

## Interreg-IPA CBC Hungary-Serbia

---

# Minutes of the 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Programming Committee

## LOGISTICAL DATA

**Date:** 07 November 2019

**Time:** 10:30 AM

**Venue:** Hotel 88 Rooms

Takovska 49, 11 000 Beograd, Srbija

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name	Institution	Function in PC
Ms Joanna Kirylo	European Commission, DG REGIO	Advisor, EC
Mr Péter Kiss-Parciu	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade – Managing Authority, Hungary	Member, Co-Chair
Mihajilo Dašić	Ministry of European Integration, National Authority, Serbia	Member, Co-Chair
Ms Nikoletta Horváth	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade – Managing Authority, Hungary	Deputy Member
Ms Valentina Vidović	Ministry of European Integration, National Authority, Serbia	Deputy Member
Ms Sanda Šimić	Ministry of European Integration, National Authority, Serbia	Advisor
Mr Viktor Tunić	Joint Secretariat, Interreg-IPA CBC Hungary-Serbia, SZPI Hungary	Head of JS, Moderator
Ms Dóra Dékány	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade – Managing Authority, Hungary	Deputy Member
Ms Ágota Józán	Bács-Kiskun County, Hungary	Member
Mr Béla Hegyesi	Ministry of Finance	Member
Miloš Golubović	Ministry of European Integration Republic of Serbia, Department for planing, programming and reporting on EU funds and Development Assistance	Member
Mr Nemanja Jakovljević	Ministry of European Integration Republic of Serbia, Department for planing, programming and reporting on EU funds and Development Assistance	Deputy Member
Ms Eszter Csókási	Csongrád County, Hungary	Member
Zoltán Nógrádi	Csongrád County Council	Deputy Member
Adrienn Futó	Széchenyi Programme Office (JS Hosting Body)	Member
Ms Jelena Todorović	Office for Cooperation with Civil Society	Deputy Member
Jelena Vasiljević	Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Serbia	Member
Vladimir Obućina	Government of Autonomous Province of Vojvodina	Deputy Member
Imre Kern	Ministry of Construction, Transport and Infrastructure	Member
Ms Jasmina Radonjić	Ministry of Construction, Transport and Infrastructure, Serbia	Deputy Member

Endre Balaša	Regional Developmental Agency PANONREG	Advisor
Nikolina Pupavac	Regional Developmental Agency "Bačka"	Advisor
Irena Živković	Regional Center for Socio-Economic Development "Banat"	Advisor
Branislav Milosav	Regional Center for Socio-Economic Development "Banat"	Deputy Advisor
Ervin Erős	Regional Developmental Agency "Srem"	Advisor
Nikica Rodin	Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia	Deputy Advisor
Mr János Halász	Joint Secretariat, Interreg-IPA CBC Hungary-Serbia, SZPI Hungary	Joint Secretariat
Ms Ágnes Dobrotka	Joint Secretariat, Interreg-IPA CBC Hungary-Serbia, SZPI Hungary	Joint Secretariat
Ms Olivera Tanacković	Joint Secretariat, Interreg-IPA CBC Hungary-Serbia, SZPI Hungary	Joint Secretariat
Mr Dejan Vujinović	Joint Secretariat Antenna, Interreg-IPA CBC Hungary-Serbia, Subotica	JS Antenna

## AGENDA

- 10:30-10:45 Welcome coffee, registration
- 10:45-11:00 Introductions, Approval of the Agenda
- 11:00-11:20 Discussion and approval of Rules of Procedures of the Programming Committee
- 11:20-11:40 Timeline of the programming process
- 11:40-12:00 Discussion and approval of the territorial analysis carried out for the Programme
- 12:00-12:30 Discussion and approval of Terms of Reference for Chapter 2 of the CP
- 12:30-13:30 Lunch
- 13:30-14:00 Discussion and approval of the Terms of Reference for SEA
- 14:00-14:30 Analysis of content of CP template and related Annexes (Ideas of SCO for future implementation, discussion about the SCO methods, intention of the COM about Annex II of the CP)
- 14:30-15:00 Feedback on Border Orientation Paper
- 15:00-15:30 Current status of EU legislation process
- 15:30-16:00 AOB

## MORNING SESSION

On behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Hungary, acting as the Managing Authority (MA) of the Interreg-IPA Cross-border Cooperation Hungary-Serbia Programme, **Mr Péter Kiss-Parciu deputy state secretary of the Ministry, Co-chairperson of the meeting** welcomes the participants of the Programming Committee (PC) to its first meeting.

