

ETC/Interreg Regulation - Annex

Version: Outcome of technical meeting of 23 January 2020

The Council amendments as subsequently agreed in the provisional common understanding are in **bold, underlined and highlighted in yellow**.

Proposed alignment with the CPR are **bold, underlined and highlighted in blue** by the Commission.

EP had not initially made amendments in the Annex; however any subsequent EP suggestions are in **green**.

ANNEX

TEMPLATE FOR INTERREG PROGRAMMES¹

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| CCI | [15 characters] |
| Title | [255] |
| Version | |
| First year | [4] |
| Last year | [4] |
| Eligible from | |
| Eligible until | |
| Commission decision number | |
| Commission decision date | |
| Programme amending decision number | [20] |
| Programme amending decision entry into force date | |
| NUTS regions covered by the programme | |
| Component of Interreg strand | |

Comments Interact

- Numbers of characters are counted with blanks!

¹ **Without prejudice to further alignment in relation to the outcome of interinstitutional negotiations on the articles of the CPR and the fund-specific regulations. Alignments on the external Interreg programmes still to follow.**

1. Programme strategy: main development challenges and policy responses

1.1. Programme area (not required for **Interreg C** programmes)

Reference: Article 17(4)(a), Article 17(9)(a)

Comments Interact

- The programme area will be set out in an implementing act pursuant to Article 8.1
- There is one major point for CBC-Programmes: on the one hand the legal provisions point at quite narrowly defined core area, i.e. the NUTS-3 regions along the border; on the other hand in recent negotiation documents the aspect of continuity is considered as additional criterion – i.e. it seems that in duly justified cases the programme area as in 14-20 might be continued. NB: negotiations are not yet closed!

Text field [2 000]

1.2. Summary of main joint challenges, taking into account economic, social and territorial disparities as well as inequalities, joint investment needs and complimentary and synergies with other forms of support, lessons-learnt from past experience and macro-regional strategies and sea-basin strategies where the programme area as a whole or partially is covered by one or more strategies.

Reference: Article 17(4)(b), Article 17(9)(b)

Comments Interact

- *Disparities; inequalities:* the difference between disparity and inequality is that disparity is (uncountable) the state of being unequal; while inequality is an unfair, not equal, state; in practice it means to use the term “disparities” rather in neutral descriptions such as references to disparities in GDP at regional level whereas the term “inequalities” implies value judgements such as inequalities in access to labour markets or education, income inequalities etc.. “Inequality” primarily refers to disparity in social or economic prosperity between groups in a society.

Materials & further reading

A couple of useful studies addressing key issues in relation to cooperation across Member States for post 2020:

| Study | Link |
|---|---|
| Missing links Comprehensive analysis of the existing cross-border rail transport connections and missing links on the internal EU borders | https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/information/publications/reports/2018/comprehensive-analysis-of-the-existing-cross-border-rail-transport-connections-and-missing-links-on-the-internal-eu-borders |
| Obstacles Easing legal and administrative obstacles in EU border regions | The study includes a final report, 15 thematic case studies and an inventory of border obstacles. https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/information/publications/studies/2017/easing-legal-and-administrative-obstacles-in-eu-border-regions In particular, over 200 well-documented border obstacles impacting the daily life of cross-border citizens and businesses have been collected and analysed in the process of the study preparation. The collection of these |

| | |
|--|--|
| | border obstacles has been put together in an inventory, which is now accessible for consultation. https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/policy/cooperation/european-territorial/cross-border/review/#1 |
| Communication: Boosting growth and cohesion in EU border regions | https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/information/publications/communications/2017/boosting-growth-and-cohesion-in-eu-border-regions |
| MRS Council conclusions on the implementation of EU macro-regional strategies (2019) | https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/policy/cooperation/macro-regional-strategies/ |
| Second Report on the implementation of EU macro-regional strategies - COM(2019) 21 final | <i>ibidem</i> |

Text field [50 000]

1.3. Justification for the selection of policy objectives and the Interreg specific objectives, corresponding priorities, specific objectives and the forms of support, addressing, where appropriate, missing links in cross-border infrastructure

Reference: Article 17(4)(c)

Comments Interact

- The justification for selection should refer both to the selected policy objective or Interreg Specific Objective and to the selected specific objective. So for each Selected specific objective (column 2) a new row should be introduced and filled in from column 1 to column 4. The term "Forms of support" here refers to grants, prizes, repayable assistance and financial instruments.

