



## 7th Interreg Europe Monitoring Committee Meeting 12 and 13 December 2017

**Hilton Tallinn Park**  
**Fr. R. Kreutzwaldi 23, Tallinn, 10147, Estonia**

**Chaired by:** Riina Nurmsaar, Margarita Golovko

**Participants:** see participants list (annex 01)

**Decision notes:** Interreg Europe JS

### 1. **Welcome, opening and approval of the agenda**

The chair welcomed the MC members. She presented a proposal of updated agenda (see annex 02) following the rescheduling of the meeting. This update aimed at treating in priority the agenda items requiring a MC decision. The agenda was approved, no objections.

**LU** delegated their vote to **NL**. **SK** delegated their vote to **CZ**.

### 2. **Presentation of the new MC members**

The participants of the monitoring committee from DE, EL, HR, HU, LT and NL introduced themselves.

### 3. **Update on general programme developments**

The **JS** presented an overview of the HR developments in the JS (see annex 03).

### 4. **Agreement for a cooperation between Interreg Europe and the S3 platform in Seville**

The **JS** presented the agreement for cooperation with the S3 platform in Seville (see annex 04). The **JS** explained that the proposal for this agreement was drafted on the basis of the existing agreement with the Committee of the Regions. The **JS** reminded that the S3 platform provided a feedback on the JS's proposal after that the supporting documents for the Monitoring Committee meeting were sent to MC members and that MC members were updated accordingly on 23 November 2017.



The **JS** presented the main differences and synergies between the two initiatives and the different areas of cooperation following the structure of the agreement: communication, projects and policy learning services. The **JS** also explained that cooperation already started since S3 representatives have already participated in two Policy Learning Platform events organised in Seville and Milan and the JS was invited to the steering committee meeting of the Industrial Modernisation platform.

The **JS** stated that the current agreement for cooperation committed both sides to meet once per year and that MC members would be constantly updated on the outcomes of this agreement for cooperation and of its related meetings. Finally the **JS** asked for the approval of the agreement for cooperation to MC members.

The chair asked MC members to express their opinions on the presented agreement for cooperation.

### **Decision**

The agreement for cooperation with the S3 platform was approved with the few clarifications required by the MC. The final version will be attached to the decision notes.

## **5. Update on Policy Learning Platform**

Peter Heydebreck, representative of Inno group, the lead contractor company in charge of the PLP started by presenting the main achievements of the first year (see annex 05). During the first year of implementation of the PLP, four thematic workshops were organised in Brussels with running projects, in addition to two wider networking events in October. A number of policy briefs and news were also published on the website. Overall, the satisfaction rate of the PLP users is encouraging.

The **JS** then provided an insight into the lessons learned from the first year and the way second year builds on these lessons. This is summarised in the PowerPoint attached as annex 05. The second year of implementation builds on the lessons learned from the first year and will feature changes in the structure of the management, implementation and work plan.

## **6. Evaluation Plan – Terms of Reference**

The **JS** presented the IR-E evaluation plan (see annex 06), which has been slightly updated compared to the plan approved in 2015. Following initial consultation, the timing of the 2018 mid-term evaluation has been changed. Since the programme implementation is already well advanced, the **JS** proposed to bring forward the mid-term evaluation so that results are available by the end of 2018. This would allow the results to feed into the 2019 Annual Report to the EC.



The **JS** then presented the ToR for the 'mid-term evaluation' (see annex 07) which consists in two different lots: the first one related to operational evaluation and the second one dedicated to impact evaluation.

#### **Decision**

- The MC agreed to approve the updated evaluation plan.
- The MC agreed to approve the ToR for the 2018 mid-term evaluation with the integration of the comments from **IE** and **NO** (see annex 07.1).

## **7. Update on third call assessment**

The **JS** provided an update on the eligibility results and strategic assessment of the third call (see annex 08).



## 8. Fourth call – discussion on possible scenarios

The **JS** presented a possible scenario for the 4th call of proposals (see annex 10). The idea was to gather PS opinions on which direction the programme should go taking into account that this would be the last call. The presentation focused on the following elements: Basic features, pilot actions, over commitment, project duration, geographical coverage and flexibility in eligibility. The Chair reminded that the decision would come next year and opened the discussion.

### Conclusion

For the eligibility of the third call, the Chair concluded that it was not reasonable to retrospectively change the decisions. The JS will further work on a proposal for the next MC meeting.

## 9. Communication

The **JS** presented a brief overview of the communication activities implemented in 2017 and the work plan for 2018, highlighting that in addition to the physical events, online and offline activities are planned, support for national points of contact and policy learning platform implementation remains a priority, targeted measures are planned for further web development (website audit), promotion of project stories (including a study on INTERREG IVC results), and more active engagement of the policy learning community together with the PLP (see the presentation in annex 11 and communication plans in annex 11.1, 11.2 and 11.3).