The other Co-chairperson of the meeting was **Mr Mihajilo Dašić, Assistant minister from the Ministry of European Integration of the Government of the Republic of Serbia – the Serbian National Authority (NA)**, in charge of the cross-border and transnational cooperation programmes. **Mr Dašić** continues with his welcome speech.

**Ms Joanna Kyrillo, the Desk officer of the European Commission**, responsible for the current programme, also introduces herself to the PC and offers help with sharing best practices relating to programme planning.

Following the introduction speeches of the MA, the national authority (NA) and the Desk officer, all meeting participants briefly introduce themselves.

After the introduction round and the conclusion that the quorum is met, **Mr Tunić** summarizes the procedure of the programme planning, emphasizing that the programme bodies and the PC will be more involved compared to the planning of the previous programme.

### The PC approves the Agenda.

**Mr Tunić** presents the draft Rules of Procedure. Relating to the membership Mr Kern makes an intervention asking to delete 'department for spatial and urban planning' from Ministry for Constructions, Transport and Infrastructure.

**Ms Horváth** ensures that the correction will be made. She continues with further suggestions to the RoP, such as the extension of the list of invitees (e.g. all the stakeholders, Secretariat of Danube Region Strategy, green NGO, DKMT Euroregion).

**Mr Tunić** concludes that the above mentioned modifications will be elaborated in the document and proposed the RoP for approval.

### Decision no.1/2019 (07.11) – The PC approves the Rules of Procedure.

**Mr Tunić** explains the importance and practice of back office option available on the webpage of the current programme that will be more in use for the future meetings.

**Ms Kyrillo** makes an intervention. At first she emphasizes the seriousness of partnership principle. **Ms Kyrillo** talks about the conference to be held in February on how to bring the cohesion policy closer to citizens and the civil society. Relating to the this **Ms Kyrillo** asks whether public consultations are planned within the programming and asks how the input of larger public could be considered, having in mind that it might be too late for.

As a reply, **Mr Tunić** explains that on one hand consultations were already made with stakeholders and potential beneficiaries in the framework of the preparation of territorial analysis. He added that more substantial public consultations were foreseen.

**Ms Horváth** further explains that in the Terms of Reference for chapter 2 the obligations of future experts were clear. She mentions that once the first draft of the CP is done, it can be put on the website for open public consultation as well as the Strategy of Environmental Assessment.

**Ms Horváth** holds her presentation on the timeline of programme planning process.

**Mr Ocskay** (CESCI) holds his presentation on the territorial analysis.

**Ms Šimić** has questions and general comments. She concludes that the current version is a good basis for further elaboration. Ms Šimić explains that NA was not contacted relating to methodology, therefore, she asks about the next steps.

**Mr Ocskay** clarifies that in the second round more specific issues will be targeted and for that, the involvement of professionals from both sides of the border is needed. He added that sectorial workshops were planned to be organised based on the territorial aspects.

**Ms Šimić** summarizes that further elaboration of territorial analysis and SWOT analysis in parallel of the elaboration of chapter II is needed.

**Ms Horváth** clarifies that territorial analysis targets to fill in chapter I of CP that is the basis of chapter II. It means that if sectorial analysis will be further explored then by the next PC to be held in spring when the inception report is planned to be proposed for approval. There will be a second document on territorial analysis, selecting the topics and SEA expert will be procured when the 1st draft of CP is done.

**Ms Šimić** thanks for the clarification and emphasizes that the current version is not sufficient and it needs to be further elaborated.

**Ms Horváth** says that decision shall not be made on the present PC, but directions need to be given to CESCI, greenlights, orientations.

**Mr Tunić** suggests to handle this version as 1st draft and opens the discussion with the experience of current programme.

**Ms Csókási** took exception of the fact that **Mr Tunić** has expressed opinion on the themes regarding economic development, while **Mr Tunić** clarifies that his opinion relates to the low quality of projects of this programme and in of the previous programmes.

**Ms Horváth** agrees with the comments relating the economic development as the body implementing the programme and not as stakeholder.

**Ms Šimić** says that there was no wide consultation process; therefore, it is difficult to decide whether the results really come from the territory. There are topics which need to be decided by line ministries and not local stakeholders. Opinion of JS and current programme evaluation results need to be taken into account. This process is not giving sufficient data to nail down today the future topics of the programme. This version can be a guideline and topics can be extended or narrowed more based on the opinion of wider territories.

**Ms Horváth** disagrees to invite ministries now, because in that way it is not territorial based development of topics, it would not be the 'voice of territories'. She asks for guidance from **Ms Šimić** how she would like to see this process further on.