Table 1

| Selected policy objective or selected Interreg-specific objective | Selected specific objective | Priority | Justification for selection |
|---|-----------------------------|----------|-----------------------------|
| | | | [2 000 per objective] |

2. Priorities [300]

Reference: Article 17(4)(d) and (e)

2.1. Title of the priority (repeated for each priority)

Reference: Article 17(4)(d)

Text field: [300]

This is a priority pursuant to a transfer under Article 17(3)

2.1.1. Specific objective (repeated for each selected specific objective, for priorities other than technical assistance)

Reference: Article 17(4)(e)

Comments Interact:

- Selection from 5 Policy Objectives (POs) and two Interreg-specific Objectives (ISOs)
- **PO 5** – choose urban only if it really targets a cross-border conurbation; otherwise take the second SO
- With reference to Articles 14(5) and 15(2) and 15 (5) of the ETC Regulation: ISO1 and ISO2 function as policy objectives:

ISO1 has 6 « specific objectives »:

1. Institutional capacity of public authorities
2. Legal and administrative cooperation
3. People-to-people actions for increased trust
4. Institutional capacity to manage macro-regional strategies
5. Support to democracy and civil society
6. Other actions to support better cooperation governance

ISO2 has 4 « specific objectives »:

1. Border management infrastructure
 2. Mobility and migration management
 3. Protection and integration of migrants (including refugees)
 4. Other actions to contribute to a safer and more secure Europe
- ISO1 and ISO2 activities listed in the Regulation function as specific objectives. Hence, they should be listed as specific objectives in column 2 of Table 1 (selected specific objective);
 - If several or additionally a different one activity – please choose “other”

Materials & further reading

| Subject | Link |
|---|---|
| See our information packages on PO 5 and ISO 1 and ISO2 including recordings on interpretation and Q&A sessions provided by colleagues from DG Regio and short papers by Interact | http://www.interact-eu.net/#o=post-2020/post-2020-programme-start |

| | |
|---|--|
| Highlights | |
| P05 | |
| For P05: interpretation video and Q&A | http://www.interact-eu.net/library#o=library/video-bringing-territoriality-interreg-qa-policy-objective-5 http://www.interact-eu.net/library#2974-publication-bringing-territoriality-interreg-policy-objective-5 |
| ISO 1 | |
| ISO1: Examples from various Interreg programmes | http://www.interact-eu.net/library#o=library/video-interreg-specific-objective-1-better-interreg-governance-programmes-reflections |
| Q&A on ISO 1: | http://www.interact-eu.net/library#o=library/video-interreg-specific-objective-1-better-interreg-governance-qa-session-ec-dg-regio |
| ISO 2 | |
| Interreg IPA Italy – Albania – Montenegro programme: | http://www.interact-eu.net/library#o=library/video-iso2-safer-and-more-secure-europe-programme%E2%80%99s-reflection-ipa-cbc-italy-albania; |
| Interreg IPA Romania – Serbia programme: | http://www.interact-eu.net/library#o=library/video-iso2-safer-and-more-secure-europe-programme%E2%80%99s-reflection-ipa-cbc-romania-serbia |
| ISO 2: Synergies and complementarities with other EU funds - DG Home: | http://www.interact-eu.net/library#o=library/video-iso2-synergies-and-complementarities-other-eu-funds-ec-dg-home |
| Q&A on ISO 2: | http://www.interact-eu.net/library#o=library/video-iso2-qa-session-ec-dg-regio |

2.1.1.1 Related types of action, including a list of planned operations of strategic importance, and their expected contribution to those specific objectives and to macro-regional strategies and sea-basis strategies, where appropriate

Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(i), Article 17(9)(c)(ii)

Comments Interact:

- The best reference document for the programmes to relate to are the MRS Action Plans that set out territorial challenges and prioritised actions, in this way providing orientation for the needed investments - the action plans are available on each MRS website.
- The sea basin strategies are available here: https://ec.europa.eu/maritimeaffairs/policy/sea_basins_en.
- Moreover, programmes can involve Strategy stakeholders (national coordinators and thematic coordinators) in the programming process to discuss how programmes can contribute to MRS priorities, focus areas/actions and processes (**partnership principle**). Since this point refers to programme areas as a whole or partially covered by one or more strategies, programmes will have to **justify the selected actions** in relation to their territorial benefit/impact. Especially for CBC this might be something to pay attention to as the relation between CBC and MRS/SBS might be quite different depending on the programme.
- MRS can also provide orientation for strategic actions, where appropriate, and provide suggestions for complementary funding.

