Euroregion improve its cooperation?" tried to identify the priority areas for future development of the CE. Respondents were also marking the priority areas s from 1 to 10, where 1 was most important and 10 less important priority.

Majority of respondents favour development of economy and trade. This is not surprise, since the territory of the CE is one of the least developed regions in the Europe, facing problems with high unemployment, low productivity and weak economic performance. Ukraine's signature of the Association agreement incl. DCFTA with the EU is also seen by many respondents as a big opportunity for enhancing economic and trade relations with expected positive impact on the CE development.

The second most prioritized area for development is tourism. Many respondents see the natural and historical potential of the CE area as the key development factor and opportunity for tourism development. Many would like to continue in projects started, esp. in building of the cross-border cycling paths, thematic hiking routes, joint promotion of the region etc. A lot of people see big potential for job creation in this sector, also in connection to creative industry.

Next five priority areas received very close scores: Nature protection and facing / prevention of natural disasters; Cultural heritage and cultural events; Science and research; Cooperation of the young people; Agriculture and food industry. There were some differences between the countries, e.g. in SK respondents prioritize cultural cooperation, and while in UA there is not such preference. In RO and UA, most of the respondents prioritize nature protection cooperation, while in SK it is not such a priority.

Other issues, e.g. minorities / ethnic groups cooperation or cooperation in other sectors e.g. health & social sector didn't received high ranks. The results are vivid from two tables below.

Rank of priorities for the CE development (Arithmetic Mean for whole territory of the CE)

Cross-border and CE territorial cooperation priority area	AM
Economy & Trade	2,59
Tourism	3,40
Nature protection and facing / prevention of natural disasters	4,16
Cultural heritage and cultural events	4,37
Science and research	4,40

Cooperation of the young people	4,62
Agriculture and food industry	4,64
Community cooperation focused on peaceful coexistence of different ethnic groups	5,59
Sports	6,33
Other areas*	8,99

* - Health & social sector, anticorruption measures were mostly mentioned by respondents

Rank of priorities for the CE development – country comparison

Cross-border and CE territorial cooperation priority area	Rank				
	Overall / CE	SK	HU	RO	UA
Economy & Trade	1	1	1	1	1
Tourism	2	3	2	2	2
Nature protection and facing / prevention of natural disasters	3	6	4	3	3
Cultural heritage and cultural events	4	2	3	5	7
Science and research	5	5	5	6	4
Cooperation of the young people	6	4	7	4	6
Agriculture and food industry	7	9	6	7	5
Community cooperation focused on peaceful coexistence of different ethnic groups	8	7	8	9	8
Sports	9	8	9	8	9
Other areas*	10	10	10	10	10

* - Health & social sector, anticorruption measures were mostly mentioned by respondents

While the visibility of the CE and the IA CE is not high, the most of the respondents would like to see higher cooperation and coordination of the regional stakeholders for more effective functioning of the CE.

Question 4	answer	SK	HU	RO	UA_ZAK	UA_IFR
		%	%	%	%	%
Do the regional governments in Hungary, Slovakia, Ukraine, Poland and Romania have to coordinate their actions in the near future and develop a coherent solution to contribute to a faster and more effective institutional reorganization of IA "Carpathian Euroregion"?	yes	47,8	61,0	47,0	66,7	50,0
	perhaps	26,1	28,8	35,5	26,9	26,9
	not sure	20,3	8,5	10,8	3,9	15,4
	rather not	4,3	0,0	5,4	1,3	7,7
	not at all	1,4	1,7	1,4	1,3	0,0

And the very high share of respondents see perspective of the functioning of the CE as a big macro region, however that should be supported by the external sources e.g. by the Brussels. We assume that there is a conditionality, while if there is no external support, there will be less support for such idea. Several respondents answered that the every initiative that brings the new investment or external EUR to the region is good.

Question 5	answer	SK	HU	RO	UA_ZAK	UA_IFR
		%	%	%	%	%

Would it be appropriate for the European Commission to establish a separate cross-border cooperation programme for the CE territory in addition to other programs (e.g. kind of Danube strategy)?	yes	72,5	47,5	54,1	68,0	38,5
	perhaps	18,9	32,2	25,7	28,2	30,8
	not sure	5,8	17,0	10,8	1,3	23,1
	rather not	2,9	1,7	8,1	1,3	7,7
	not at all	0,0	1,7	1,4	1,3	0,0

Hungary

Q1> Are you aware about the existence and activities of the "Carpathian Euroregion" and/or are you involved in some form of cross-border cooperation within the "Carpathian Euroregion" (not necessarily only grant projects).	yes 40,68%	perhaps 25,42%	not sure 18,64%	rather not 10,17%	not at all 5,08%
--	---------------	-------------------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------

Comments: Authorities, municipalities and research institutes have much wider and accurate information about the Carpathian Euroregion than other types of respondents. Some of them have or had direct contact with the organisation of the CE. By contrast, other social groups do not have any information on the Euroregion.

Q2> Do the activities of the Interregional Association (IA) "Carpathian Euroregion" influence your life?	yes 8,47%	perhaps 8,47%	not sure 6,78%	rather not 11,86%	not at all 64,41%
--	--------------	------------------	-------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Comments: The majority of the respondents cannot perceive any influence on their personal or professional life. Only those professionals identify some impacts that have direct or indirect relation with the CE, but otherwise the Carpathian Euroregion seems to be partly invisible and to have marginal effects on their population.

Question 3> In which sectors must the International Association of Carpathian Euroregion improve its cooperation?

Priority development areas in HU part of the CE (Arithmetic Mean)

Rank	Topic	AM
1	Economy	3,10
2	Tourism	3,27
3	Cultural heritage and cultural events	4,32
4	Nature protection and facing / prevention of natural disasters	4,53
5	Science and research	4,77
6	Agriculture and food industry	4,95
7	Cooperation of the young people Community cooperation focused on peaceful coexistence of different ethnic groups	6,02
8	Community cooperation focused on peaceful coexistence of different ethnic groups	6,05
9	International sport events	8,60
10	Other	9,40

Priority development areas in HU part of the CE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a.	AM	SD	N
Economy & Trade (e.g. cooperation and networking of SMEs, organization of exhibitions and contracting markets, etc.)	24	9	5	5	5	5	3	3	1	0	-	3,1	2,37	60
Tourism (e.g. joint cross-border touristic products, destination promotion, etc.)	7	11	19	12	6	4	0	1	0	0	-	3,27	1,49	60
Agriculture and food industry	1	11	6	5	12	9	7	8	1	0	-	4,95	2,13	60
Science and research	4	5	11	9	8	8	8	4	3	0	-	4,77	2,19	60
Cultural heritage and cultural events	2	14	5	9	11	10	9	0	0	0	-	4,32	1,86	60
Nature protection and facing / prevention of natural disasters	10	5	5	5	9	13	10	3	0	0	-	4,53	2,24	60
Cooperation of the young people	5	0	6	7	4	2	12	22	2	0	-	6,02	2,36	60
Sports	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	11	37	6	-	8,60	1,12	60
Community cooperation focused on peaceful coexistence of different ethnic groups	4	5	2	7	4	7	9	8	14	0	-	6,05	2,62	60
Other (health care, social care, other)	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	54	-	9,40	2,15	60

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: According to the answers, cross-border cooperation (clusters, joint marketing, supply chain) within the CE has to focus on economy and business affairs. This can be a basis for a more integrated transboundary labour market.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a.	AM	SD	N
Tourism (e.g. joint cross-border touristic products, destination promotion, etc.)	7	11	19	12	6	4	0	1	0	0	-	3,27	1,49	60

Comments: Tourism – including creation and development of attractions, tourist services, programme packages, joint marketing – is and has to be a traditionally emphasized topic in the border areas.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a.	AM	SD	N
Agriculture and food industry	1	11	6	5	12	9	7	8	1	0	-	4,95	2,13	60

Comments: Agriculture and food industry is reevaluated due to the intention of creating short food chain (including local farmer markets and direct producer sales), but it is also a sensitive area because of the increased importance of national products.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a.	AM	SD	N
Science and research	4	5	11	9	8	8	8	4	3	0	-	4,77	2,19	60

Comments: Universities, colleges and research institutes have longstanding international partnerships, but it would be advisable to create an extent network within the CE. Relatively wide range of EU and other international grants are available to elaborate joint R&D strategies and to implement common research projects.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a.	AM	SD	N
Cultural heritage and cultural events	2	14	5	9	11	10	9	0	0	0		4,32	1,86	60

