

Interreg



Co-funded by
the European Union

IPA ADRION

2nd restricted call for proposals

Discussion on the main elements shaping the call

*12° IPA ADRION MC meeting
Ljubljana, 12-13 November 2024*

IPA ADRION Joint Secretariat



2nd restricted call – recap on available resources and MC decisions



Thematic wise, all indicative actions not included in the 1st call for proposals shall be eligible in the 2nd call, i.e.:

Specific Objective	No. of eligible indicative actions
1.1	8
2.1	3
2.2	Not enough resources
2.3	5
2.4	Not enough resources
3.1	4
TOTAL	20

For the same specific objectives (i.e.: 2.2 and 2.4 excluded), there were 23 actions eligible in the first call
A project proposal can address to more than 1 indicative action within the selected SO



2nd restricted call recap on available resources and MC decisions

SO	Interreg available Funds 2 nd restricted call (including savings after 1 st call negotiation)
SO 1.1	3.319.715,51
SO 2.1	7.595.103,94
SO 2.2	54.391,60
SO 2.3	6.565.657,81
SO 2.4	310.163,68
SO 3.1	3.667.119,31
Total	21.512.151,85



SO 2.4: MC decided to shift left resources to SO 1.1
Resources reduced following the negotiation process

Interreg



Co-funded by
the European Union

IPA ADRION

2nd restricted call recap on available resources and MC decisions



- During the MC in Zagreb, the MC expressed the intention of increasing the SO 1.1 budget of 1 MEUR Interreg by shifting savings of SO 2.4 that at that time would have allowed to meet the MC requirement.
- Following the negotiation process SO 2.4 savings reduced to EUR 310.163,68 (see the seven communications to the MC on the closure of the negotiation phase of the last project of the 1st call for proposals and clarifications to Greek delegation on S.O 2.4)
- If the intention of increasing SO 1.1 budget is confirmed, other solution(s) should be identified.



2nd restricted call

Possible redistribution of available resources (1/3)



Shifting of funds within the same priority (from SO 1.2 to SO 1.1)

- Max allocation of Interreg funds for future strategic projects under SO 1.2 (“unimasters”) – MEUR 7,20
- Max allocation decided by MC depending on the master duration (1 or 2 years)
- Based on information provided by projects on their future masters, the max allocation of Interreg resources to projects would be of MEUR 6,85
- **Potential further MEUR 0,35 could be additional shifted to SO 1.1**



2nd restricted call Possible redistribution of available resources (2/3)

Shifting of all savings of 1st call from all priorities to priority 1 (from all SOs to SO 1.1)

SO	CP 2021-2027 Budget without TA pursuant to Article 27(1) (a1) (A)	1 ^o call Interreg funds allocated (B)	Interreg available Funds for the 2nd restricted call (it includes savings generated after negotiation) (C= A-B)	(ouf of column C) 1 ^o call savings generated already inside column C (D)	Amount that can be left over by Strategic call SO 1.2	Interreg Available Funds for the 2nd restricted call Proposal to shift all savings to SO 1.1
SO 1.1	28.828.851,00	25.509.135,49	3.319.715,51	169.978,58		4.804.638,05
SO 1.2	7.207.213,00				357.213,00	
SO 2.1	24.156.597,00	16.561.493,06	7.595.103,94	374.836,36		7.220.267,58
SO 2.2	10.065.245,00	10.010.853,40	54.391,60	54.391,60		
SO 2.3	24.156.587,00	17.590.929,19	6.565.657,81	385.489,99		6.180.167,82
SO 2.4	8.723.212,00	8.413.048,32	310.163,68			
SO 3.1	11.183.607,00	7.516.487,69	3.667.119,31	2.827,91		3.664.291,40
Total	114.321.312,00	85.601.947,15	21.512.151,85	987.524,44	357.213,00	21.869.364,85

+ MEUR 1,48



Proposed shifting in compliance with art. 19.5 of Interreg Regulation:

Following the consultation of and the approval by the monitoring committee and in compliance with Article 8 of Regulation (EU) 2021/1060, the managing authority may transfer during the programming period an amount of up to 10 % of the initial allocation of a priority and no more than 5 % of the programme budget to another priority of the same Interreg programme.

Priority initial allocation		amount of up to 10 % of the initial allocation of a priority (art. 19.5 Interreg Regulation)	proposed shifting of funds
priority 1	36.036.064,00	3.603.606,40	357.213,00
priority 2	67.101.641,00	6.710.164,10	1.124.881,63
priority 3	11.183.607,00	1.118.360,70	2.827,91
total	114.321.312,00	11.432.131,20	

shifting from SO 1.2 to 1.1 within the same priority

Proposed shifting below the maximum threshold reported in Interreg Regulation



Interreg



Co-funded by
the European Union

IPA ADRION

Possible elements to be considered to shape the 2nd restricted call



The limited financial resources available and the high number of eligible actions risk generating disappointment among potential beneficiaries.

- ! Need of designing a feasible, fair and appealing call by ensuring equal treatment between ERDF and IPA potential beneficiaries while envisaging some changes in key call elements already discussed while preparing the 1st call for proposals.



