



1st Interreg Europe Informal Programming Committee Meeting

1 October 2019

Lille/France

Chaired by: Annukka Mäkinen (FI)
Participants: See Participants' List (**Annex 01**).
Decision notes: Interreg Europe JS

1.	Welcome, opening and approval of the agenda
	The chair welcomed the participants to the first informal Interreg Europe programming committee and invited the new members to introduce themselves.
2.	Set-up of the Programming Committee
	JS proposed to launch a written procedure for the Interreg Europe Monitoring Committee to set-up the programming committee. The text of the procedure was presented. JS confirmed that Partner States would have until the date of the first PC meeting to designate their representatives. EC confirmed that no orientation paper would be released for Interreg Europe. Concerning the establishment of a formal PC, the solution may be to keep an informal format for the PC. EC highlighted the importance of starting the programming as soon as possible even if EC cannot give more guarantee at this stage. The Chair proposed to close the discussion and to go ahead with the proposed written procedure.
3.	Update on Brexit and post 2020
	<u>Update on Brexit:</u> UK provided an update about the BREXIT situation. While the UK still aims at securing a deal with the EU, the MHCLG in parallel starts preparing a potential no-deal scenario. They had sent two communications to the UK partners (see here as well as Annex 2 for further information), informing them that the UK guarantees funding for already approved projects. Regarding the actual delivery of this funding guarantee, they will analyse the individual situations with the aim to identify the best solution to allow continuation as much as possible despite a potential no-deal BREXIT. The cut-off date to determine the eligibility of UK partner's costs for the ERDF is currently still looked in by the legal department (e.g. claims made before the Brexit vs. claims after BREXIT). The general guidance at this stage still is to UK project partners to continue delivering as normal. Regarding questions of the UK TA contribution or first level control modalities after BREXIT, no certain answer can be provided today as it depends on the overall settlement between the UK and EU. Regarding possible scenario's to continue cooperation after BREXIT, the UK is hearing the UK



	<p>partners that are making the case of continuing cooperation. The DCHLG as devolved administration is currently acting as observer and will come back on this to their EU-partners when the overall framework is clearer.</p> <p>The EC confirms analysing different scenarios, which however will only be made public when an actual scenario is confirmed.¹ The EC is inviting each MA involving UK partners and suggesting to make a maximum payments before the possible Brexit date. Whenever there is a UK LP in the project, consideration should be given to switch the UK LP to another partner from EU-MS. The EC will be clearer on this once they know what is actually going to happen and when they have a better understanding of the working of the UK guarantee.</p> <p><u>Update on the preparation of the post2020 legislative framework and MFF</u></p> <p>FI gave an update from the Finnish presidency of the EU. The programming committee is reminded what is in the MFF negotiating box (see Annex 3, CPR p. 15ff, ETC: p. 24 ff). The MFF will be discussed at the October European Council on the key questions. The overall objective is to have a deal within the Council on MFF before the end of the year. Interreg will most likely be discussed at the very end.</p> <p>Regarding the cohesion policy package, the trilogue process has been resumed. 4 technical meetings on CPR already taken place, a first trilogue meeting is scheduled for October. The CPR will be processed in trilogue first as it provides the framework for many programmes. If sufficient progress, the Finnish presidency is also ready to tackle the sectoral files such as ETC. First Interreg technical meetings will take place at the earliest during the last two months of the Finnish presidency, depending on progress made regarding the CPR.</p> <p>RO mentioned the importance for each Partner State to give a clear mandate to the MFF group to provide sufficient means for Interreg Europe.</p>
4.	Rules of procedure of the Programming Committee
	<p>JS presented the few changes made to the draft rules of procedures compared to the document sent before the meeting and highlighted the proposal under § 4.1 related to the decision making procedure.</p> <p>The JS clarified that the Programme Committee meetings are covered by the technical assistance budget of the current programme as approved by the Monitoring Committee. Concerning the duration, it would meet as long as needed until the programme was approved. JS however indicated that this did not need to be included in the rules of procedure.</p> <p>The JS clarified that PS should have the right to delegate their votes without justifying the reasons for this delegation.</p> <p>The JS will revise the draft rules of procedure accordingly (Annex 4) and the decision on these rules will be taken at the first official Programming Committee meeting in Helsinki next December.</p>

¹ Information made available after the PC meeting: A new delegated Regulation was published by the EC on 10/10/19. It contains a timeline by which the UK would have to confirm its financial participation to the 2019 EU budget and control and audit requirements (7 calendar days) and pay its contribution (20 days), in case of BREXIT without a deal. https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/initiatives/c-2019-7296_en



5.	Timeline
	The JS presented the timeline for programming (Annex 5). The PC agreed that the Troika should also be invited to meetings between the external company providing programming support and the MA/JS. PL wondered whether a public consultation was needed to be carried out before the final approval of the CP would be possible. If confirmed, the timeline would also have to take this into consideration.
6.	Interreg Europe/INTERACT: which positioning in the future programming period
	<p>Interreg Europe / INTERACT JS first presented the current state of play clarifying that there was no overlap between the two programmes but areas of synergies (Annex 6). Interreg Europe JS then presented the positioning for the future programming period. The two programmes will remain fundamentally different: INTERACT capitalising on cooperation and being mainly targeted at ETC programme while Interreg Europe focuses on local and regional development practices not linked to cooperation. Both programmes could however directly contribute to the development of cooperation within mainstream programmes (Annex 7).</p> <p>EC commented that in the context of this informal programming meeting, it was of interest to both programmes to clarify their distinctive roles and try to pass through the national channels the relevant rewording in the regulation. In principle the “trilogue” will discuss the ETC regulation by the end of the year. In the Council-version regulation INTERACT is responsible for providing assistance to the mainstream programmes when they decide to do cooperation. This is a point that maybe the programmes need to further clarify.</p> <p>INTERACT explained that it is challenging to clarify the roles of the 4 pan European programmes as not the same people are sitting in their Committees. INTERACT also highlighted that there is no confusion on the beneficiaries’ side about the role of each programme.</p> <p>LU made a formal request to the Committee for the four pan European programmes to coordinate in order to facilitate their programming and shape a strategic orientation for the future. The four programmes should work on their complementarities, synergies and contributions to each other and propose a roadmap for each other’s programming process.</p> <p>EE asked INTERACT to analyse how the Goal 1 Programmes plan to use the proposed CPR article 17 (3) (d) (v) on cooperation in the future. The starting point for such analysis could be the macro regional strategies.</p>
7.	Contract for drafting the Interreg Europe Cooperation Programme 2021-2027: Terms of Reference
	<p>JS presented the draft of the terms of reference for drafting the Interreg Europe Cooperation Programme 2021-2027 and addressed the different comments provided by the PC members prior to the meeting (Annex 8 and 9).</p> <p>JS explained that the terms of reference should be approved through written procedure.</p>
8.	First exchange on the core features of the future programme (objectives, thematic scope, operations supported)
	JS presented the history and rationale of the programme as well as the possibility to agree on a few core features (Annex 10).
9.	AOB
	The JS reminded the participants that in its email of 02/09/2019 the JS had asked the MC members to inform the JS by 01/10/2019 if they had carried out any national checks, and if yes, what was the outcome of such checks. In case there were no national checks to report, it would also be sufficient to send this as a reply.



End of Meeting

NOTE: To ensure transparency of the Programming 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