Comments: Cultural heritages and events can be identified as cooperation areas with relatively spectacular and rapid results. These are important also in people-to-people relations and as tourism attractions.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a.	AM	SD	N
Nature protection and facing / prevention of natural disasters	10	5	5	5	9	13	10	3	0	0	-	4,53	2,24	60

Comments: Two types of area of interventions can be identified: on the one hand, joint protection of natural values, biodiversity and ecotourism, on the other hand, risk prevention and disaster management as typical cross-border issue because of increasing frequency of natural and man-made disasters (flood, fire, weather extremities).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a.	AM	SD	N
Cooperation of the young people	5	0	6	7	4	2	12	22	2	0	-	6,02	2,36	60

Comments: It is important to sensitize the population to multiculturalism – it can be achieved more effectively by involving young people. Cultural and sport events, exchange programmes for youth can contribute to a more integrated cross-border region.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a.	AM	SD	N
Sports	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	11	37	6	-	8,60	1,12	60

Comments: Although sport events have territorially limited influence, they are good examples of important people-to-people interactions. Competitions and tournaments at euroregional level can enhance the identity and connectivity within the border area.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a.	AM	SD	N
Community cooperation focused on peaceful coexistence of different ethnic groups	4	5	2	7	4	7	9	8	14	0	-	6,05	2,62	60

Comments: Carpathian Euroregion is characterized by unique ethnic composition. With people-to-people and intercommunal actions this multiculturalism can be used as a strength. A common challenge of the region is the high ratio of the people at risk of poverty (mainly Roma people) – activities aiming at their inclusion can be speed up the development of the whole CE. Community-led local development is a usable method in this field.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a.	AM	SD	N
Other (health care, social care, other)	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	54	-	9,40	2,15	60

Comments: Health care and social care were mentioned in the questionnaires as other possible field of cooperation, but the differences in legislative environment make the collaboration difficult.

Q4> Do the regional governments in Hungary, Slovakia, Ukraine, Poland and	yes 61,02%	perhaps 28,81%	not sure 8,47%	rather not	not at all 1,69%
---	---------------	-------------------	-------------------	------------	---------------------

Romania have to coordinate their actions in the near future and develop a coherent solution to contribute to a faster and more effective institutional reorganization of IA "Carpathian Euroregion"?				0%	
---	--	--	--	----	--

Comments: Most of the respondents have the opinion that governmental decisions and agreements should be made to reinforce the Carpathian Euroregion. However, without motivation and commitment of the partner counties and municipalities the CE cannot be fundamentally renewed.

Q5> Would it be appropriate for the European Commission to establish a separate cross-border cooperation programme for the CE territory in addition to other programs (e.g. kind of Danube strategy)?	yes 47,46%	perhaps 32,20%	not sure 16,95%	rather not 1,69%	not at all 1,69%
---	---------------	-------------------	--------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Comments: According to the answers, the main advantage of a separate CBC programme is the financial independency which makes the euroregional objectives achievable. Nonetheless, some of the respondents consider that it would be difficult to realize because of the overlaps with other similar programmes (Danube Strategy, INTERREG and ENI programmes etc.).

Romania

Q1> Are you aware about the existence and activities of the "Carpathian Euroregion" and/or are you involved in some form of cross-border cooperation within the "Carpathian Euroregion" (not necessarily only grant projects).	yes 16,22%	perhaps 21,62%	not sure 8,11%	rather not 35,14%	not at all 18,92%
--	---------------	-------------------	-------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Comments: Respondents noted only sporadic information from the mass media and mostly related to some events organised on the topic related to the Carpathian Euroregion and/or CBC. Some respondents were aware of its existence and activities in between 2001-2004, but then no more information. Only limited amount of respondents were involved in projects implemented within the CE.

Q2> Do the activities of the Interregional Association (IA) "Carpathian Euroregion" influence your life?	yes 6,76%	perhaps 10,81%	not sure 17,57%	rather not 32,43%	not at all 32,43%
--	--------------	-------------------	--------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Comments: Some respondents replied that there is no direct relation between the IA CE activities and their lives. One comment as example: "It is possible that the activities of IA CE are affecting my professional activities, family and social life, but I cannot identify mechanisms, through which this is happening." Representatives of some SMEs accepted that joint economic and trade strategies and programmes can have influence on their business activities.

Question 3> In which sectors must the International Association of Carpathian Euroregion improve its cooperation?

Priority development areas in RO part of the CE (Arithmetic Mean)

Rank	Topic	AM
1	Economy	2,09
2	Tourism	2,64
3	Nature protection and natural disasters Tourism	3,38

4	Cooperation of the young people	3,85
5	Cultural heritage and cultural events	4,11
6	Science and research	4,18
7	Agriculture and food industry coexistence of different ethnic groups	4,27
8	International sport events	5,24
9	Community cooperation focused on peaceful	6,31
10	Other	9,30

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Economy & Trade (e.g. cooperation and networking of SMEs, organization of exhibitions and contracting markets, etc...)	46	11	4	4	4	1	1	1	2	0	-	2,09	1,94	74

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Most of the respondents prefer support of networking activities esp. for SMEs (e.g. cross-border clusters), creation of a database of SME's that imports/exports and possible investment/trade projects in Euroregion, support business start-up & spin offs incl. infrastructure and services for SMEs, organisation of the CE trade fairs. Some of respondents would welcome trainings and exchange of experts, esp. to support R&D in companies, some would like to see higher promotion of local products.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Tourism (e.g. joint cross-border touristic products, destination promotion, etc...)	17	24	16	6	9	1	1	0	0	0	-	2,64	1,42	74

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: The key development areas should be> enhanced promotion of tourist destinations, touristic infrastructure development, development of joint tourism packages, development of thematic cross-border touristic routes and linking touristic networks.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Agriculture and food industry	8	13	8	6	18	11	4	4	2	0	-	4,27	2,15	74

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Most of respondents would favour enhanced facility services for small farmers & manufacturers esp. towards eco agriculture, improved cross-border promotion of agricultural products and to exploit agricultural production on different markets, organisation of joint seminars and workshops for transfer of know-how on technology and farming methods, market, distribution chains, etc. as well as organization of joint exhibitions and contracting markets.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Science and research	14	11	10	7	11	5	4	7	4	1	-	4,18	2,59	74

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Most of actions should be aimed at transfer of know-how, organisation of seminars and workshops on latest science and research developments, exchanges between University professors

and students, common actions and projects in the research field, esp. in these areas: economy, tourism, heritage, history, culture.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Cultural heritage and cultural events	5	18	12	9	7	11	8	1	3	0	-	4,11	2,15	74

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Respondents would welcome organisation of common events for promotion of cultural values, organization of international festivals, inter-cultural exchanges, and development of heritage tourism. Several respondents would also welcome joint promotion of the CE customs and traditions – as part of the tourism promotion activities. Some respondents proposed to share experience and improve policies to protect cultural heritage of the CE.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Nature protection and facing / prevention of natural disasters	13	14	17	15	3	4	5	3	0	0	-	3,38	1,93	74

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Respondents would welcome joint CBC projects in order to prevent natural disasters, sharing experience in this field and most of respondents would like to have awareness raising campaigns on the nature protection, incl. organization of trainings and seminars for information/education in the field of nature protection and natural disasters prevention.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Cooperation of the young people	11	14	13	7	11	7	6	5	0	0	-	3,85	2,15	74

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Most respondents favour support of youth NGOs and their youth cooperation programs, exchanges of young people, e.g. via summer camps, organisation of competitions, festivals, discussion “clubs”, etc. Several respondents stressed the necessity to support projects for strengthening the common identity.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Sports	3	8	8	14	8	6	8	14	5	0	-	5,24	2,35	74

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Most of people would support organization of cross-border sports competitions and maybe some joint CE championship in selected sports.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Community cooperation focused on peaceful coexistence of different ethnic groups	4	5	5	5	11	1	13	8	18	4	-	6,31	2,66	74

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Most of respondents would welcome experience exchange in the field of ethnic inclusion and mass media cooperation in the promotion of peaceful coexistence and the unequivocal delineation from extremist currents.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Other (health care, social care, etc.)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	44	9,30	4,08	30

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Other areas for development were identified: social projects for disadvantaged people, higher cooperation of mass-media, cross-border regional development planning, and creation of cross border cooperation platforms in sustainability domains.