Text field [7000]

List of planned operations of strategic importance

Text field [2000]

For component 4 Interreg *INTERACT* and *ESPO*N programmes:

Reference Article 17(9)(c)(i)

Definition of a single beneficiary or a limited list of beneficiaries and the granting procedure

Text field [7000]

2.1.1.2 Indicators

Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(ii), Article 17(9)(c)(iii)

Comments Interact.

- Don't forget that half the story is told by the selected SO - the context of cooperation is clear by that; the indicator should highlight the cooperation aspect: we recommend the use of the common Interreg indicators (it might also be quite difficult to show critical mass when using a thematic indicator)
- Preferably use common indicators as set out in Annex 1 to the ERDF Regulation
- If you have the feeling you need to be more specific – please use common output indicators and be more specific with the result indicator
- It is recommended to use max. 2 to 3 pairs of indicators per SO – in order to avoid overly sophisticated indicator system (which would again run against the intent to aggregate and achieve / show a critical mass for Interreg at the European level)
- In case you opt for one of the ISOs please try to use the common Interreg indicators!
- For output indicators, baselines shall be set at zero. The milestones set for 2024 and targets set for 2029 shall be cumulative. (Att. 33.2 of the ETC regulation); Milestones are obligatory for all outputs
- For the Result indicators: Baselines may be zero or >0 (where known or to be estimated; Milestones are not obligatory
- Handling of the indicator ID is the same as for the period 14-20

Materials & further reading

Legal Provision:

- **Draft CPR** :Art 2 - Definitions (indicator concepts, ...); Art 11 - Performance Framework; Art 13 - PF Methodology; Art 17 - Programme Contents
- **Draft ERDF/CF Regulation**: Art 2, 7 – SOs and common indicators; Annex I - Common output + result indicators
- **Draft Interreg Regulation**: Art. 33 Indicators for ETC (Interreg) goal; Art. 34 Evaluation during programming period; Annex – Programme template

Please see the materials in the community on indicators and results! If you are not yet a member of this community please contact us!

| Subject | Link |
|--|---|
| Intervention logic and indicators post-2020: Let us share & harmonise!, 23-24 January 2020, Vienna: presentation on intervention logic and indicators: | http://www.interact-eu.net/library#2792-presentations-intervention-logic-and-indicators-post-2020-let-us-share-harmonise |
| Revised draft indicator fiche ((version 2 from 26 June 2020), based on: the comments provided by the MAs in the past meetings; the updated list of indicators from the Council): | https://connections.interact-eu.net/forums/html/topic?id=c3e5f98c-1740-4750-a054-dc2de16745b4 |
| Q&A on ISO 1: | http://www.interact-eu.net/library#o=library/video-interreg-specific-objective-1-better-interreg-governance-qa-session-ec-dg-regio |

Table 2: Output indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID [5] | Indicator | Measurement unit [255] | Milestone (2024) [200] | Final target (2029) [200] |
|----------|--------------------|--------|-----------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Table 3: Result indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID | Indicator | Measurement unit | Baseline | Reference year | Final target (2029) | Source of data | Comments |
|----------|--------------------|----|-----------|------------------|----------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|----------|
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

2.1.1.3 The main target groups

Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iii), Article 17(9)(c)(iv)

Comments Interact.

- *It refers to target groups (in the sense of groups targeted by projects and not beneficiaries)*

Text field [7000]

2.1.1.4 Indication of the specific territories targeted, including the planned use of ITI, CLLD or other territorial tools

Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iv)

Comments Interact:

In case you opt for PO 5 you should provide a sketch of the following issues:

- The specific territories targeted and the key issues you would like to address with a strategy-based multi-sectoral approach
- The intended delivery method; in case you opt to use “other territorial tools” please explain briefly on the one hand the process of strategy-building (highlighting the aspects of multi-level-governance (MLG), i.e. the participatory approach and the involvement of local and regional bodies) and the approach to project generation; on the other hand please provide a brief and concise explanation on the acknowledgement respectively appraisal/approval of the strategy by the MC and the approach to project selection and monitoring of strategy implementation

For other POs it is recommended to use the section to provide an outline on the territorial approach to the PO. Specific territories in respectively territorial features of the programme area may have an important role in all POs. For example addressing climate change in the SO in PO 2 might look very differently for specific territories within the programme area. terials & further reading.

