



## 5th Interreg Europe Programming Committee (PC) Meeting 4-5 November 2020

### Online

**Chaired by:** Germany (DE)  
**Participants:** See Participants' List (Annex 01).  
**Decision notes:** Interreg Europe JS

<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome, opening and approval of the agenda</b>
	<p><b>Chair</b> welcomed all PC members. 27 Partner States (PS) were present (LU &amp; CH were missing). Concerning the agenda, the PC agreed on the agenda with the addition of a new item 1.b that consisted of the following:</p> <p><i>1.b Presentation of new PC members + Update programme preparations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Post 2020 negotiations</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Written procedures</i></li> <li>▪ <i>other</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Presentation of new PC members:</b> The PC welcomed new member from <b>PT</b>.</p> <p><b>Post 2020 negotiations:</b> <b>JS</b> received information that the REGI committee of the European Parliament proposes in the trialogue that the overall Interreg budget is increased. Should the budget however be reduced in comparison to the budget of the current programme period, there seem to be ideas circulating that the cut should then be equally shared among all the Interreg Strands. This may mean 25-30% reduction on the Interreg Europe budget. The MA prepared a letter to the EC requesting to keep the current budget proposal of 500 M€ for strand C and furthermore proposing that the relative allocation of funds among the four interregional cooperation programmes (Espon, Interact, Interreg Europe and Urbact) remains the same as in the current programming period. In this context, and in view of the upcoming Structural Measures Working Party meetings, all PS were kindly asked to advocate towards all relevant bodies for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the non-reduction of the overall budget and</li> <li>▪ for keeping the relative shares of the strand C programmes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision:</b> The agenda (Annex 02) with the above modification was approved without objections.</p>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Projects implementation – reminder on the current logic</b>
	<p><b>JS</b> presented the current logic of the project implementation (Annex 03) to facilitate the discussion on the future operations. <b>JS</b> highlighted the characteristics that make Interreg Europe unique compared with cross-border and transnational cooperation programmes. The whole logic in Interreg Europe is to start from the contexts and policy instruments of the participating regions and check on a regular basis whether these instruments and contexts were influenced by the project. This is the reason why Interreg Europe is the only Interreg programme to have a core part of the reporting dedicated to monitoring results in each participating region.</p>



<b>3.</b>	<b>Features of the future operations</b>
	<b>JS</b> presented the proposal for the features of the future operations i.e. projects and platform (Annex 04).
<b>4.</b>	<b>CP V2: preliminary approval</b>
	<p><b>Experts</b> reminded the PC of the methodology adopted for developing version 2 of the Cooperation Programme (Annex 05). For every section, the text was presented, and the changes resulting from the discussions so far as well as the input previously received by the Partner States (Annex 06).</p> <p><b>Section 2.1.1.1 - Types of action</b></p> <p><b>1. Interregional projects</b></p> <p><b>Decision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <b>Experts</b> confirmed that the expression ‘in principle’ allows some flexibility in relation to the duration of the core phase (some projects may need less than 3 years).</li><li>▪ The text ‘in justified cases’ will be kept, and the requests about the action plan and the follow-up phase will be taken on board in the CP.</li><li>▪ <b>Experts</b> confirmed that the word ‘approach’ is broad enough to include all the proposals mentioned by the Partner States. Further details should also be provided in the programme manual.</li></ul> <p><b>2. The policy learning platform (PLP)</b></p> <p><b>Decision:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ <b>Experts</b> proposed to introduce evaluation recommendations and 2014-20 experience if they match the level of detail required in a programme document. The more detailed description of the platform in the manual will be the occasion to check whether the evaluation recommendations are followed.</li><li>▪ The emphasis on beneficiaries contributing to the platform and the connections to other platforms will be introduced.</li><li>▪ ‘Europe’ and ‘platform’ will be harmonised along the entire text.</li></ul> <p><b>Section 2.1.1.3 Target groups</b></p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The definition of the eligible beneficiaries will be kept, and the reference to the Public Procurement Directive will be taken to a footnote.</p> <p><b>Guiding principles for the selection of projects</b></p> <p><b>Decision:</b> PS agreed with the proposed text.</p> <p><b>Chapter 5 - Communication and visibility</b></p> <p><b>Experts</b> and <b>JS</b> communication unit made a short presentation of the content of chapter 5, highlighting that the draft proposal is in line with the EC guidance on communication and visibility (Annex 05).</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> PS agreed with the text updated with the above-mentioned modifications.</p> <p><b>Chapter 6 – Implementing provisions</b></p> <p><b>Section 6.2. Procedure for setting up the joint secretariat</b></p> <p><b>Decision:</b> PS agreed with the text updated with the above-mentioned modification.</p>



	<p><b>Section 6.3 Apportionment of liabilities among participating Member States and where applicable, the third countries and OCTs, in the event of financial corrections imposed by the managing authority or the Commission</b></p> <p>The text in this section mainly comes from the previous cooperation programmes (2014-2020), but the paragraph about the liabilities regarding TA required modification. In order to reply to partner states' questions about the modified text, <b>JS</b> made a detailed presentation of how to calculate TA considering that in line with the draft regulations TA will be calculated as a flat rate in relation to project expenditure in the future (Annex 07). This calculation does not impact the financing plan in the CP. The final TA amount will be known only ex-post, will depend on final project spending rate and could be impacted by corrections of project expenditure (audits, national checks, etc.). <b>JS</b> also made a clear difference between the contents that are needed in the programme document, and the further internal arrangements on liabilities between the programme and the PS.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> PS agreed with the text updated with the above-mentioned modification.</p> <p><b>Chapter 7 – Use of unit costs, lump sums, flat rates and financing not linked to costs</b>  <i>There is no need to fill in this chapter regarding the reimbursement from the programme to the EC as what is envisaged does not fall into articles 88 and 89 of draft CPR regulation. It will be specified in the programme manual.</i></p> <p><b>Decision:</b> The Chair confirms the preliminary approval of CP version 2 with no objections from the PS. JS confirmed that the general principle applies during the entire drafting process “nothing is approved until everything is approved”.</p> <p><b>Next steps:</b> the draft version 3 made up of the update of draft versions 1 and 2 in track change and additional developments related to Chapter 2 on indicators and on Chapter 4 “actions taken to involve the relevant programme partners” will be circulated for discussion during the next PC meeting on 16-17 December 2020.</p>
5.	<p><b>Template “Agreement to the CP”</b></p>
	<p><b>JS</b> presented the template for the “Agreement to the CP” (Annex 08). The template will be completed when the budget of the programme is available and technical assistance arrangements will have been discussed in the PC. However, <b>JS</b> asked PS to already check the procedure for signature of this agreement in their country and to start the discussion at national level about the Group of Auditor representation and the First Level Control system and responsible body for the FLC system. The aim is to ensure a smooth and quick signature process of the agreements later.</p>
6.	<p><b>Timeline (update)</b></p>
	<p><b>JS</b> presented updated timeline (Annex 09).</p>
7.	<p><b>Any other business</b></p>
	<p><b>Written procedure on the future monitoring system</b></p> <p><b>Decision:</b>          After discussion, PS agreed on the organisation of an ad-hoc PC meeting at short term and only dealing with the future monitoring system. At this meeting INTERACT should be present to answer questions. PS should then make a final decision. <b>JS</b> will contact INTERACT accordingly and propose possible meeting dates.</p> <p><b>Comments on CP version 1</b>  <b>JS</b> proposed to go back to these comments during the PC meeting in December.</p>



## 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](mailto:info@interregeurope.eu)