Q4> Do the regional governments in Hungary, Slovakia, Ukraine, Poland and Romania have to coordinate their actions in the near future and develop a coherent solution to contribute to a faster and more effective institutional reorganization of IA "Carpathian Euroregion"?	yes 46,95%	perhaps 35,49%	not sure 10,81%	rather not 5,40%	not at all 1,35%
--	---------------	-------------------	--------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Comments: Some respondents stressed a need for the Joint Development Strategy of the CE, kind of the Europe 2020 Strategy. Most of the respondents mentioned need of regional administrations getting closer to ordinary citizens, understanding their needs, to work for their benefits, showing concrete result of the CE cooperation, etc. Some respondents wish to have higher involvement of national institutions into the CE cooperation, even at the level of presidents and ministers. Several respondents called for new or revised regional development cooperation structure that needs to harmonise its objectives (Strategy) and Actions (Operational Procedures) to new geopolitical environment (e.g. situation in Ukraine) and EU level policies. Several respondents would welcome establishment of similar institutions in all CE countries for management of the CE cooperation (or joint institution – EGTC) that can improve and simplify ways to take joint decisions. On the other side, minority of respondents could not see the benefits from institutional reorganisation of the IA CE for their everyday life.

Q5> Would it be appropriate for the European Commission to establish a separate cross-border cooperation programme for the CE territory in addition to other programs (e.g. kind of Danube strategy)?	yes 54,05%	perhaps 25,68%	not sure 10,81%	rather not 8,11%	not at all 1,35%
---	---------------	-------------------	--------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Comments: Even the most of respondents are in favour of such programme, there were a lot of negative comments. The positive ones noted that such programme can significantly improve common future development plans and projects and a dedicated financial instrument in most cases is a good catalyst for materialization of the projects of a certain organizations. Negative comments noted that previous experience of these programs demonstrates the usefulness of these financial allocations. Another respondent noted: "It would contribute to the development of some institutions for sure, although not necessary of the region itself." Some respondents consider current programmes sufficient regarding the support of cross-border cooperation.

Slovakia

Q1> Are you aware about the existence and activities of the "Carpathian Euroregion" and/or are you involved in some form of cross-border cooperation within the "Carpathian Euroregion" (not necessarily only grant projects).	yes 41 58,6%	Perhaps 8 11,4%	not sure 8 11,4%	rather not 5 7,1%	not at all 8 11,4%
--	--------------------	-----------------------	------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------

Comments:

Several respondents participated directly at the activities of the International organisation CE and, or are also members (esp. mayors of responded municipalities) of the Slovak part of the CE. Mostly respondents know some publications prepared by the CE Slovakia, or know the CE from its national website. Four respondents presented very close cooperation with the CE, esp. on joint projects. And another four respondents had some professional relation to the CE – former employees, former members of Board of Directors, co-founders of the CE. On the other hand, young people and students never heard about the CE.

Q2> Do the activities of the Interregional Association (IA) “Carpathian Euroregion” influence your life?	yes	Perhaps	not sure	rather not	not at all
	24	9	7	18	12
	34,3%	12,8%	10,0%	25,7%	17,1%

Comments:

Most of respondents answered that they are using information from brochures issued by CE, esp. about cultural heritage, bike paths for the tourism reasons. Some replied that reading publications improved their information about the territory of the CE and their neighbouring regions. Some would welcome more publications on development of cycling tourism in the CE incl. cycling maps. Representatives of regional administration and municipalities have also experience with joint projects and participation at the conferences organised by the IA CE. Several respondents however commented that activities of the IA CE are year-by-year more seldom, less visible and limited.

Question 3> In which sectors must the International Association of Carpathian Euroregion improve its cooperation?

Priority development areas in SK part of the CE (Arithmetic Mean)

Rank	Topic	AM
1	Economy & Trade	3,14
2	Cultural heritage and cultural events	3,78
3	Tourism	3,80
4	Cooperation of the young people	4,14
5	Science and research	4,42
6	Nature protection and natural disasters	4,44
7	Community cooperation focused on peaceful coexistence of different ethnic groups	4,55
8	International sport events	5,11
9	Agriculture and food industry	5,36
10	Other	9,20

Economy & Trade (e.g. cooperation and networking of SMEs, organization of exhibitions and contracting markets, etc...)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	28	6	9	3	8	1	2	3	2	2	6	3,14	2,65	64

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments:

Role of the CE see several respondents in organisation of networking and clustering activities across borders, exchange programs, information database creation, mapping of new work possibilities in neighbouring regions. Representatives of intermediaries (chambers, RDAs, business

centres) would also welcome creation and support of joint ventures, joint training system and the movement of skilled labour across borders, preparation of coordinated targeted investment, activities related to transfer of EU standards for Ukraine, organization of exhibitions and sales markets esp. for small and medium businesses, etc. One businessman noted: “I do not see any results of previous action in this field in my region. It must be top priority for the future.”

Cultural heritage and cultural events	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	11	14	12	8	4	4	4	5	3	0	5	3,78	2,45	65

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments:

Most of respondents would welcome support of cooperation between communities and cultural organizations esp. on joint cultural events (festivals, symposiums, concerts, performances, religious traditional events etc.), different kind of publications production and improvement (modernisation) of the cultural and historical sites in the CE. Esp. mayors of villages would welcome also revitalization of the surrounding area and small-scale infrastructure related to cultural tourism (signs, parking lots, toilets, monuments etc.).

Tourism (e.g. joint cross-border touristic products, destination promotion, etc...)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	14	13	9	10	4	1	4	2	4	3	6	3,80	2,74	64

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments:

Generally, most of the respondents would welcome higher tourism promotion and information sharing of the CE territory using several tools: joint information publications, web sites & social networks, information boards at the border crossings, tourist destinations promoting/marketing etc. Several respondents would welcome improved cooperation between tourist companies & agents and/or establishment of joint cross-border tourism enterprises. Some respondents would welcome also joint touristic products, improving the Carpathians image, even the “CE brand” creation, networking of tourism actors and staff training (providers of tourism services).

Agriculture and food industry	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	5	3	6	10	8	4	0	3	13	1	17	5,36	2,75	53

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments:

Respondents would welcome higher exchange of information on agricultural and food products production and market development, including improvement of information and warning systems related to quality of food, possible contamination of food products, health protection of people and animals etc. Some respondents would welcome support of bio & eco products and small & home farmers. Three respondents would even welcome higher integration of the CE agriculture market, e.g. via joint agricultural holdings and cross-border joint-venture creation as a PPP projects.

Science and research	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	9	9	7	8	10	9	4	6	3	0	5	4,42	2,42	65

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments:

Most of respondents would welcome joint research projects through international / EU grants, enhancement of the Universities cooperation between themselves, but also with business sector. Several respondents recommend elaborating joint R&D and education modernisation strategy for the CE territory, since coordination is very weak, results of the current research are “very weak”, competitiveness and quality of the research and educational institutions in the CE is very low compared to other EU regions.

Nature protection and facing / prevention of natural disasters	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	9	7	10	3	12	12	5	3	2	1	6	4,44	2,35	64

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments:

Most of the respondents would welcome further investment into improvement of the cross-border information systems for natural disasters, joint trainings of forces to battle the natural disasters and investment into prevention of disasters (e.g. flood & fire prevention measures). Second highest group of respondents would welcome higher protection of the nature in the CE territory, higher coordination & cooperation of institutions responsible for nature protection and joint projects that would lead to higher protection of nature. Some respondents would even like to have joint initiatives that would lead to same/joint nature protection standards, incl. e.g. harmonisation and increase of fines for pollution.

Cooperation of the young people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	7	12	10	10	7	7	7	4	0	1	5	4,14	2,25	65

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments:

Majority of respondents’ see the main role of CBC in organisation of joint cultural, sport and educational events (e.g. knowledge competitions) for young people, enable them to meet as often as possible. Such regular and unregularly organised events should be supported by students’ exchanges, summer schools, ambassadors programs etc. Several respondents also mentioned need to face the problem of unemployment of young people. Sharing know-how how to face the problem and joint projects in this area, incl. e.g. joint trainings of young unemployed could be tested.

Sports	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	8	5	9	4	5	7	12	11	3	0	6	5,11	2,57	64

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments:

Most of the respondents would welcome organisation of sports events between communities that that would also focus on networking, building partnerships and friendships across the border. Some people also propose exchange programs for the talented young sportsmen and organization of regional cross-border leagues, e.g. in soccer, basketball, volleyball or other sports.

Community cooperation focused on peaceful coexistence of different ethnic groups	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	8	14	4	8	9	3	4	6	8	0	6	4,55	2,73	64

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments:

Most of recommendations in this area were proposed on the basis of “people-to-people” activities. Other respondents would welcome more information sharing and exchange of good practices on community development and on inclusion of the Roma minority.

