

## Interreg-IPA CBC Hungary-Serbia

---

# Minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Programming Committee

## LOGISTICAL DATA

**Date:** 18 November 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 Elisa Grafulla	European Commission, JRC	Presentation on New European Bauhaus, EC
Mr Mihajilo Dašić	Ministry of European Integration, National Authority, Serbia	Member
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
Mr Tamás Molnár	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 Dóra Dékány	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 Katarina Ginić	Ministry of European Integration, National Authority, Serbia	National Authority
Ms Ana Filovski	Ministry of European Integration, National Authority, Serbia	National Authority
Mr Viktor Tunić	Joint Secretariat, Interreg-IPA CBC Hungary-Serbia, SZPO Hungary	Joint Secretariat
Ms Csilla Szalóky-Hoffmann	Ministry of Finance, Hungary	Deputy Member
Ms Jasmina Radonjic	Ministry of Construction, Transport and Infrastructure	Deputy Member
Mr Péter Csibi	Prime Minister's Office, Hungary	Deputy Member
Mr Vladimir Obućina	Government of Autonomous Province of Vojvodina	Deputy Member
Mr Kornél Mák	Bács-Kiskun County, Hungary	Substitute Member
Ms Ágota Józán	Bács-Kiskun County, Hungary	Member
Ms Eszter Csókási	Csongrád County Council	Member
Mr Zoltán Nógrádi	Csongrád County Council	Deputy Member
Ms Aleksandra Vukmirović	Standing Conference of Towns and Municipalities	Member
Ms Jelena Vasiljević	Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Serbia	Member

Ms Ivana Djurica	European Affairs Fund of AP Vojvodina	Member
Mr László Körmöczi	CSEMETE Nature and Environment Protection Association	Member
Ms Adrienn Futó	SZPO Hungary	Member
Mr Richárd Gönczi	SZPO Hungary	Deputy Member
Ms Sanda Šimić Stambolić	Ministry of European Integration Republic of Serbia	Advisor
Ms Anamarija Viček	Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia	Advisor
Ms Rouz Bugarčić	Ministry of interior of the Republic of Serbia	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
Mr Miloš Gajić	Ministry of Culture and Media, Republic of Serbia	Deputy Advisor
Ms Radmila Mendebaba	DKMT	Advisor
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 Relja Burzan	Joint Secretariat Antenna, Interreg-IPA CBC Hungary-Serbia	JSA
Mr Dejan Vujinović	Joint Secretariat Antenna, Interreg-IPA CBC Hungary-Serbia	JSA
Mr János Halász	Joint Secretariat, Interreg-IPA CBC Hungary-Serbia, SZPO Hungary	Joint Secretariat
Ms Andrea Szeti-Furka	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
- General overview of the situation regarding EC regulations and programming obligations
- Overview of the Programming process
- Horizontal principles – presentation of the New European Bauhaus initiative
- Final version of the Strategic Environmental Assessment – discussion, decision
- Framework Methodology: Indicators and intervention logic – discussion, decision
- Update of the Interreg Programme after public discussion and other changes
- Interreg Programme - final draft – discussion, decision
- 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 **Mr Mihajilo Dašić, 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. **Mr Dašić** 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, **Mr Tunić** briefly presents the regulations relevant for the new programme. **Ms Kiryłło** completes the provided information. She draws the attention to the Multi Annual programming document for IPA funds that should be adopted by January 2022. There are two implementing acts as well (on the geography and on the budget of the programme). Once the CPR Committee accepts it, the two acts can be sent for adoption that might be by the end of 2021 or early 2022. Therefore, if the Programme is submitted in February 2022, it can be adopted without any delays on the Commission's side.

**Mr Tunić** continues with the timeline and the current status of the programming process.

**Ms Horváth** adds that the programme budget allocation is increased with 1.55 million euro IPA fund compared to the previous estimations. She also mentions the strategic project on the border-crossing point in Hercegszántó, which is a top-down proposal agreed by both governments. The related negotiations are still on-going, but this information should be incorporated into the Interreg Programme appendix 3. She continues that the Managing Authority received further larger scale project ideas targeting the emblematic topics of the region. It is planned to have a call for proposals for large scale projects in the next programme. Nevertheless, the programme bodies are working with external experts to better identify and highlight the bottom-up needs.

**Mr Tunić** explains the importance of the horizontal principles. **Ms Horváth** adds that even more emphasis should be given to horizontal principles in the next period. She informs the PC that informal comments on the Interreg Programme have already been received from the Commission including ones relating the horizontal principles. Most of these comments are handled within the document.

**Mr Tunić** explains that the horizontal principles are not to be only fulfilled, but promoted as well by the projects; this aspect will be taken into consideration while assessing applications. **Mr Tunić** then gives the floor to **Ms Grafulla** to present the New European Bauhaus initiative of the Commission to the Programming Committee.

**Ms Grafulla** explains in details the new initiative of the Commission.

**Ms Horváth** thanks for the presentation and expresses how the presentation helped the PC to understand the initiative. She asks whether a programme can join this initiative with using the same principles for example in a call for proposals or it should happen on another level.

**Ms Graflula** explains that the New European Bauhaus is open for everyone to join, its approach can be adopted by Interreg as well as by all kind of actors, such as national, regional and local actors, civil society, etc. **Ms Kiryfő** asks whether a project that could be labelled as part of the initiative can compete in the competition for the prize mentioned in the presentation and she inquires about the list of the eligible countries. **Ms Grafulla** replies that the concept for the next edition of the New European Bauhaus Prize is still under definition. **Ms Kiryfő** emphasises that third countries participating in Interreg programmes should also be included.

