

Interreg-IPA CBC Hungary-Serbia

Minutes of the 4th meeting of the Programming Committee

LOGISTICAL DATA

Date: 17 June 2021

Time: 10:00 AM

Venue: Online meeting

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name	Institution	Function in PC
Ms Joanna Kiryłło	European Commission, DG REGIO	Advisor, EC
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 Katarina Ginić	Ministry of European Integration, National Authority, Serbia	National Authority
Mr Tamás Horváth	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade – Managing Authority, Hungary	Managing Authority
Ms Viktória Várkonyi	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade – Managing Authority, Hungary	Managing Authority
Ms Szilvia Hujbert	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade – Managing Authority, Hungary	Managing Authority
Ms Dóra Dékány	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade – Managing Authority, Hungary	Managing Authority
Mr Viktor Tunić	Joint Secretariat, Interreg-IPA CBC Hungary-Serbia, SZPO Hungary	Joint Secretariat
Mr Viktor Oroszi	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade Budapest; EU Strategy for the Danube Region	Member
Mr Dániel Vargha	Prime Minister's Office - Hungary	Deputy Member
Dr Roland Mák	Bács-Kiskun County, Hungary	Substitute Member
Ms Dorina Válik	Bács-Kiskun County, Hungary	Substitute Deputy Member
Mr Béla Hegyesi	Ministry of Finance, Hungary	Member
Ms Eszter Csókási	Csongrád County Council	Member
Mr Zoltán Nógrádi	Csongrád County Council	Deputy Member
Mr Siniša Trkulja	Ministry of construction, transport and infrastructure, Serbia	Member
Aleksandra Vukmirović	Standing Conference of Towns and Municipalities	Member
Mr Slobodan Milivojević	Standing Conference of Towns and Municipalities	Deputy Member
Ms Jelena Vasiljević	Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Serbia	Member
Ms Anamarija Viček	Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia	Advisor

Emese Lalić Urban	Ministry of Construction, Transport and Infrastructure	Advisor
Ms Nikolina Pupavac	Regional Developmental Agency “Bačka”	Advisor
Ms Andrea Hajdar	Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia	Advisor
Ms Irena Živković	Regional Center for Socio-Economic Development “Banat”	Advisor
Mr Branislav Milosav	Regional Center for Socio-Economic Development “Banat”	Deputy Advisor
Ms Radmila Mendebaba	DKMT	Advisor
Mr Richárd Gönczi	SZPO Hungary	Deputy Member
Mr Mátyás Jaschitz	CESCI	External expert
Ms Kitti Dubniczki	CESCI	External expert
Mr Balázs Wächter	Vital Pro Ltd.	External expert
Mr Bonis Sebastian	Optimeast Europe Srl.	External expert
Ms Senka Gavranov	Optimeast Europe Srl.	External expert
Ms Mónika Németh	Grants Europe Ltd.	External expert
Mr János Halász	Joint Secretariat, Interreg-IPA CBC Hungary-Serbia, SZPO Hungary	Joint Secretariat
Ms Olivera Tanacković	Joint Secretariat, Interreg-IPA CBC Hungary-Serbia, SZPO Hungary	Joint Secretariat
Ms Ágnes Dobrotka	Joint Secretariat, Interreg-IPA CBC Hungary-Serbia, SZPO Hungary	Joint Secretariat

AGENDA

- Introduction, Approval of the Agenda
- Introduction of SEA team and state of play of SEA process
- Discussion and decision on the draft of Chapter 1 of the Interreg Programme document
- Discussion and decision on the draft of Chapter 2 of the Interreg Programme document
- Discussion and decision on the draft of Chapter 4, 5 and 7 of the Interreg Programme document
- Next steps in the programming process
- AOB

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, **Ms Nikoletta Horváth deputy head of the Managing Authority, Co-chairperson of the meeting** welcomes the participants of the Programming Committee (PC) to its second meeting.

The other Co-chairperson of the meeting was **Ms Valentina Vidović, representing 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. **Ms Vidović** continues with her welcome speech.

Finally, **Mr Viktor Tunić**, the head of the Joint Secretariat greets the participants.

After the welcome speeches, it is concluded that the quorum is met.

Ms Horváth presents the agenda of the meeting and proposes it to approval.

The PC adopts the agenda.

After the approval of the Agenda, **Ms Horváth** gives the floor to **Ms Németh** representing Grants Europe Consulting as an advisor being in charge for the preparation of Strategic Environmental Assessment. **Ms Németh** presents the current status of the implementation and her team. She sums up the inception report in which the timeline, the methodology and the assets are elaborated. A scoping report is ready and since the inception report is approved by the PC, the scoping report will be submitted to the national environmental authorities in Hungary and Serbia. Based on their comments, the team will prepare the draft environmental report. It is foreseen to be presented by middle of July. Then the consultation process will be launched in parallel with the one of the draft Interreg programme. The final draft of SEA is foreseen to be sent for approval to the PC by September.