Other	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
		1								9	60	9,20	2,53	10

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments:

Only few people added any other topic. Most of them mentioned possible cooperation in health & social sector, e.g. providing health services across the border. Some mentioned need for historical research of the development of the CE territory and its inhabitants and one responded mentioned need to fight with high corruption at all levels of society on the territory of the CE.

Q4> Do the regional governments in Hungary, Slovakia, Ukraine, Poland and Romania have to coordinate their actions in the near future and develop a coherent solution to contribute to a faster and more effective institutional reorganization of IA “Carpathian Euroregion”?	yes	perhaps	not sure	rather not	not at all
	33	18	14	3	1
	47,8%	26,1%	20,3%	4,3%	1,4%

Comments:

Most of the respondents were in favour of the higher coordination, however, some advised to coordinate firstly in each country itself and decide what is the role and position of the national part of the CE. Some respondents call for higher involvement of regional administrations and cities in the CE national part. On the other hand, several respondents pointed out on the need to keep independence of the national part of the CE from the “political influence” of national and/or even regional administration. One respondent would increase the role of CBC intergovernmental commissions in CBC and replaced the current model by governmental one.

Q5> Would it be appropriate for the European Commission to establish a separate cross-border cooperation programme for the CE territory in addition to other programs (e.g. kind of Danube strategy)?	yes	perhaps	not sure	rather not	not at all
	50	13	4	2	0
	72,5%	18,9%	5,8%	2,9%	0,0%

Comments:

Total majority voted yes and most of the comments we can summarize to this sentence: “any new financial aid to underdeveloped regions such as the CE is good & such program would enable enhanced cooperation through the whole CE territory incl. Polish region.” At the same time, several respondents called for higher transparency of such programs and more effective spending of such external resources.

Ukraine

Ivano-Frankivsk oblast

Q1> Are you aware about the existence and activities of the "Carpathian Euroregion" and/or are you involved in some form of cross-border cooperation within the “Carpathian Euroregion” (not necessarily only grant projects).	yes	perhaps	not sure	rather not	not at all
	7,7%	15,38%	26,92%	26,92%	23,08%

Comments: Several respondents were involved in CBC projects, esp. in the area of tourism development. Some respondents heard about CE from mass media. Most of the respondents would recommend improving information exchange, mass media communication and social networks for promotion of the CE.

Q2> Do the activities of the Interregional Association (IA) “Carpathian Euroregion” influence your life?	yes 3,81%	perhaps 15,38%	not sure 7,7%	rather not 42,33%	not at all 30,78%
--	--------------	-------------------	------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Comments: Most people that answered positively are active participants of projects of the IA CE, e.g. participants at the conferences organised. Some entrepreneurs noted that the IA CE should enrich its activities so, that it can help business processes in the CE to become more effective, e.g. improvement of common information resources, improvement of business legislation and formal procedures e.g. related to cross border flow of goods, etc. Majority of respondents do not see any influence on their lives.

Question 3> In which sectors must the International Association of Carpathian Euroregion improve its cooperation?

Priority development areas in Ivano-Frankivsk oblast (Arithmetic Mean)

Rank	Topic	AM
1	Economy & Trade	1,83
2	Tourism	3,61
3-4	Nature protection and natural disasters	4,26
3-4	Agriculture and food industry	4,26
5	Science and research	4,53
6	Cultural heritage and cultural events	5,60
7	Cooperation of the young people	5,71
8	Community cooperation focused on peaceful coexistence of different ethnic groups	6,19
9	International sport events	7,50
10	Other	8,97

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Economy & Trade (e.g. cooperation and networking of SMEs, organization of exhibitions and contracting markets, etc...)	45	5	5	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	2	1,83	1,97	60

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Most of respondents would welcome activities aimed at simplification of business processes (e.g. in trade: export-import operations, joint tourism development), dealing with environmental issues and impacts, creation and cooperation of SME-s networks, and information basis for cross-border market access.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Tourism (e.g. joint cross-border touristic products, destination promotion, etc...)	5	31	5	2	-	10	2	5	-	2	-	3,61	2,46	62

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Main initiatives according to respondents should involve improvement of tourism infrastructure, creation of tourist networks, and deployment of navigation and rescue systems for tourists.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Agriculture and food industry	5	12	12	7	5	7	10	2	2		-	4,26	2,21	62

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Most people would welcome multilingual information resources providing e.g. price information on commodities, organisation of workshops and trainings on agriculture and food industry, joint trading facilities for small farmers & manufacturers, and activities aimed at creating profitable environment for investments in the sector.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Science and research	10	7	5	10	12	2	7	2	5	2	-	4,53	2,58	62

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Top priorities should be: creation of the network of universities, research labs with involvement of local authorities, NGOs and businesses; exchanges between university professors and students; organisation of scientific conferences and workshops; and joint research activities.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Cultural heritage and cultural events	-	-	5	10	21	10	7	5	2	2	-	5,6	1,66	62

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Respondents would welcome organisation of common cultural events, artistic symposia, international festivals, etc. and organisation of conferences on historical and cultural heritage protection.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Nature protection and facing / prevention of natural disasters	-	10	19	14	5	2	7	-	5	-	-	4,26	2,02	62

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Common CBC projects with unified efforts aimed to mitigate natural disaster hazards, cooperation in protected areas management and sharing experience, and enhancement of rescue infrastructure and services provided.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Cooperation of the young people	-	2	10	10	-	16	12	10	-	2	-	5,71	1,96	62

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Top priorities should be: supporting youth projects and initiatives esp. on topics like reducing energy consumption, environment protection, intercultural and historical heritage, looking for common identity as inhabitants of CE, etc.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Sports	-	2	5	2	5		2	17	27	2	-	7,50	2,17	62

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Priorities seen by most of respondents: Organizing of cross-border championships and other sports events in the context of the Carpathian Euroregion that will promote strengthening the common identity and promote IA CE as institution itself.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Community cooperation focused on peaceful coexistence of different ethnic groups	-	5	5	5	7	10	7	12	11	-	-	6,19	2,20	62

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Most respondents would welcome activities aimed at promotion of peaceful coexistence of ethnic groups and the unequivocal delineation from extremist currents, sharing experience in the field of ethnic inclusion, and promoting common identity and ways of thinking, common CE values.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	n.a	AM	SD	N
Other (health care, social care)	-	-	2	5	-	2	2	2	2	47	-	8,97	2,09	62

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Some respondents would welcome organising workshops and seminars on improving healthcare systems in the CE countries. Others would like to have higher cooperation of institutions dealing with disadvantaged people. One of the respondents also highlighted need for simplification of border and custom procedures and other formalities when crossing the border.

Q4> Do the regional governments in Hungary, Slovakia, Ukraine, Poland and Romania have to coordinate their actions in the near future and develop a coherent solution to contribute to a faster and more effective institutional reorganization of IA “Carpathian Euroregion”?	Yes 50,00%	Perhaps 26,93%	not sure 15,38%	rather not 7,69%	not at all 0,00%
--	---------------	-------------------	--------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Comments: Several respondents noted that signing the political part of the Association Agreement between Ukraine and EU is the most important event that will have a great influence on all aspects of life in Carpathian Euroregion. This should support further development of relationships between citizens, regional authorities and other institutions. Therefore open discussions on common CE problems and finding solutions should be carried on regular basis with EU partners at all levels.

Q5> Would it be appropriate for the European Commission to establish a separate cross-border cooperation programme for the CE territory in addition to other programs (e.g. kind of Danube strategy)?	Yes 38,46%	Perhaps 30,77%	not sure 23,08%	rather not 7,69%	not at all 0,00%
---	---------------	-------------------	--------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Comments: Most of respondents see such initiative as positive: “Establishing a separate CBC program covering CE territory is extremely necessary, because CE after signing of the political part of the Association Agreement between Ukraine and EU is becoming now a special part of Europe. This will have a great influence on European stability, common security system and economy.” Other respondents noted that huge investment into the infrastructure on the CE territory is needed and therefore external sources are very welcomed.

Zakarpattya oblast

Q1> Are you aware about the existence and activities of the "Carpathian Euroregion" and/or are you involved in some form of cross-border cooperation within the "Carpathian Euroregion" (not necessarily only grant projects).	yes	Perhaps	not sure	rather not	not at all
	42	18	9	6	4
	53,16%	22,78%	11,00%	7,59%	5,00%

Comments: A lot of respondents had an opportunity to directly participate of heard of cross-border projects of the Interregional Association "Carpathian Euroregion", esp. financed through the ENPI CBC 2007-2013 programme, but also other programs. Some mentioned concrete projects, e.g. with SK town Michalovce in the field of SMEs cooperation. However, some mentioned that the heard of the CE, but don't have any information on the activities and projects of the IA CE.