**Mr Tunić** moves to the next agenda point and gives the floor to **Ms Németh** so she presents the latest information regarding the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) document.

**Ms Németh** informs the PC on the finalisation of the SEA and explains how the received comments and remarks were handled in the document.

**Mr Tunić** says that the PC needs to decide whether further comments will be added to the document or the presented version can be approved.

**Ms Horváth** explains that there are a few remarks that have not been communicated to the experts yet. Therefore, the current version can be approved by the PC with the condition that the programme bodies and the experts are entitled to handle the informal comments if deemed necessary.

**Mr Tunić** proposes for approval the current version with the condition mentioned by **Ms Horváth**.

**Decision no.16/2021 (18.11) – The PC approves of the presented version of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Report with the condition that the programme bodies and the expert team are entitled to handle the informal comments if deemed necessary.**

Moving to the next agenda point **Mr Tunić** asks **Mr Wächter** to present the content of the Framework Methodology document.

**Mr Wächter** explains briefly the content of the methodology document.

**Ms Horváth** mentions that informal comments, such as estimated project size, have been received from the Commission for the methodology document as well. These comments will be handled by the programme bodies. She repeats that there are bottom-up initiated large-scale project ideas, which can influence the present document. Therefore, the PC can approve today the basic concept with the condition that the comments of the Commission will be taken care of. Once the fine-tuned version is ready then it can be circulated together with the meeting minutes. In case it takes more time, then decision will be made later, but it cannot be postponed too much having in mind the length of governmental processes and the tight schedule for official submission.

**Ms Csókási** praises the work that the experts put in the preparation of the document. She asks for clarification whether in case only the basic concept will be approved then the fine-tuned version can be circulated and approved within a written procedure. Since large-scale project ideas can be considered, for Csongrád-Csanád county it would be extremely good to welcome again these large-scale projects. The strategic projects of the current programme are very successful with great multiplication effects. Therefore, it would be useful to implement these kind of projects with the similar amount of 50% of the total allocation as it is now in the current programme.

**Ms Horváth** informs the PC that, based on pre-discussions with the Serbian ministry on the possible outcomes of the present meeting, comments of the Commission concerning the methodology and the bottom-up initiated targeted areas need to be checked with the experts as it would influence both the Interreg Programme and the methodology. **Mr Tunić** and **Mr Halász** clarify that in the current programme the strategic projects were contracted in 40.9% of the total allocation. Ms Horváth continues that the possible scale of the allocation for large-scale projects in the next programming period needs to be checked. She proposes that the comments of the Commission will be treated with special care and it will be analysed which potential earmarked territories should be highlighted in the Interreg Programme. After all this the final version of the document would be proposed for approval before the governmental processes.

**Mr Nógrádi** asks whether the rate of the large-scale projects is 30, 40 or 50% of the total allocation.

**Ms Horváth** replies that it is 40% in the current programme referring to the Cooperation Programme quoted by **Mr Halász**. She continues that the possibilities in the new programme need to be checked by knowing the practice of the 2014-2020 programme and the limited resources.

**Mr Nógrádi** asks whether the indicators and budget sizes presented in the methodology fit to the rate of the large-scale projects.

**Ms Horváth** replies that the large-scale notion has not been incorporated into the methodology, because the idea arose in the meantime. Therefore, this will be introduced in an updated version of the document so the indicators and other data could be harmonised with the introduction of large-scale concept.

**Mr Nógrádi** asks whether the rate of the possibility of 50% allocation for large-scale projects can be opened.

**Ms Horváth** says she does not think so, because even though the PC is discussing the 40% the total budget of the next programme is less than the current one.

**Mr Tunić** emphasizes that decision on percentages should not be made in a way of defining projects that would come later on during the implementation of the Programme. Also, the PC needs to consider the initiatives and the idea behind them, while open competition should be ensured for the large-scale projects as well. The standpoint of the Joint Secretariat is that large-scale projects should be developed together with the Secretariat of the Programme. The goal is to achieve the indicators while respecting all the principles as it is a result oriented programme leading to successful emblematic projects. Therefore, the Secretariat is willing to take part in further developing ideas that are big or small.

Replying to **Mr Tunić's** question **Ms Horváth** says that at this moment it might be stated that the PC acknowledged the content of the methodology and the Interreg Programme, but there are certain elements that need to be fine-tuned based on Commission's and the PC's comments. These will possibly be handled by the circulation of the meeting minutes. If not, then later in written procedure.

**Mr Tunić** concludes that the PC can be continued with the next points and no decision will be made on the documents within this meeting. **Mr Tunić** goes through the Interreg Programme to inform the PC what changes have been made in comparison to the published version of the document.

**Ms Horváth** confirms that the PC only acknowledges the content of the current version of the document and no decision is made on the present meeting. The next version of the Interreg

Programme and the Framework Methodology, which should be the final one, will either be circulated together with the meeting minutes or the decision will be made within a written procedure.

In any other business, **Ms Horváth** mentions that after the governmental approvals there will be a member state agreement template to be shared with the Serbian colleagues based on what the ministers should agree on the Interreg Programme. This agreement will be submitted together with Interreg Programme, as its annex, in the SFC system. After the submission, official comments from the Commission are still expected. Therefore, **Ms Horváth** proposes that the future decision of the PC should authorise the two countries and the Joint Secretariat to handle the requested changes. Naturally, each version of the document will be sent to the PC for information even in case the changes could be elaborated internally. Additionally, the expert team will also be available during the official consultation round of the Commission if necessary.

Since there are no more remarks, **Ms Horváth** thanks for the contribution of the committee and concludes the 5<sup>th</sup> PC.