| Subject | Link |
|---|---|
| Presentation ‘Territorial tools – CLLD: (Christian Stampfer, Land Tyrol, Austria): | http://www.interact-eu.net/library#2854-presentations-bringing-territoriality-interreg |
| Presentation ‘Territorial tools – ITI: (Sandra Sodini, EGTC Euregio Senza Confini): | http://www.interact-eu.net/library#2854-presentations-bringing-territoriality-interreg |
| Presentation ‘Territorial tools – Integrated territorial & thematic plans (Alessandra Giovinazzo, Interreg ALCOTRA Programme (IT-FR): | http://www.interact-eu.net/library#2854-presentations-bringing-territoriality-interreg |

Text field [7000]

2.1.1.5 Planned use of financial instruments

Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(v)

Comments Interact:

Where it is envisaged to use financial instruments (FIs), this section should include a description of the planned financial instruments. It should outline the planned scope for the use of financial instruments and the intentions of the Member State in this regard. As FIs can be set-up in mid-period, and the ex-ante assessment required for each instrument is not necessarily completed at the time of submission of the operational programme, the description should be clear on where the use of FIs is definite (e.g. has been already subject to ex-ante assessment and instrument is being set up) and where it is under consideration or planned.

NB: Where appropriate, this section should indicate whether the entire priority axis will be:

- implemented solely on basis of FIs or*
- if planned FIs will be combined with any form of Union contribution, including from the same Fund (acc. Art 52(4) of Draft CPR) or*
- combined with ancillary programme support in the form of grants as a single financial instrument operation [cf. Art. 52(5) draft CPR]*

Materials & further reading

- Financial instruments: <http://www.interact-eu.net/library#2750-presentations-interreg-ipa-cbc-programmes-finance-meeting>*

Text field [7000]

2.1.1.6 Indicative breakdown of the EU programme resources by type of intervention

Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(vi), Article 17(9)(c)(v)

Table 4: Dimension 1 – intervention field

Comments Interact:

- **Annex 1 Table 1** of the CPR includes Dimensions and codes for the types of intervention for the ERDF, the ESF+ and the Cohesion Fund - Article 17(5); the codes are sorted by PO
- For the ISOs no specific codes have been defined

Next to codes for Technical Assistance (TA) the table includes a section on “other codes related to Policy Objectives 1-5”. Among those the following ones might be of potential interest for Interreg programmes:

| Code | Wording |
|------|---|
| 132 | Improve the capacity of programme authorities and bodies linked to the implementation of the Funds |
| 135 | Enhancing institutional capacity of public authorities and stakeholders to implement territorial cooperation projects and initiatives in a cross-border, transnational, maritime and inter-regional context |

But please note that code 135 is pretty close to TA!

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|-------------|------|--------------------|------|--------------|
| | | | | |

Table 5: Dimension 2 – form of financing

Annex 1 Table 2 of the CPR includes the codes for the form of finance; in the context of Interreg programmes by far the most relevant one is:

- 01 for grants

Just to let you know that there are also others such as 03 for “support through financial instruments: loans”

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|-------------|------|--------------------|------|--------------|
| | | | | |

Table 6: Dimension 3 – territorial delivery mechanism and territorial focus

Annex 1 Table 3 of the CPR includes the codes for the territorial delivery mechanism and territorial focus. Table and codes are divided in four sections:

Section 1: Integrated territorial investment (ITI)

Section 2: Community led local development (CLLD)

Section 3: Other type of territorial tool under PO 5 – therein the following codes might be interesting in the context of Interreg programmes; in particular code 37 since programme territories often reveal several geographical features

| Code | Wording |
|------|---------------------------|
| 33 | Functional urban areas |
| 34 | Mountainous areas |
| 35 | Islands and coastal areas |
| 36 | Sparsely populated areas |

| | |
|----|-------------------------------------|
| 37 | Other types of territories targeted |
|----|-------------------------------------|

Section 4: Other approaches (i.e. in POs other than PO 5 and if neither ITI nor CLLD is used; obviously the choice of the code should be coherent with the outlines on territorial features and approaches provided in section 2.1.1.4)

| Code | Wording |
|------|-------------------------------------|
| 41 | Urban neighbourhoods |
| 42 | Cities, towns and suburbs |
| 43 | Functional urban areas |
| 44 | Mountainous areas |
| 45 | Islands and coastal areas |
| 46 | Sparsely populated areas |
| 47 | Other types of territories targeted |
| 48 | No territorial targeting |

| Priority No | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|-------------|------|--------------------|------|--------------|
| | | | | |

2.T. Technical assistance priority

Reference: Article 17(4)(f) ETC

| |
|--------------------------|
| <i>Text field [8000]</i> |
|--------------------------|

| Priority No | Fund | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|-------------|------|------|--------------|
| | | | |

Comments Interact:

The approach to TA has been simplified. A flat rate mechanism is introduced which enables topping up each interim payment by a specific percentage [cf. Art. 26, draft Interreg Regulation] and thus linking the EU payment of TA to progress in programme implementation. Please note that there will no longer be a dedicated priority axis for TA and the TA percentage has to be considered when setting-up the financial plan for each priority axis!