Q2> Do the activities of the Interregional Association (IA) "Carpathian Euroregion" influence your life?	yes	perhaps	not sure	rather not	not at all
	19	28	9	11	12
	24,05%	35,44%	11,39%	13,92%	15,19%

Comments: Most of the respondents that replied "yes" noted that the CE provides the opportunities for scientific persons and students to take the data and baselines to make graduation and scientific works. Others were somehow participating directly or indirectly on some projects with "the CE status." Few respondents added, that there were different levels of cooperation e.g. during 1993 – 2008 all CE regions had same conditions, in the period 1998 – 2004 the CE activity in 4 countries were oriented to the EU integration and the Ukraine has fallen behind. Years 2005-2014 are connected to new financial instruments for CBC and many projects realised, however, respondents could not exactly say with what impact.

Question 3> In which sectors must the International Association of Carpathian Euroregion improve its cooperation?

Priority development areas in Zakarpattya oblast (Arithmetic Mean)

Rank	Topic	AM
1	Economy	2,83
2	Cooperation of the young people	3,60
3	Tourism	3,83
4	Cultural heritage and cultural events	4,12
5	Science and research	4,18
6	Nature protection and natural disasters	4,32
7	Agriculture and food industry	4,56
8	Community cooperation focused on peaceful coexistence of different ethnic groups	4,64
9	International sport events	5,56
10	Other	7,79

Economy & Trade (e.g. cooperation and networking of SMEs, organization of exhibitions and contracting markets, etc...)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	38	3	8	1	4	3	1	1	1	5	0	2,83	2,88	65

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: One quotation of all positive answers: "Nothing unites us so much as joint economic interests in joint geographical area." Many respondents would welcome support of innovative

knowledge-based economy development and establishment of clusters, logistics centres, etc. with joint aim of attracting investments to the Carpathian Euroregion area. Several respondents called for higher support of SMEs, development of innovations and know-know transfer, even creation of the special funds for financing of strategic regional economic projects. Some respondents noted the need to enhance operation of the Free Economic Zone Zakarpattya.

Tourism (e.g. joint cross-border touristic products, destination promotion, etc...)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	21	11	5	5	5	3	2	4	2	6	1	3,83	3,10	64

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Priorities should include development of the thematic tourism routes across the CE area, joint development of the Action Plans e.g. for joint touristic products, forming one common tourism brand “Carpathians” or on establishment of “the GeoThermParks”. Best practices should be shared between the stakeholders, networks of tourist and information centres should be established, information and promotional programs to support tourism should be put in place. Some respondents mentioned need to simplify border crossing for tourists.

Agriculture and food industry	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	9	14	8	2	4	4	9	7	5	1	0	4,56	2,83	63

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Respondents would welcome development of the CBC partnerships in agriculture and food industry, esp. for experience exchange and for adaptation of the agriculture and food industry in Ukraine to the EU standards. Environmentally friendly agricultural projects should be supported and some respondents would welcome joint fairs, exhibitions of agricultural products (wine, beekeeping, local products).

Science and research	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	11	11	8	4	6	7	8	5	2	0	0	4,18	2,36	62

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Priority activities in this area should focus on development of human resources at the R&D institutions in the CE, establishment of the technoparks and science exchange programs, joint research esp. in economy, culture, tourism, history, agriculture and energy effectiveness.

Cultural heritage and cultural events	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	13	9	9	8	6	7	6	6	0	2	0	4,12	2,50	66

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Respondents mentioned mostly these priorities: development of the directory (catalogue) for the cultural events in the CE, organisation of joint cultural events and many respondents would welcome higher involvement of the IA CE in projects for conservation and restoration of historical and cultural architecture – churches, castles, monuments, etc.

Nature protection and facing / prevention of natural disasters	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	14	6	8	9	2	9	4	3	4	3	0	4,32	2,78	62

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Priorities should be: implementation of the programs and projects oriented on the adaptation of the nature protection and ecology in Ukraine towards the EU standards, esp. in solid waste management, adaptation to climate change, conservation of nature, reforestation and biodiversity. Environmental networks and community based environmental activities should be supported, even some respondents propose establishment of joint funding programs for nature protection and natural disasters prevention for small scale project support.

Cooperation of the young people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	17	17	4	2	7	5	1	8	0	2	0	3,60	2,69	63

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Priority should be: involvement of the youth of Ukraine to the EU Youth initiatives esp. within the CE. One idea was the establishment of the European Exchange School and the International Educational Consortium that should support activities related to youth cooperation. Such initiatives should lead to intensification of contacts between students and increasing mobility of young people. Some respondents also recommended exchanges of children for rest and health recovery reasons (summer schools, including religious groups meetings, language schools and thematic camps for kids).

Sports	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	10	5	6	1	7	1	16	8	3	7	0	5,56	3,02	64

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Most of respondents would welcome organization of joint sport events, competitions and joint training camps e.g. of young sportsmen.

Community cooperation focused on peaceful coexistence of different ethnic groups	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	12	7	6	4	9	1	2	6	3	6	0	4,64	3,11	56

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Respondents recommended organisation of multi-ethnic events & joint projects with involvement of different ethnic groups. Some would like to see higher support for minority schools in neighbouring countries of the CE. Other part of the respondents would support existing partnerships between towns and villages (sister cities projects).

Other (to be added)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	No answer	AM	SD	N
	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	4	16	0	7,79	3,31	29

AM – Arithmetic Mean, SD – Standard Deviation, N – Number of responses calculated (without No answers)

Comments: Other proposals included need for support of media cooperation in the CE, development and implementation of energy efficiency measures in public buildings, health care cooperation, and few respondents would direct the support for infrastructure projects in the CBC areas (roads, bridges, etc.).

Q4> Do the regional governments in Hungary, Slovakia, Ukraine, Poland and Romania have to coordinate their actions in the near future and develop a coherent solution to contribute to a faster and more effective institutional reorganization of IA "Carpathian Euroregion"?	yes	perhaps	not sure	rather not	not at all
	52	21	3	1	1
	66,67%	26,92%	3,85%	1,28%	1,28%

Comments: Most of the respondents are in favour of higher coordination of actions for faster and more effective institutional reorganization of the IA CE, within the new geopolitical conditions resulting from the signing of the political part of the Association Agreement between Ukraine and EU. Several comments asked for modernization of the mission of the IA CE, e.g. to complete the legal registration of the organization for the status of international organization (EGTC). Several other respondents wish to keep the current status of the IA CE, but would welcome more deep cooperation of national parts of the CE on joint initiatives.

Q5> Would it be appropriate for the European Commission to establish a separate cross-border cooperation programme for the CE territory in addition to other programs (e.g. kind of Danube strategy)?	yes	perhaps	not sure	rather not	not at all
	53	22	1	1	1
	67,95%	28,21%	1,28%	1,28%	1,28%

Comments: Huge majority of respondents would welcome separate CBC program for the whole territory of the CE, incl. possible increase of financial allocations. Some respondents made a concern that because of weak political will and lack of joint initiative, it seems that this possibility will be lost even for period behind 2020. One respondent replied that current CBC programs and the Eastern Partnership initiatives provide enough opportunities for cooperation in the CE.

3. Experts interviews

Hungary

Six Hungarians experts (2 civil servants, 3 researchers, 1 project manager / expert) were interviewed. Half of them are actively participating in institutions that are developing the CE (the Carpathian Foundation, the Regional Development Association for the Carpathian Euroregion, the Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén County Council as member of the Hungarian National Part) and the others are doing research on different aspects of the CE cooperation.

Hungarian experts have a uniform view about the CE: the most successful period of the CE was between 1993 and 2003. CE had a geopolitical and international mission, but after the transition of the CEE countries, unfortunately, intensity of the cooperation has been changed (esp. after accession to the EU). Although the IA CE can get additional resources due to the EU-membership and several CBC programs, it has lost its international importance. The new frame of the cooperation has been dominated in the format between the EU and the V4. Researchers also noted that CE as interregional organization doesn't have political significance anymore.