Interreg



Co-funded by
the European Union

IPA ADRION

Confirmed key elements



Key principles defined by MC during the design of the 1st call confirmed

- Eligibility of the lead partner (IPA/ERDF participating countries)
- Lead partner can only be a public/public equivalent body/international organization subject to national law
- Project partners can be public, public equivalent body or private bodies
- One-step call and assessment approach
- Max project duration (36 months)

Interreg



Co-funded by
the European Union

IPA ADRION

Shaping the 2nd restricted call for proposals Possible elements to be considered



Proposed elements for 2nd restricted call shaping

- A. Compulsory and/or stressed focus on activities aimed at strengthening the transfer of know-how and the effectiveness of the proposals
- B. Partnership dimension
- C. Overall Interreg project budget
- D. Ensure a good balance between available funds, number projects to be granted and number of expected applicants.

Possible elements to be considered to shape the 2nd restricted call



A - FOCUS ON ACTIVITIES (1/2)

To increase the intensity of the exchange of practices, and of the supporting measures for the benefit of IPA and/or of ERDF lagging behind partners, compulsory capacity building activities are proposed.

Capacity building:

- a) Shall be a supporting measure for the exploitation of project outputs and results. It shall contribute to improving the understanding, knowledge, skills, competences and access to information of targeted stakeholders.
- b) Shall be jointly developed at transnational level and tailored according to the needs of the specific territories and target groups.
- c) May include e.g. seminars, study visits, peer reviews, online training courses, tutoring on knowledge sharing.
- d) In case lagging behind ERDF partners will be the beneficiaries of this action, their identification must be duly justified.

Capacity-building as such shall not be the focus of a project proposal.



Possible elements to be considered to shape the 2nd restricted call



A - FOCUS ON ACTIVITIES (2/2)

Strengthen the leverage effect on investment, development perspectives and policy development

- Ensure stronger tied links with other sources of funding (in particular at national level) able to grant complementary measures (e.g.: investments, follow up activities etc)
- Proposed action plans, strategies etc should be linked to needs and plans elaborated for the benefit of the area where the partner is located (e.g.: proposal on marine/maritime activities should be linked to the existing maritime spatial plans; proposed strategies on climate change mitigation should be linked to the investments done through the Recovery and Resilience Facility funds and understood as a step ahead).





Possible elements to be considered to shape the 2nd restricted call



B - FOCUS ON PARTNERSHIP

Due to the limited financial resources available, a fair reduction of the eligible partnership, while ensuring equal treatment between ERDF and IPA potential beneficiaries, could contribute increasing the number of granted projects (combined with overall Interreg budget reduction)

Minimum dimension of project partnership: at least **4 eligible partners (2 IPA +2 ERDF partners)** from different participating countries (1st call: at least 6 eligible partners (3 IPA + 3 ERDF partners)).

Maximum 2 project partners per participating countries.



Possible elements to be considered to shape the 2nd restricted call



C - MAXIMUM PROJECT FINANCIAL SIZE DIMENSION

Due to the limited financial resources available, and the high number of eligible indicative actions, a fair reduction of the maximum Interreg budget, combined with a revision of the size of the partnership, could contribute increasing the number of granted projects



OPTION 1 - Maximum Interreg project budget:
MEUR 1,2



Minimum number of granted projects: 18,2

OPTION 2 - Maximum Interreg project budget:
MEUR 1,3



Minimum number of granted projects: 16,8

OPTION 3 - Maximum Interreg project budget:
MEUR 1,5



Minimum number of granted projects: 14,5

Average allocated budget in the 1° call was of MEUR 1,3 Interreg funds, with a bigger minimum eligible partnership (6 partners)

Possible elements to be considered to shape the 2nd restricted call



C - MINIMUM NUMBER OF GRANTED PROJECTS (ACCORDING TO MAXIMUM ELIGIBLE BUDGET) PER SO (considering the proposed budget redistribution)

SO	Available Interreg amount	Number of indicative actions to be granted	Maximum Interreg project budget		
			Option 1 Meur 1,2	Option 2 Meur 1,3	Option 3 Meur 1,5 (= 1 st call)
SO 1.1	4.804.638,05	8	4	3,7	3,2
SO 2.1	7.220.267,58	3	6	5,5	4,8
SO 2.3	6.180.167,82	5	5,1	4,7	4,1
SO 3.1	3.664.291,40	4	3,1	2,9	2,4
Total	21.869.364,85	20	18,2	16,8	14,5

The reduction of Interreg project budget would slightly increase the minimum number of granted projects in comparison with the rules set forth in the 1^o call application manual

Option 1 would better ensure the achievement of the missing output indicators targets



Possible elements to be considered to shape the 2nd restricted call

D - ENSURE A GOOD BALANCE BETWEEN AVAILABLE FUNDS, NUMBER OF PROJECTS TO BE GRANTED AND NUMBER OF EXPECTED APPLICANTS

Avoid side effects but significant such as:

- Decrease of interest from potential beneficiaries due to long time necessary to assessment all received applications (meanwhile, e.g.: other projects can be granted, and some partners could be overwhelmed)
- Risk of changing priorities among the partners due to internal changes
- Long assessment process means late start, late effective spending with consequences on the financial performance. Year 2027 could be challenging in terms of meeting the programme financial performance if 2nd restricted call projects are not fully operative by that time
- The later the projects are approved, the later possible savings could be re-used

Monitoring of granted projects shall run in parallel and must be ensured.

- Participation of the same applicant only once/call (VAT number shall be used for its identification) regardless:
 - the applicant's organization in departments
 - the call addresses several SOs.
- Eligibility and admissibility checks should be kept as part of the competition process