The **JS** also informed the MC that the annual event of 2018 (24-25 April 2018, Sofia) will focus on exchange of experience between ongoing projects. In addition, a separate event will be organised in early April 2018 to promote the 4<sup>th</sup> call and facilitate networking as requested by the MS.

### Conclusion

It was pointed out that the Estonian events organised in 2017 were missing from the list provided in the annex and asked for them to be included to complete the overview. There were no further comments on the communication activities.

## 10. Programme Finance

The **JS** informed the MC that:

- The spending target for 2018 has been reached so there is no decommitment risk for 2018. Based on the current estimations on the spending for 2019, no decommitment risk is expected for 2019 (further details in annex 12).



- All 2017 national contributions to technical assistance budget have been received. A new payment request was sent in September 2017. The payment due date is 31 January 2018.
- A performance review will be carried out in 2019 (further details in annex 13)
- IVC programme is officially closed (see annex 14). Following the JS presentation on this point, a discussion took place.

## Decision

The MC agreed to:

- Keep the ERDF surplus as a contingency reserve for the time being
- Take case-by case decisions regarding its actual use as the programme moves forward and needs arise.

## 11. Presentation of a project with an Estonian partner

Kristjan MARK (**KM**), Head of Maintenance and Waste Management Division in Environment Department presented the experience of Tallinn City Government as project partner in the INTHERWASTE project which aims to improve waste management policies in heritage cities in Europe. All partners (Cordoba, ES; Krakow, PL; Porto, PT; Ibiza, ES; and Tallinn, EE) have UNESCO heritage listed city centres. **KM** highlighted common waste management problems faced by heritage cities and presented a good practice on deposit refund schemes (see annex 15).

## 12. Monitoring 1st and 2nd call projects

Due to time constraints, the **JS** did not cover all the agenda points indicated under '12. Monitoring 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> call projects'.

The **JS** focussed on the mid-term review meeting informing the MC members that a mid-term review meeting would be organised with all approved projects before the end of phase 1 (further details can be found in annex 16). The first mid-term review meetings are scheduled in the second half of January 2018 and concern 19 first call projects. The **JS** pointed out that during this meeting, projects would update the JS about the project implementation both in terms of activities and budget consumption, discuss the need of potential budget changes and request pilot actions. The **JS** clarified that since pilot actions require the approval of the Monitoring Committee, in case the relevance of pilot actions is demonstrated during the mid-term review meetings, the related requests for change would be treated in February and the approval would be requested from the



Monitoring Committee either during the MC meeting foreseen in March 2018, in Sofia, or through written procedure.

### 13. Update on programme management matters

Due to a limited time available, the **JS** only very shortly informed the MC of the designation of the MA/CA, the submission of two interim payment claims, the annual review of the risk management mapping and audit matters (see annexes 17, 18 and 19).

The **JS** then shortly presented the programme anti-fraud strategy and the use of the Arachne tool, with the focus on the use of Arachne before the project approval (see annex 20).

#### Conclusion

The **JS** concluded that the financial insolvency check was identified as one of the major risk to be checked with Arachne, because in case of the insolvency the partner state risks to be financially liable. It is also the partner state that decided on the eligibility of partner based on their territory. It is therefore included in the programme eligibility check as it allows to secure the project implementation and partner state financial liability. It is thus both in the partner states' and programme interest (see also agenda item 8 of MC4 in Winterthur).

### 14. Exchange of information on post-2020 programming period

The **JS** presented the state of play of the discussion on post-2020 programming period (see annex 21). It has been underlined that the meetings on post-2020 are informal. After these discussions, proposals would be submitted to the monitoring committee for information, feedback and decision.

The **JS** then asked Partner States to inform the monitoring committee on any existing national position on post 2020.

After the exchange on national positions on post 2020, the Partner States were asked for a possible mandate to MA/JS to support and contribute to discussion on post 2020 interregional cooperation programme.

#### Decision

The proposal with a revised wording was approved by the monitoring committee:

The MC asks the MA /JS

- to contribute to the post-2020 discussion with their experience and knowledge and



- to regularly inform the MC about the input given and the discussion outputs.

## 15. Any other business

**EE** made a general remark and asked the Monitoring Committee to take the objectives and indicators in the operational programmes as a basis for the decisions while selecting projects.

### TRANSPARENCY

The **JS** introduced a proposal to publish the decision notes of the MC meetings without annexes on the website with a possibility to request annexes by email (see annex 22).

The MC agreed to:

- Publish only information and decisions of the Monitoring Committee meetings without annexes on the website with a possibility to request annexes by email. The discussion part that includes the countries point of view will be kept internal and not published.

### TIMELINE

The **JS** presented the updated timeline for the upcoming year (see annex 23). There were no questions or comments.

**NOTE:** To ensure transparency of the Monitoring Committee meetings, the decision notes are published on the Interreg Europe's website. Annexes as mentioned in the notes can be requested by email: [info@interregeurope.eu](mailto:info@interregeurope.eu)