Key success & failure factors of current functioning of the IA CE:

Success factors	Failure factors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - keeping institutional activities of the Interregional Association "Carpathian Euroregion" alive, including organisation of conferences, expert group meetings, realization of pilot projects, joint strategy development - created network of institutions (NGO, local government, civil servant, SME) covered by Interregional Association "Carpathian Euroregion" - other reasons mentioned: personality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - insufficient level of information exchange among regional authorities and border regions of Carpathian Euroregion's countries on the needs and opportunities of cross-border cooperation - Association "Carpathian Euroregion", including: legal status, hierarchy and management system, common resource (financial) basis, cross-border network of experts and etc. - other reasons mentioned: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) differences between the aims and motivation of the national parts

and commitment of the chairman is very important	b) barriers on borders of Ukraine (and Romania) c) lack of clear vision
--	--

Problems that must be resolved for a significant improvement and increase of the efficiency of Interregional Association “Carpathian Euroregion” were rated by HU experts so:

Rank of importance	Arithmetic Mean	Measure to be taken
1	1,650	creating a stable financial basis as institutional (contributions of regions), and project (Development Fund of Carpathian Euroregion - Carpathian Foundation) activities of the Carpathian Euroregion (<i>source-driven development is incidental, grants are not enough to calculable operation and development</i>)
2	2,17	institutional improvement of Carpathian Euroregion (legal status of the Carpathian Euroregion; management system; common decision making, etc.) (<i>sound legal background is required</i>)
3	3,33	development, by the border regions of the 5 countries, of a consolidated Strategy of Carpathian Euroregion’s activities in the medium (long term) perspective
4	4,67	development and implementation of a Communication Strategy of the Interregional Association “Carpathian Euroregion”
5	5,00	development and implementation of measures on promotion and branding of the Carpathian Euroregion’s activities on a permanent basis
6	5,17	intensification and improving the communication and cooperation between Carpathian Euroregion and various European programs and institutions (Danube Strategy, Eastern Partnership, ENPI, Visegrad Fund, Carpathian Strategy, Association of European Border Regions “AEBR”, etc.)
7	6,17	purposeful and active involvement of inter-municipal component (partner cities, Twin Cities, Association of self-governments and others) and civil society organizations to the activities of Carpathian Euroregion
8	8	other problems

When speaking about the possible change of “legal” status of the IA CE for the EGTC, Hungarian experts were not united. Some experts think that the EGTC-form alone will not solve the problem. Several other factors can influence the successful operation (joint mission and aims, stable financial basis, etc.). Other experts think that it can be useful, because:

- in an EGTC partners are forced to cooperate more intensively, organizational duplication can be eliminated;
- an EGTC has better chance to get financial supports and grants in current period;
- an EGTC represents a stable legal form with clear decision-making processes.

Generalized vision of improving the role and position of the Interregional Association “Carpathian Euroregion” until 2020 in current conditions, in a view of HU experts can be summarized in these points:

- Stronger and more formalized cooperation is needed:
 - a) Creating a stable financial basis
 - b) Strengthening internal and external communication
 - c) Assessment of long-term opportunities for institutional renewal (EGTC vs. macro-regional strategy at EU-level)

- Mediatory function in Euro-Atlantic integration of Ukraine – using the accumulated experiences and the personal contacts (transfer of experience about democracy, self-governance and self-government).
- Potential areas of the cooperation: tourism, culture, R&D, education, social care, economy.
- The cooperation can be developed to a “Carpathian knowledge region” – based on the strong tertiary education and R&D experiences.
- The uncertain political situation in Ukraine can influence adversely the interregional cooperation.
- Carpathian Horizon 2020 >> European macrostrategy can be one of the alternatives.
- Continuation of Nyiregyhaza Initiative (EuroClip Public Foundation: <http://www.euroclip.hu//en/?>) is needed.
- Trust, commitment, motivation and joint mission are required. Potential advantages should be made clear at all level (population, communities, municipals, authorities, county, and country).
- Maybe the territory of the CE is too large. Bi- or trilateral cooperation can be function more effectively.
- International good practices have to be analysed (South-Tirol, SaarLorLux, Dutch and Spanish examples).
- Creating (inter)regional identity is very important, but high investment (not just financial) is needed.

Romania

In Romanian part of the CE, 44 interviews were conducted. Most of the respondents were civil servant at national/regional administrations (13), officers at local authorities (12), representative of small and medium-sized businesses (7), and experts, researchers and academicians (12). All of them have some experience in cooperation with the IA CE, esp. participating at events and study tours organised by the IA CE, or doing research on some aspects of the CE development. Most of Interviewed civil servants are members of the Romanian part of the IA CE.

77,5% evaluate the function of the IA CE as partially successful, 17,5% as successful and only 5,0% as unsuccessful and ineffective. Most of respondents welcome possibilities that the IA CE is providing to keep the contacts with partners from other CE regions and countries and to exchange and share experience e.g. via conferences, workshops organised.

Key success & failure factors of current functioning of the IA CE:

Success factors	Failure factors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - motivation of border regions' institution and also communities for cross/border cooperation - institutional activities of the Interregional Association “Carpathian Euroregion”, including conferences, expert group meetings, realization of pilot projects, joint strategy development - already established cooperation networks that can be base for further development of cooperation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - barriers of borders with Ukraine, despite the existence of Carpathian Euroregion - systemic inefficiency of “institutional activities” of the Interregional Association “Carpathian Euroregion”, including: legal status, hierarchy and management system, common resource (financial) basis cross-border network of experts and etc. - reduced level of motivation of Carpathian Euroregion border regions' communities (population) for CBC - insufficient level of information exchange among regional authorities and border regions of

	Carpathian Euroregion's countries on the needs and opportunities of cross-border cooperation
--	--

Only 1/5 of RO respondents (7) see the joining of Hungary, Slovakia, Poland (later - Romania) to the EU as a problematic factor for development of the cooperation in the CE. More respondents (10) think that this process brought new possibilities for CBC cooperation. Others respondents are neutral.

Problems that must be resolved for a significant improvement and increase of the efficiency of Interregional Association "Carpathian Euroregion" were rated by RO experts so:

Rank of importance	Measure to be taken
1	development and implementation of measures on promotion and branding of the Carpathian Euroregion's activities on a permanent basis
2	creating a stable financial basis as institutional (contributions of regions), and project (Development Fund of Carpathian Euroregion - Carpathian Foundation) activities of the Carpathian Euroregion (<i>source-driven development is incidental, grants are not enough to calculable operation and development</i>)
3	institutional improvement of Carpathian Euroregion (legal status of the Carpathian Euroregion; management system; common decision making, etc.) (<i>sound legal background is required</i>)
4	development, by the border regions of the 5 countries, of a consolidated Strategy of Carpathian Euroregion's activities in the medium (long term) perspective
5	purposeful and active involvement of inter-municipal component (partner cities, Twin Cities, Association of self-governments and others) and civil society organizations to the activities of Carpathian Euroregion
6	development and implementation of a Communication Strategy of the Interregional Association "Carpathian Euroregion"
7	intensification and improving the communication and cooperation between Carpathian Euroregion and various European programs and institutions (Danube Strategy, Eastern Partnership, ENPI, Visegrad Fund, Carpathian Strategy, Association of European Border Regions "AEBR", etc.)
8	other problems

76,7 % of RO respondents are in favour of the CE EGTC establishment and transformation of the IA CE into such legal person. The others are against. Elaboration of a common development strategy/ identification of common projects portfolio / implementation of joint projects is seen as the key initial step for improving the role and position of the Interregional Association "Carpathian Euroregion" until 2020 in current conditions (22 respondents), while 21 respondents don't know what initiatives should be taken. One respondent estimated the collapse of the CBC cooperation in the CE and he/she doesn't see effectiveness of supporting the functioning of the IA CE in the current economic and geopolitics situation.

Slovakia

8 interviews were conducted in Slovak part of the CE – Prešov and Košice regions. 3 respondents are directly involved in the CE activities (employees of the Slovak part of the IA CE and the Carpathian Foundation), 3 respondents are experts of NGOs involved into CBC projects in the CE territory and 2 were researchers/academicians dealing with CBC and the CE issues.

When evaluating functioning of the CBC in CE, all 8 respondents rated it as partially successful, mostly referencing for good years in between 1998 till 2004. We can summarize their comments: CE has been established with the aim to support the CBC on borders of five post-communist countries. It met its original goal as it created platform for regular communication between the regional and local authorities of 5 countries, however, it could not expand sufficiently into lower levels of cooperation between CBC actors in terms of creating sustainable networks of CBC e.g. on NGOs and SMEs levels.