Please note that there will no longer be a dedicated priority axis for TA and the TA percentage has to be considered when setting-up the financial plan for each priority axis!

3. Financing plan

Reference: Article 17(4)(g)

3.1 Financial appropriations by year

Reference: Article 17(4)(g)(i), Article 17(5)(a)(i)-(iv)

Table 7

| <i>Fund</i> | <i>2021</i> | <i>2022</i> | <i>2023</i> | <i>2024</i> | <i>2025</i> | <i>2026</i> | <i>2027</i> | <i>Total</i> |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| <i>ERDF</i> <i>(territorial cooperation goal)</i> | | | | | | | | |
| <i>ERDF</i> <i>programmed under Article 17(3)</i> <i>(Investments for Jobs and Growth goal)</i> | | | | | | | | |
| <i>IPA III CBC</i> ² | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Neighbourhood CBC</i> ³ | | | | | | | | |
| <i>IPA III</i> ⁴ | | | | | | | | |
| <i>NDICI</i> ⁵ | | | | | | | | |
| <i>OCTP</i> <i>Greenland</i> ⁶ | | | | | | | | |
| <i>OCTP</i> ⁷ | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Interreg Funds</i> ⁸ | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Total</i> | | | | | | | | |

3.2 Total financial appropriations by fund and national co-financing

Reference: Article 17(4)(g)(ii), Article 17(5)(a)(i)-(iv), Article 17(5)(b)

² Component 1 **Interreg A**, external cross-border cooperation

³ Component 1 **Interreg A**, external cross-border cooperation

⁴ Components 2 and 4 **Interreg B and C**

⁵ Components 2 and 4 **Interreg B and C**

⁶ Components 2 and 4 **Interreg B and C**

⁷ Components 3 and 4 **Interreg C and D**

⁸ ERDF, IPA III, NDICI or OCTP, where as single amount under Components 2 and 4 **Interreg B and C**

Table 8*

| PO No or TA | Priority | Fund (as applicable) | Basis for calculation EU support (total or public) | EU contribution (a) | National contribution (b)=(c)+(d) | Indicative breakdown of the national counterpart | | Total (e)=(a)+(b) | Co-financing rate (f)=(a)/(e) | Contributions from the third countries (for information) |
|-------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | National public (c) | National private (d) | | | |
| | Priority 1 | ERDF ⁷ | | | | | | | | |
| | | IPA III CBC ⁹ | | | | | | | | |
| | | Neighbourhood CBC ¹⁰ | | | | | | | | |
| | | IPA III ¹¹ | | | | | | | | |
| | | NDICI ¹² | | | | | | | | |
| | | OCTP Greenland ¹³ | | | | | | | | |
| | | OCTP ¹⁴ | | | | | | | | |
| | Interreg Funds ¹⁵ | | | | | | | | | |
| | Priority 2 | (funds as above) | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | All funds | | | | | | | | |
| | | ERDF | | | | | | | | |
| | | IPA III CBC | | | | | | | | |
| | | Neighbourhood CBC | | | | | | | | |
| | | IPA III | | | | | | | | |
| | | NDICI | | | | | | | | |
| | | OCTP Greenland | | | | | | | | |
| | | OCTP | | | | | | | | |
| | | Interreg Funds | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | All funds | | | | | | | | |

* Prior to the mid-term review, this table includes the amounts for the years 2021-2025 only.

⁷ When ERDF resources correspond to amounts programmed in accordance with Article 17(3), it shall be specified.

⁹ Component 1 Interreg A, external cross-border cooperation

¹⁰ Component 1 Interreg A, external cross-border cooperation

¹¹ Components 2 and 4 Interreg B and C

¹² Components 2 and 4 Interreg B and C

¹³ Components 2 and 4 Interreg B and C

¹⁴ Components 3 and 4 Interreg C and D

¹⁵ ERDF, IPA III, NDICI or OCTP, where as single amount under Components 2 and 4 Interreg B and C

4. Action taken to involve the relevant programme partners in the preparation of the Interreg programme and the role of those programme partners in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation

Reference: Article 17(4)(h)

Comments Interact

Key elements of the partnership principle are set out in the CPR and Code of conduct. Here we've tried to condense the key information.