Ms Horváth thanks for the presentation and explains that besides the expert team, there are constant consultations with SEA national contact point from the Ministry of Agriculture. She invites the participants to ask questions regarding the topic. Since there are no questions, **Ms Horváth** concludes that the letter with the scoping will be prepared and sent to the relevant authorities in line with the national processes in a couple of days.

Ms Horváth continues with the next agenda point, which is chapter 1 of the Interreg programme prepared by CESCO. She adds that the chapter 1 content is based on the territorial analysis and the chapter 2 that was already presented.

Ms Dubniczki from CESCO summarizes shortly the 1st chapter of the programme document.

After the presentation, **Ms Horváth** mentions that before the committee meeting on the Hungarian national level consultation only technical comments were received from the Ministry of Interior regarding water management topics. These comments will be shared with the experts and will be handled by the expert team. Another comment was received from Csongrád-Csanád county asking for the inclusion of Baja (besides of Subotica and Szeged) relating to transport network. **Ms Horváth** shares that the participants of the national level consultation were satisfied with the draft document.

Mr Gönczi signals that chapter 1.2.4 on synergies with other instruments should also contain other cross-border co-operations as well. Having in mind the character limits, there is no need to insert deep analysis, but these instruments should also be mentioned.

Ms Dubniczki confirms that this request is acceptable.

Mr Tunić says that since these remarks would not in fact change the overall content of chapter 1, the document could be proposed for provisional approval. The updated version would be shared with the committee together with the minutes of the meeting.

Ms Horváth agrees and proposes the draft of chapter 1 for approval with the mentioned technicalities and conditions.

Decision no.10/2021 (17/06) – The PC approves of the draft version of chapter 1 of the programming document.

After the voting, **Ms Horváth** invites Mr Wächter, representing Vital Pro Ltd, to present the content of chapter 2 of the document.

Mr Wächter thanks for the possibility and summarises the draft content of chapter 2.

Mr Tunić expresses that very productive meetings were held between the Joint Secretariat, other programme bodies and the expert team. He continues that the Secretariat finds chapter 2 well prepared and respects the wishes of the region. He also mentions that the current version is good to start the public consultations and in the meantime further work can be done on the indicators, target groups and the financial allocation.

Ms Horváth says that the content of the document was also discussed on the national level consultation. The same comments were received from Ministry of Interior as for chapter 1. Also, water management issues need some fine-tuning. And Bács-Kiskun county signalled that EUROVELO 13 should be reflected in the programming document and in call for proposals to be launched later.

Mr Wächter confirms that incorporation of EUROVELO 13 is possible within thematic touristic routes.

Ms Kiryłło poses the question whether the programme is thinking about any projects with strategic importance.

Ms Horváth replies that ideas are still under elaboration and discussions are on-going whether the project of strategic importance could be financed from ISO2, however it has limited sources (5%). Recommendations are received from bilateral ministerial meeting at the Joint Economic Forum in Belgrade on Hercegszántó border-crossing, which would fit in the budget, since it could be only planning no infrastructure. It would represent a good example how programming periods would be building blocks for a greater projects overreaching the programme allocation. But at this moment nothing is set in stone. Short summary will be prepared and sent to Serbian colleagues and if basic agreement is reached, further details will be prepared.

Ms Kiryłło makes a small remark about Court of Auditors auditing a big sample of internal cross-border projects. One of the criticisms was that many projects are not genuine cross-border but rather “mirror” projects. Therefore, if there are for example infrastructure projects the fact that they are funded by Interreg and not by the mainstream programmes, must be very well justified by their cross-border impact.

Mr Tunić expresses his confidence that the current strategic projects of the programme would pass this kind of audits. He also underlines, that the cross-border effect should be crucial for this type of projects for the future programme.

Ms Horváth gives information on the current version of the programme allocation that might be 62 million euro. She explains that the Managing Authority is working on having at least the same size of the programme that it is in the current period (65.124 million euro) and asks for possibilities of increasing the 62 million euro.

Ms Kirylo mentions that there are additional funds dedicated to the IPA CBC programmes. However, it is not yet clear yet how they will be allocated to individual programmes (ex. what share will go to the cross-border, transnational and interregional strands) .

Ms Tunić says that he is very satisfied with this news and states that the decrease might be only around 3 million euro. This is considered as a great achievement having in mind that scenarios of 30% decrease were also realistic at a time.

Ms Horváth invites the participants to ask questions on chapter 2 and also on any other mentioned topics.