Especially in later stages, the cooperation became more concrete and results-bringing, when only particularly interested countries/region was involved. This was related mainly to projects dealing with local problems or interests where bi-lateral or tri-lateral cooperation seemed to be more useful and successful compared to 5-countries cooperation. It had several reasons:

- 1) Romania as one of the involved countries represented a permanent source of questions and uncertainties as member local and regional governments were getting in and out of the association based on the current political circumstances in the country. This made the cooperation with them challenging for the rest of the involved entities.
- 2) Different form of governance on local and regional level in all of the countries represented another challenge for cooperation especially due to different level of independence and decision-making power.
- 3) The second part of existence of IA Carpathian Euroregion (after 2004) was strongly affected by passive approach of many of the members and even the leaders of the structure. This might be the direct consequence of the changed political and economic environment in the area and the fact that cooperation within EU can be achieved by other methods and approaches and the role of Carpathian Euroregion is no longer the same as it was in the beginning of its existence.
- 4) At the same time, after 4 out of 5 countries entered European Union, cooperation with Ukraine became difficult and challenging due to the border. This is a permanent bother for most of the entities trying to establish contacts and cooperation with Ukrainian organizations and regions.
- 5) Specific role and impact was achieved by the EU CBC programs, which still are based mostly on bilateral CBC (e.g. SK-HU, SK-PL, HU-RO programmes) and ENPI HU-RO-SK-UA CBC program lack of Polish involvement. Many CBC actors therefore concentrated mostly on bilateral cooperation and in case of Poland, many links were broken esp. between PL and RO/HU regions.

Key success & failure factors of current functioning of the IA CE:

Success factors	Failure factors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - institutional activities of the CE implemented by regional authorities remain the cornerstone of the CBC within CE (conferences, expert group meetings, realization of pilot projects, joint strategy developments) - considering mainly the first half of operation of IA Carpathian Euroregion, the cooperation was mainly driven by local NGOs and local governments who felt strong interest in joint programs and cooperation. Those represented a great opportunity to break out from isolation and exploring new territories. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CBC within CE suffered from the interventions of the national governments which led to its enormous territorial expansion. In other words it brought under one umbrella regions that are culturally but also in terms of social and economic conditions too different and do not create - barriers on the borders of EU countries with Ukraine represent a permanent obstacle and they discourage most of the players. Long waiting times, unpredictable behaviour of the officials at the border-crossings, unclear requirements and unnecessary bureaucracy in visa regime are contributing to the failures in cooperation.

<p>The created networks proved to be more active and effective in fostering cooperation than the elected bodies representing the IA Carpathian Euroregion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CBC Communities are able to prepare interesting small-scale projects from small amount of money 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the systemic inefficiency of the structures of IA Carpathian Euroregion is another huge obstacle, having in mind that there is no real culture of cooperation established in any of the involved countries. - financial instability of IA Carpathian Euroregion
---	--

Four countries entering the EU in 2004 made their officials representing the member municipalities and regions less active regarding the activities and operation within the IA Carpathian Euroregion. This might be caused by focus to other priorities and opportunities such as e.g. running for funds from European funding schemes and using the advantages of European assistance.

The Schengen border made problematic CBC with Ukraine in terms of movement of goods, services and people over the border and thus problematized CBC within CE. However, even more important problem for CBC within CE is being posed by different models of public administration of participating states with different competencies of regional authorities.

The positive impact of joint the EU is the availability of CBC programmes and resources (through grant system) for more efficient cooperation of countries. But as mentioned above, mostly on bilateral basis.

Problems that must be resolved for a significant improvement and increase of the efficiency of Interregional Association "Carpathian Euroregion" were rated by SK experts following way:

Rank of importance	Arithmetic Mean	Measure to be taken
1	1,63	creating a stable financial basis as institutional (contributions of regions), and project (Development Fund of Carpathian Euroregion - Carpathian Foundation) activities of the Carpathian Euroregion (<i>source-driven development is incidental, grants are not enough to calculable operation and development</i>)
2	1,75	development, by the border regions of the 5 countries, of a consolidated Strategy of Carpathian Euroregion's activities in the medium (long term) perspective
3	4,13	institutional improvement of Carpathian Euroregion (legal status of the Carpathian Euroregion; management system; common decision making, etc.) (<i>sound legal background is required</i>)
4	4,25	development and implementation of a Communication Strategy of the Interregional Association "Carpathian Euroregion"
5	5,38	development and implementation of measures on promotion and branding of the Carpathian Euroregion's activities on a permanent basis
6	5,63	intensification and improving the communication and cooperation between Carpathian Euroregion and various European programs and institutions (Danube Strategy, Eastern Partnership, ENPI, Visegrad Fund, Carpathian Strategy, Association of European Border Regions "AEBR", etc.)
7	5,75	purposeful and active involvement of inter-municipal component (partner cities, Twin Cities, Association of self-governments and others) and civil society organizations to the activities of Carpathian Euroregion
8	7,5	other problems: influencing European funding schemes in supporting smaller multi-lateral and multi-regional initiatives in order to support development of particular natural regions

The joint strategy of the CE is basic prerequisite for any successful development of CBC within any euroregion. The participants have to understand the goals they want to achieve. And finally, in order to increase their co-ownership they have to agree on the creation of a common budget by their own donations. Even if that would be a symbolic allocation by each of the participating actors it is precondition for successful joint and shared CBC activities.

But, strategies without well considered action plans will not bring any results and even the best action plans without a well-functioning governance structure will fail in a very short time. Complete strategic change is needed with special strength on structural change as well as cultural change in the organization after a careful assessment of the internal and external environment of the organization.

If speaking about the needed change, 6 SK experts are in favour of EGTC creation for the Carpathian Euroregion. 2 are against, while the think current organisation structure can be secured, but cooperation can be still improved.

When speaking about the future vision, all 8 SK experts expressed similar Vision:

Firstly, CE should adopt its strategic goals agreed by all participants; secondly, regional and local authorities should contribute to the common CE budget; thirdly, CE should be able to contribute to better coordination of the regional development policy and territorial planning of the neighbouring regions; fourthly, it should become a platform for the planning of joint activities supported on the EU and/or national level; fifthly, CE should aim at institutionalizing networks of cooperation on NGOs and SMEs levels, and sixthly, it should aim at creating a public sense of shared CBC territory and neighbourhood, including by media and consistent PR policy.

IA Carpathian Euroregion has chance to survive and become effective only after serious and careful revision of its vision, mission and strategic goals. A new strategy including communication and marketing strategy is essential for continuation of its performance. However, this will not be successful without serious revision of structures and particular leaders responsible for the governance of the institution otherwise the whole effort might be just useless waste of resources (not just money and time but also interest and devotion of stakeholders in the region).

Taking into consideration the strong integration interests in Ukraine, a new space is opening up for most of the players and IA Carpathian Euroregion could utilize its position and remains of its reputation for the good cause. However, having in mind all the weaknesses of this structure, it would be highly recommended to partner with other organizations which could make the efforts happen thanks to their know-how and resources

It is high time for the members to establish a well-functioning membership system and think about development of a joint fund supporting important projects and programs in the future. One of the Carpathian Foundations located in one of the stabile countries of the Euroregion would be the best choice in terms of reliability, transparency and cost effectiveness.

Ukraine

22 interviews were conducted in **Ivano-Frankivsk oblast**. Most of respondents were experts of NGOs, researchers and academicians (11), 6 respondents were from national/regional administrations and 3 from local municipalities. Also 2 businessmen were interviewed that participated at some of the IA CE recent activities. As in case of Romania, most of respondents participated at some events organised by the IA CE.

When evaluating functioning of the CBC in CE, 72,7 % of respondents rated it as partially successful, 4,5 % as successful and 22,8 % as unsuccessful and ineffective. Those noting the problems of CE CBC mentioned only limited number of projects realised and huge absence on information flow to citizens about the cooperation in the CE and involvement of Ivano-Frankivsk institutions.

Key success & failure factors of current functioning of the IA CE:

Success factors	Failure factors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - existing motivation and “personal” involvement of some stakeholders for development of the CBC in the CE - established networks of institutions (NGO, local government, civil servant, SME) for CBC - current activities of the Interregional Association “Carpathian Euroregion”, including conferences, expert group meetings, realization of pilot projects, joint strategy developments ... for enhancing the functioning of the CBC in the CE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - insufficient level of information exchange between border regions - Schengen border obstacles - significant differences in border regions esp. management of CBC, regional/local administration different competences for CBC, different access to external financial support - Insufficient level of information exchange between local authorities and civil society about needs and possibilities of cross-border cooperation - systemic inefficiency of “institutional activities” of the Interregional Association “Carpathian Euroregion”, including: legal status, hierarchy and management system, common resource (financial) basis cross-border network of experts and etc.