Preamble of the CPR:

- The principle of partnership is a key feature in the implementation of the Funds, building on multi-level governance (MLG) and ensuring the involvement of civil society and social partners. In order to provide continuity in the organisation of partnership, Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 240/2014 should continue to apply [Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 240/2014 of 7 January 2014 on the European code of conduct on partnership in the framework of the ESIF]*

Draft CPR, Article 6 is important since it includes the minimum requirements!

- 1. Each Member State shall organise a partnership with the competent regional and local authorities. That partnership shall include at least the following partners:
 - a) urban and other public authorities;*
 - b) economic and social partners;*
 - c) relevant bodies representing civil society, environmental partners, and bodies responsible for promoting social inclusion, fundamental rights, rights of persons with disabilities, gender equality and non-discrimination.**
- 2. In accordance with the multi-level governance principle, the Member State shall involve those partners [...] throughout the preparation and implementation of programmes including through participation in monitoring committees in accordance with Article 34.*

More details are in the European Code of Conduct

Article 4 – Identification of relevant partners for programmes

For each programme:

- a) competent regional, local, urban and other public authorities,*
- b) economic and social partners,*
- c) bodies representing civil society, such as environmental partners, non-governmental organisations, and bodies responsible for promoting social inclusion, gender equality and non-discrimination,*

For ETC programmes (in addition):

- i. EGTCs operating in the respective cross-border or transnational programme area;*
- ii. authorities or bodies that are involved in the development or implementation of a macro-regional (MRS) or sea-basin strategy (SBS) in the programme area, including priority area coordinators (PACs) for MRS.*

Provisions related to the composition of the MC are in Article 28 of the ETC Regulation; the Article does not explicitly refer to the inclusion of a wider partnership. But Article 9 of the Code stipulates that information on the inclusion of partners during preparation and implementation is to be provided and Article 10.2 of the Code states:

- As regards the MCs of ETC programmes, partners may be represented by umbrella organisations at Union or transnational level for interregional and transnational cooperation programmes. Member States (MS) may involve partners in the preparations of the MC, in particular through their participation in coordination committees at national level organised in the participating MS.*

Article 16 of the Code refers to the responsibility of the MA to involve the partners in the MC and its tasks, Article 17 sets out a similar provision for the programme evaluations.

Text field [10 000]

5. **Approach to communication and visibility for the Interreg programme (objectives, target audiences, communication channels, including social media outreach, where appropriate, planned budget and relevant indicators for monitoring and evaluation)**

Reference: Article 17(4)(i)

Comments Interact

- *This section is the required minimum to describe the programme's approach to communication but given all implicit requirements we would recommend to develop a Communication Strategy covering the entire period as basis for annual action plans; in best case the Strategy should include the approach to capitalisation*
- *It is quite useful to consider the changes of key communication tasks across the programme life-cycle when indicating target audiences*
- *The minimum requirement is to run a programme website including information on calls and the list of projects respectively beneficiaries (cf. CPR Article 44 respectively Article 35 of the ETC Regulation)*

Draft CPR(Article 43) brings in requirements for the overall coordination of the communication approach:

1. *Each Member State shall identify a communication coordinator for visibility, transparency and communication activities in relation to the support from the Funds, including programmes under the European territorial cooperation goal (Interreg) where that Member State hosts the MA. The communication coordinator shall coordinate communication and visibility measures across programmes.*
2. *Each MA shall identify a communication officer for each programme ('programme communication officer').*

Materials & further reading

- *How to build a programme communication strategy, 16 June, online: presentations under: <http://www.interact-eu.net/library#2960-how-build-programme-communication-strategy>*

Text field [4 500]

6. Implementing provisions

6.1. Programme authorities

Reference: Article 17(7)(a)

Comments Interact

A quick overview on key functions of the programme authorities:

| Legal reference | Authority | Function |
|-----------------|-----------|--|
| ETC Art. 44 | -- | Programme authorities |
| ETC Art. 45 | MA | Functions of the MA (cross-reference to Article 66, 68 and 69) |
| CPR Art 66 | MA | Functions of the MA |
| CPR Art. 68 | MA | Programme management by the MA |
| ETC Art. 22 | MA | Selection of projects by the MC and role of MA therein |
| CPR Art. 69 | MA | Support of the work of the MC by the MA |
| ETC Art. 46 | -- | Accounting function (cross-reference to Article 70 of the CPR); body should be independent from units in charge of verifications |
| ETC Art. 31 | MA | Transmission of data to EC |
| ETC Art. 34 | MA | Responsibility for evaluation |
| ETC Art. 35 | MA | Responsibility with regard to transparency and communication |
| | | |
| ETC Art. 47 | AA | Functions of the AA |