**Ms Šimić** concludes that methodology should be discussed. Consultation process needs to be widened as much as possible. Municipalities cannot be considered as only potential applicants neither the only territorial stakeholders in charge for spatial development. She underlines that it is about the eligible territory's interest only. PC shall discuss how wide the scope of consultation should be. PC should also consult on which sectors to have on sectorial workshops, because it cannot be decided based on workshops made for the municipalities and anonym questionnaires.

**Ms Horváth** says that CESCO was not guided by MA relating the methodology. She understands that further workshops are needed and list can be provided whom to invite, who is considered as relevant territorial expert.

**Mr Tunić** clarifies how the questionnaires were sent out. He concludes that the sectorial workshops need to be put on hold for now based on the remarks of the PC. He asks for more involvement of MA, NA and the JS in the work and discussions on the future steps.

**Mr Ocskay** says that definition of territory and territorial actors matters. Based on definition used by CESCO territorial actors are those institutions, which have territorial competences and can manage the territory where they are located. All 13 topics can be further elaborated. He would be cautious with involvement on ministries at this point. The final decision is in PC's hand. CESCO is open for any solutions.

**Ms Csókási** would like to urge the stronger involvement of the programme area rather than JS. The HU county councils have territorial development as one of their only tasks, therefore, a strong expertise is present in the councils and should be more involved.

**Mr Tunić** clarifies that the nature of the involvement of the JS and he agrees that area should be even more involved.

**Ms Horváth** says that there is a need to widen the list of participants to be invited in the second round based on the definition mentioned by CESCO.

**Ms Vidović** agrees with the initiative to hold new workshops. Wider consultations are needed where besides for example EC regulation, some parts of the draft should be presented to see the current situation. She proposes that the call for consultations is also announced on the programme and ministries' website. She states that the number of further workshops can be decided later and also suggests the participation of MA, NAs and the JS.

**Ms Horváth** asks **Mr Ocskay** for a possible schedule. She asks whether the mentioned expectations and previously not envisaged additional tasks are feasible.

**Mr Ocskay** summarizes that two more workshops (one in HU, one in SRB) need to be organised including more stakeholders. The PC can help CESCO to identify the territorial actors to be invited.

**Ms Šimić** makes an intervention that by experience 3 workshops per country is a good way to go for a territory as wide as the territory of this programme. It means that at least one, if possible two more workshops are desirable. She asks for better involvement of NA in the future to diminish workload of CESCO with providing premises or giving presentations if needed.

**Mr Ocskay** asks whether the questionnaire needs to be reopened.

**Ms Šimić** asks for a report done on questionnaires who replied, etc. It should not be dispatched again but it would also be good to left accessible giving the possibility for any institution to fill it in before taking the decision.

**Mr Ocskay** makes a remark that opening again the online survey again might distort the result, because institutions invited for the first round might have project ideas that were further communicated to other actors in the meantime.

**Ms Šimić** says the more the merrier principle should be applicable and in the end it is the PC itself who decides on the basis of what the interest of the territory is. The more project ideas, the more inputs the PC have helps to have a more justified decision.

**Ms Horváth** concludes that PC agreed that one workshop per country needs to be organised with extended invitees to whom the contact details can be already collected both sides from the relevant stakeholders and CESC should provide a proposal on the online survey whether it is necessary or not.

**Mr Tunić** closes this point of the discussion of territorial analysis and moves the discussion of Terms of Reference (ToR) of Chapter 2 to the afternoon session.

#### **AFTERNOON SESSION**

**Ms Horváth** presents that having analysed the obligatory elements of the programming document, the available external and internal capacities and the technical assistance resources, the tasks of internal and external capacities can be defined. She concludes that Serbia and Hungary and the JS can contribute to most of the chapters which is related to implementation, programme structure, shared responsibilities and liabilities, communication, involvement of partnership and financial plan. All results would be presented to the CP at a later stage. Chapter 2 and SEA definitely needs external capacities, therefore the draft ToRs were elaborated. She invites the participants to asks questions and then the document can be proposed for approval.

**Ms Horváth** and **Mr Tunić** explain that as background information data of the current CP were used. He emphasises that these data are not up-to-date, but clarifies that this chapter is giving information only for the future service provider as part of the procurement documentation. This chapter is part of the PraG template.