15 respondents were unable to estimate how much and how exactly were the activities of IA CE influenced by joining of Hungary, Slovakia, Poland (later - Romania) to the EU. 7 respondents answered that this process enabled higher cooperation also with UA border regions, e.g. establishing new CBC programs with UA border regions.

Problems that must be resolved for a significant improvement and increase of the efficiency of Interregional Association “Carpathian Euroregion” were rated by Ivano-Frankivsk experts so:

Rank of importance	Arithmetic Mean	Measure to be taken
1	2,23	institutional improvement of Carpathian Euroregion (legal status of the Carpathian Euroregion; management system; common decision making, etc.) <i>(sound legal background is required)</i>
2	3,00	development, by the border regions of the 5 countries, of a consolidated Strategy of Carpathian Euroregion’s activities in the medium (long term) perspective
3	3,45	creating a stable financial basis as institutional (contributions of regions), and project (Development Fund of Carpathian Euroregion - Carpathian Foundation) activities of the Carpathian Euroregion <i>(source-driven development is incidental, grants are not enough to calculable operation and development)</i>
4	4,14	development and implementation of a Communication Strategy of the Interregional Association “Carpathian Euroregion”
5	4,86	intensification and improving the communication and cooperation between Carpathian Euroregion and various European programs and institutions (Danube Strategy, Eastern Partnership, ENPI, Visegrad Fund,

		Carpathian Strategy, Association of European Border Regions “AEBR”, etc.)
6	5,36	purposeful and active involvement of inter-municipal component (partner cities, Twin Cities, Association of self-governments and others) and civil society organizations to the activities of Carpathian Euroregion
7	5,95	development and implementation of measures on promotion and branding of the Carpathian Euroregion’s activities on a permanent basis
8	7,86	other problems

86,4 % of Ivano-Frankivsk respondents are in favour of the CE EGTC establishment and transformation of the IA CE into such legal person. The others (13,6 %) are against.

When speaking about the future priorities, most of respondents highlighted signature of the political part of the Association Agreement between Ukraine and EU that is the most important event that will have a great influence on all aspects of life in the Carpathian Euroregion. They believe that it will enhance and improve existing relationships between citizens and regional authorities in the CE. However, several supporting activities must be done:

- Institutional changes in organization structure of the IA CE;
- Much higher spreading of information about the Carpathian Euroregion among citizens in Ivano-Frankivsk region;
- Closer cooperation and mutual profitable experience exchanges in different fields of life such as municipal management, education, health care, science, culture, tourism and recreation, economy and environment protection, etc.;
- Adaptation of Ukrainian legislation to EU standards, integration to EU security system, political consolidation and enforcing processes of democracy in Ukraine.

22 interviews were also conducted in **Zakarpattya oblast**. Majority (17) of respondents represented universities and NGOs, 3 respondents were civil servants, representatives of local authorities / governments and 2 were representatives of SMEs.

The majority of surveyed experts have experience in CBC projects and programs with co-financing from the European Union, 3 are directly working with the Carpathian Euroregion agenda, 4 persons are having direct experience with the Carpathian Foundation and the rest actively participated in seminars and trainings organised by the IA CE. 73 % of respondents in Zakarpattya oblast consider CBC activities of the IA CE as partially successful, 9 % as successful and 18 % as unsuccessful and ineffective.

25% of respondents noted that CBC cooperation is more productive and successful on the other side of the border, namely in the border regions of Slovakia, Hungary, Romania and Poland. The same number of respondents said that there is a lack of practical measures and activities in the frame of CE, the activity of the IA Carpathian Euroregion has recently become formal and CE exists only in words and paper. One of the respondents commented that “the CE as an instrument of foreign policy was successful and brought to the region peace, stability and good neighbourly relations. After completing the main mission app. 10 years ago, it was unable to identify new goals and didn’t become a generator of regional development in the next years.

Key success & failure factors of current functioning of the IA CE:

Success factors	Failure factors
- common interests, common understanding of problems and desire	- systemic inefficiency of “institutional activity” of Interregional Association Carpathian Euroregion,

<p>to solve them on governmental and non-governmental level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - high level of institutions' and citizens motivation in border regions for CBC - established institutional networks for CBC, e.g. the IA CE - historical fact that the CE has become an important instrument of foreign policy - mutual interest in the development of ethnic cultures of borderland (e.g. Ruthenians-Ukrainians are in Slovakia and vice versa, Slovak and Hungarian minority in Zakarpattya region) 	<p>including: legal status, hierarchy and management system, common resource (financial) basis, cross-border network of experts and others.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - insufficient level of information exchange between regional authorities and border regions of the Carpathian Euroregion the needs and opportunities of cross-border cooperation. - Interregional cooperation is usually initiated at the community level, involving regional institutions. In areas that are not EU members, such cooperation is difficult because of weak organization of communities and lack of appropriate institutions and tools. - lack of border crossing points and Schengen obstacles caused a growing of imbalance of UA participation in the CE's activities - the IA CE for more than 20 years did not become complete institution in the terms of legal status, regular management and policy support as well as financing, low effective system of information exchange, etc.
---	--

In contrary to Ivano-Frankivsk, 90% of the experts in Zakarpattya noted that it is possible to say that the activities of the IA CE were influenced by the accession of Hungary, Slovakia, Poland in 2004 (later - Romania) to the EU, and to the Schengen area. Some experts even divided development of the CE cooperation into 5 periods: 1st period of "euphoria" 1993-1998, 2nd period as preparation of 4 countries for accession to the EU (1998-2003); 3rd period as the new "euphoria" related to great expectations with the EU accession and joining the Schengen area (2004 – 2010), 4th period of stagnation and social explosion in Ukraine (2010-2013) and new 5th period that brought discussions on the need of developing new CE strategy and cooperation models.

Problems that must be resolved for a significant improvement and increase of the efficiency of Interregional Association "Carpathian Euroregion" were rated by Zakarpattya experts by following:

Rank of importance	Measure to be taken
1	institutional improvement of the Carpathian Euroregion (CE's legal status, system management, and making common decisions, etc.)
2	need to develop a consolidated CE Strategy of 5 countries' border regions for the medium or long term
3	need to create a stable financial and institutional basis (contributions of regions) and projects (Fund for the Carpathian Euroregion Development - Carpathian Foundation) of the Carpathian Euroregion
4	improved communication and cooperation of Carpathian Euroregion with the European programs and institutions (Danube Strategy, Eastern Partnership, ENPI, Visegrad Fund, Carpathian Strategy, Association of European Border Regions AEBR - etc.).
5	development and implementation of communication strategy in the CE
6	need for more active involvement of inter-municipal component (municipalities, Twin Cities, Association of local governments, etc.) and civil society organizations to the activities of the Carpathian Euroregion

Most of respondents expressed their hope that the development of consolidated CE Strategy till 2020 will contribute to a complete reorganization of IA CE and qualitatively improve its efficiency. 90% of responses are in favour of creating the EGTC for the Carpathian Euroregion. Only 2 respondents indicated that there is no future of CE and 1 of them proposed to close the IA CE organization in a near future.

The future vision seen by most of respondents must bear in fact these conclusions:

- the CE should be an important instrument of active experience and best practices exchange between the EU and Ukraine. Especially in the field of European integration reforms and process of accession. The CE will contribute to the development of Zakarpattya region, which must become an example for the whole territory of Ukraine. Within the CE we should return to the idea of free economic zone and the innovation development of the region.
- current trends towards bilateral institutional forms of CBC are the reflection of new interests between communities and regions in terms of regionalization in 2004- 2014, also caused by the European type of society (transfer of powers and finance to local governments, subsidiarity, settings of the European funds resources for development of poor and CBC regions etc.). Since end of 2015, Ukraine, by the results of reforms, will gradually join to this process, hopefully.
- the CE should again become a key instrument for the development in the Carpathian Basin. Firstly, it needs to identify, develop and implement global development projects with cross-border impact. In this aspect the experience of organization could be used by the EU as an implementer for example of the Carpathian Programme with the appropriate financing, operating and regulatory framework.

Secondly, it is necessary to take into account the changes that have occurred in recent years, and especially in Ukraine, to implement a free trade agreement between the EU and Ukraine. Thirdly, development of consolidated vision and mission of CE and directions of its development. Identification and development of instruments for interaction of institutions in different countries to improve cross-border cooperation. There are prospects in the so-called "local" regions, the more detailed the problem and tied to the area - the easier is to solve it. The new CE institution could be the "umbrella" superstructure that promotes the development of smaller regions on the CE territory.