Table 10

| Programme authorities | Name of the institution [255] | Contact name [200] | E-mail [200] |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Managing authority | | | |
| National authority (for programmes with participating third countries, if appropriate) | | | |
| Audit authority | | | |
| Group of auditors representatives | | | |
| Body to which the payments are to be made by the Commission | | | |

6.2. Procedure for setting up the joint secretariat

Reference: Article 17(7)(b)

Text field [3 500]

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

Reference: Article 17(7)(c)

Text field [10 500]

7. Use of unit costs, lump sums, flat rates and financing not linked to costs

Reference: Articles 88 and 89 CPR

Comments Interact

We limit our considerations to Article 88 since we think that the application of Article 89 (financing not linked to cost) in the context of Interreg is not very likely - currently only one example for the application of the model in a ERDF mainstream programme exists.

The interpretation and handling of the provisions related to Article 88 have been widely discussed over the past year. When ticking yes here you have to fill in the appendix. That has a couple of implications you should duly consider. Recent discussions in the past months have shown that:

- In terms of legal certainty it would be ideal to make use of appendix 2 provided that the audit authority (AA) is willing to carry out an ex-ante assessment of the proposed programme-specific simplified cost options (SCOs) but there is no clear legal obligation for the AA to do so, besides the reference in the appendix itself. Legal certainty means in this context that the methodology for the SCOs will not be subject of an audit by the AA or the Commission during the implementation.
- Having ticked "Yes" but not having a finalised or not having at all the ex-ante assessment means the Commission will not accept your programme (or ask you to take out this specific SCO)
- For pre-defined SCOs offered in the Regulation(s) (off-the-shelf SCOs) points 1, 3 and 5 of section C of appendix 2 do **not** have to be filled. This means that points 2 and 4 of section C have to be filled in the case of off-the shelf SCOs.

Table 11: Use of unit costs, lump sums, flat rates and financing not linked to costs

| Intended use of Articles 88 and 89 | YES | NO |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| From the adoption programme will make use of reimbursement of eligible expenditure based on unit costs, lump sums and flat rates under priority according to Article 88 CPR (if yes, fill in Appendix 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| From the adoption programme will make use of financing not linked to costs according to Article 89 CPR (if yes, fill in Appendix 2) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

APPENDICES

Comments Interact

- No specific requirements for the map of the programme area
- Appendices 2, 3 and 3a are only to be submitted, if applicable.

- Map of the programme area
- **Reimbursement of eligible expenditure from the Commission to the Member State Union contribution** based on unit costs, lump sums and flat rates
- **Union contribution based on F** financing not linked to cost

Appendix 1: Map of the programme area

Appendix 2: **Reimbursement of eligible expenditure from the Commission to the Member State Union contribution** based on unit costs, lump sums and flat rates

Appendix 3 Union contribution based on financing not linked to costs Reimbursement of eligible expenditure from the Commission to the Member State based on unit costs, lump sums and flat rates

Appendix 3a: List of planned operations of strategic importance with a timetable

Appendix 2: ~~Reimbursement of eligible expenditure from the Commission to the Member State based on unit costs, lump sums and flat rates~~ Union contribution based on unit costs, lump sums and flat rates¹⁶

¹⁶ **The Council's partial mandate changed the title of the appendix, linked to CPR Block 6. Without prejudice to further alignment on the outcome of the interinstitutional agreement on CPR Block 6.**

Template for submitting data for the consideration of the Commission

(Article 88 CPR)

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Date of submitting the proposal | |
| Current version | |

A. Summary of the main elements

| Priority | Fund | Estimated proportion of the total financial allocation within the priority to which the SCO will be applied in % (estimate) | Type(s) of operation | | Corresponding indicator name(s) | | Unit of measurement for the indicator | Type of SCO (standard scale of unit costs, lump sums or flat rates) | Corresponding standard scales of unit costs, lump sums or flat rates |
|----------|------|---|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | Code | Description | Code | Description | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

B. Details by type of operation (to be completed for every type of operation)

Did the Managing Authority receive support from an external company to set out the simplified costs below?