**Ms Csókási** mentioned that she did not receive the final comments relating to the ToR of Chapter 2.

**Ms Šimić** shares the comments, which are:

- minor corrections on data related to minorities;
- the fact that on Serbian side counties changed to districts;
- list of tasks are adjusted to list of outputs;
- Chapter 1 should be used as guidance for further work; organisation of workshops;
- Chapter 4.2 point 8 – public consultations and clarification sentence added;
- 4.3.2 Beneficiary countries are not clear, clarification was inserted;
- in point 4.1.1 comment made to the last activity.

[all detailed comments are available in the attached draft document]

**Ms Radonjić** requires update of background information e.g. currently there are 9 border-crossing points and not 7.

**Mr Tunić** repeats that as background information data of the current CP were used.

**Ms Horváth** says that final modifications will be shared within the minutes and the final version will be approved in a Written Procedure. She suggests to either have the extract from the CP with a footnote making the updates or delete the whole text and make references to the for certain websites where the relevant information can be gained.

**Mr Tunić** repeats that background information is information for the service provider and it is not that relevant that it needs to be up-to-date at this stage. He proposes to leave the data with a footnote saying that those data were provided what were possessed at the moment.

**Ms Šimić** says that disclaimer should be included that data in the ToR are not updated and those will be elaborated in the new programme.

**Ms Horváth** and **Mr Tunić** conclude that this part require technical corrections.

**NO DECISION MADE ON ToR of Chapter 2 – to be concluded within Minutes and WP**

**Ms Horváth** presents the essence of the Terms of Reference for the Strategic Environmental Assessment. She notes that the situation of background information is the same as discussed in chapter 2 and invites the participants for questions.

No comments were made, therefore, Ms Horváth proposes the document for approval.

**Decision no.2/2019 (07.11) – The PC approves the ToR of the SEA.**

**Ms Horváth** introduces the next agenda point saying that the Annexes of CP document also need to be submitted and emphasizes the importance of simplified cost options that can be defined and improved based on lessons learnt. She adds that practical solutions on the reimbursement aspects between the COM and the MA are still analysed.

**Mr Tunić** gives his presentation on analysis of content of CP template and related Annexes.

**Ms Kyrillo** remarks that methodologies need to be start now because based on experience there are programmes to whom it takes years. She suggests to have close contact with INTERACT and the relevant COM unit. She mentions that auditors are very much affected and COM is holding trainings to them to avoid that auditors 'scare' the programmes off certain solutions.

**Ms Kyrillo** draws the attention that lump sums should be tied to milestones as in case of a package of activities to be reimbursed by lump sum each activity must be performed to get approval.

**Mr Tunić** replies that in this topic the JS can cooperate with other programmes of the same hosting institution and NAs can also contribute with inputs from programmes they are involved in.

**Ms Kyrillo** gives feedback on Border Orientation Paper emphasizing that the idea is that it is a good starting point for discussion and that it represents the COM's view on what should be taken into consideration when planning the next programming period. This is not a legally binding document. Therefore, disagreement is welcomed, but reasons need to be given on it. She further explains the content of the document and makes a remark on small project funds that were developed by the experts rather for internal programmes than external ones.



**Ms Horváth** presents the current status of the EU legislation process.

**Ms Tunić** concludes that since the next programme might have smaller budget, the thematic objectives need to be cut relatively fast.

**Ms Csókási** expresses that the cooperation of the two countries is very good. She says that the border crossing situation is the only factor that causes difficulties in the cooperation. Unfortunately, the budget foreseen in the next period is not enough to solve this situation. It can happen in peak time that 8-9 hours waiting is needed. The budget of the programme is not sufficient for modernizing the border-crossing points that would contribute to an even better cooperation. Therefore, she is asking for the possibility of extra funds to solve the mentioned problem to have much better results from economical and civil point of view.

**Ms Kyrillo** replies that she checks the possibilities with other DGs as well.

**Ms Radonjić** makes an intervention relating to the BOP mentioning that the expensive and huge infrastructure projects are difficult to fit to the smaller programme, the smaller budget. She remarks that the intention is not all the way consistent.

**Ms Kyrillo** replies that this is the result that every DG pushes its priorities. She mentions that the money to be given by non-EU member added to the ERDF allocation needs to be at least 50%. It can happen also that the ERDF is 30% and the external fund is 70%. She adds that she will bring to the attention this remark on practical feasibility to the DG.

**Ms Kyrillo** presents the upcoming important events organised by INTERACT (Europe Day, European Cooperation Day, Interreg Annual Event) and the calendar that will contain all the important initiatives. She emphasizes the importance of increasing visibilities.

As there were no further comments **Mr Tunić** concludes the 1<sup>st</sup> PC.