Ms Vukmirović greets the participants and asks a thematic question. Her Ministry proposed on the last meeting the topic of joint cross-border sustainable mobility plans that she could not see in the draft document at the moment. It meant to be included in ISO1. She also makes a technical remark, namely that the whole document shall be adjusted in terms of terminology regarding administration such as towns, cities, municipalities, local governments, etc.

Mr Wächter confirms that the terminology will be reviewed and corrected. He also mentions that the requested mobility plans should be considered under public transport development activities. The request could be solved with the adjustment of the activity called 'coordination of cross-border transport development plan'.

Ms Csókási signals two minor comments. First is on the languages on publications (page 19) that should be extended to at least Romanian and German languages as well. The second remark is relating to main target groups (page 23), from where Chambers of Commerce is suggested to be excluded.

Mr Wächter replies that the first proposal will be handled by extending the language possibilities. As for the target groups, the Chambers are relevant, but can be considered under other items of the list of the target groups.

Ms Horváth confirms, that Chambers can be deleted from the list if it is requested, as later it can still be considered based on the wording of the remaining part of the target groups.

Mr Tunić also confirms that the mentioned specific objectives should not necessary consider the Chambers as one of the main target groups and it will be the call for proposals where the target groups and potential beneficiaries will be defined in more details.

Mr Trkulja repeats the request of **Ms Vukmirović** regarding the sustainable mobility plans. He suggests to use the terminology of 'transport and mobility'.

Ms Horváth confirms that this change is supported.

Since there are no more questions and comments, **Ms Horváth** proposes for approval the draft chapter 2 with the discussed slight corrections.

Decision no.11/2021 (17/06) – The PC approves of the draft version of chapter 2 of the programming document.

After the voting, **Ms Horváth** explains that the other chapters of the programming document (chapter 4, 5 and 7) are rather about the programme set up and implementation and invites the participants to ask questions.

Mr Tunić takes the word and summarises the current content of these chapters (financing allocations, institutional set up, communication, simplified cost options).

Ms Horváth adds that simplification will not be part of the Interreg programme, but it will be part of the future calls for proposals.

Since there are no more questions and comments, **Ms Horváth** proposes for approval the draft of chapters 4, 5 and 7 with the discussed content.

Decision no.12/2021 (17/06) – The PC approves of the draft version of the chapter 4, 5 and 7 of the programming document.

Ms Horváth says that the next step is that the Secretariat prepares the minutes which will be circulated together with the documents containing the approved corrections. She explains there are three different teams working that on these three parts (chapter 1, 2 and other chapters). She suggests to put the three parts together not to duplicate the template; that way the document will be clearer. She further elaborates that after the scoping SEA process is done, there are two sets of obligation. One is the draft SEA report, which is part of the draft Interreg programme and the other one is the public consultation in terms of the Interreg programme. Therefore, once the document is put together, it will be sent for translation so it will be ready by the time the scoping is done. She continues that after the PC approves the final documentation, the national governmental approval will start. While the translation of this version of the documents will be done with external assistance, it is agreed that the JS will do the fine-tuning of the translations if any changes will be necessary as a result of the public consultations and for other possible reasons.

Ms Horváth also explains that currently we are waiting for the Commission's decision on the allocation, but until that we can calculate with the already mentioned 62 million euro. As for the enlargement of partnership principle, the Serbian colleagues signalled their need and it was agreed that after the national processes there might be some changes in the Rules of Procedure.

Ms Kiryłło informs the Programming Committee on the state of play of the legislation process. The legislations should be adopted by end of June. However, there is a delay with implementing acts (budget and geography), because there are still consultations on the geography of certain programmes. Therefore, it is not possible to decide on the budget allocation at the moment.

The Commission's assessment is that the implementing acts will be published in the very end of this year or in January. The multi annual strategic document, prepared by DG NEAR, is planned to be endorsed and published in autumn. However, the final draft of this document has been widely consulted and should not change any more. Having in mind that this document contains rather general information, it should not affect the outcome of the programming processes.

As for SFC2021 (the system of the EC used by programmes to report with), it should be launched in September this year. However, if the document is mature enough the programme should not wait for

the SFC2021 to be operational, because this draft can also be submitted via SFC2014 (under the functionality of 2021-2027). This would be an informal dialogue, meaning, that time is not counting during this phase. This option could help very much the effective work and co-operation.

The template of financing agreement to be officially given to the programme when the programme is adopted, but prior consultations will be possible in the meantime.

Ms Horváth agrees that before circulating the final documents with the programming committee this option of uploading it into the current version of the SFC for prior consultation is a good opportunity.

Ms Vidović thanks to **Ms Kiryłto** the useful information and explains that the situation is somewhat the same within Romania-Serbia programme. She also expresses her satisfaction relating to the foreseen programme allocation.

Since there is no more remarks, **Ms Horváth** thanks for the contribution of the committee, the work of the experts, the useful information of **Ms Kiryłto** and concludes the 4th PC.