If so, please specify which external company: Yes/No – Name of external company

Types of operation:

| | |
|--|--|
| 1.1. Description of the operation type | |
| 1.2 Priority /s Specific objective(s) concerned | |
| 1.3 Indicator name ¹⁷ | |
| 1.4 Unit of measurement for indicator | |
| 1.5 Standard scale of unit cost, lump sum or flat rate | |
| 1.6 Amount | |
| 1.7 Categories of costs covered by unit cost, lump sum or flat rate | |
| 1.8 Do these categories of costs cover all eligible expenditure for the operation? (Y/N) | |
| 1.9 Adjustment(s) method | |
| 1.10 Verification of the achievement of the unit of measurement - describe what document(s) will be used to verify the achievement of the unit of measurement - describe what will be checked during management verifications (including on-the-spot), and by whom - describe what the arrangements are to collect and store the data/documents | |
| 1.11 Possible perverse incentives or problems caused by this indicator, how they could be mitigated, and the estimated level of risk | |
| 1.12 Total amount (national and EU) expected to be reimbursed | |

¹⁷ Several complementary indicators (for instance one output indicator and one result indicator) are possible for one type of operation. In these cases, fields 1.3 to 1.11 should be filled in for each indicator.

C: Calculation of the standard scale of unit costs, lump sums or flat rates

1. Source of data used to calculate the standard scale of unit costs, lump sums or flat rates (who produced, collected and recorded the data; where the data are stored; cut-off dates; validation, etc.):

2. Please specify why the proposed method and calculation is relevant to the type of operation:

3. Please specify how the calculations were made, in particular including any assumptions made in terms of quality or quantities. Where relevant, statistical evidence and benchmarks should be used and attached to this annex in a format that is usable by the Commission.

4. Please explain how you have ensured that only eligible expenditure was included in the calculation of the standard scale of unit cost, lump sum or flat rate;

5. Assessment of the audit authority(ies) of the calculation methodology and amounts and the arrangements to ensure the verification, quality, collection and storage of data:

**** Justifications on the underlying data, the calculation methodology and resulting rate or amount and related assessment by the audit authority [(in points 1, 3 and 5)] are not required when the simplified cost options submitted in this Appendix are established at Union level [(other policies or through the DA referred to in Article 88(4)).***

Appendix 3: Union contribution based on Financing not linked to costs

Template for submitting data for the consideration of the Commission

(Article 89 CPR)

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Date of submitting the proposal | |
| Current version | |

A. Summary of the main elements

| Priority | Fund | <i>The amount covered by the financing not linked to costs</i> | Type(s) of operation | Conditions to be fulfilled/results to be achieved | Corresponding indicator name(s) | | Unit of measurement for the indicator | [Envisaged reimbursement to the beneficiaries] ¹⁸ |
|----------------------------|------|--|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | Code | Description | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| The overall amount covered | | | | | | | | |

¹⁸ The Council partial mandate added this column in line with CPR Block 6. Without prejudice to further alignment on the outcome of the interinstitutional agreement on CPR Block 6.

B. Details by type of operation (to be completed for every type of operation)

Types of operation:

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------|------|---------|
| 1.1. Description of the operation type | | | |
| 1.2 Priority /s Specific objective(s) concerned | | | |
| 1.3 Conditions to be fulfilled or results to be achieved | | | |
| 1.4 Deadline for fulfilment of conditions or results to be achieved | | | |
| 1.5 Indicator definition for deliverables | | | |
| 1.6 Unit of measurement for indicator for deliverables | | | |
| 1.7 Intermediate deliverables (if applicable) triggering reimbursement by the Commission with schedule for reimbursements | Intermediate deliverables | Date | Amounts |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 1.8 Total amount (including EU and national funding) | | | |
| 1.9 Adjustment(s) method | | | |
| 1.10 Verification of the achievement of the result or condition (and where relevant, the intermediate deliverables) - describe what document(s) will be used to verify the achievement of the result or condition - describe what will be checked during management verifications (including on-the-spot), and by whom - describe what arrangements there are to collect and store the data/documents | | | |
| 1.10a Use of grants in the form of financing not linked to costs. <u>Does the grant provided by Member State to beneficiaries</u> | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>take the form of financing not linked to costs? [Y/N]</i> ¹⁹ | |
| 1.11 Arrangements to ensure the audit trail Please list the body(ies) responsible for these arrangements. | |

new Appendix 3a

Appendix 3a: List of planned operations of strategic importance *with a timetable* - Article 17(4)

Text field [2 000]

¹⁹ **The Council's partial mandate added point 1.10a, which was amended to improve clarity.**