



## ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION REPORT 2010

1.	IDENTIFICATION	2
2.	OVERVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME	3
	<b>2.1 Achievement and analysis of the progress</b>	3
	<b>2.2 Information about compliance with Community law</b>	14
	<b>2.3 Significant problems encountered and measures taken to overcome them</b>	14
	<b>2.4 Changes in the context of the operational programme implementation (if relevant)</b>	16
	<b>2.5 Substantial modification pursuant to Article 57 of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006</b>	16
	<b>2.6 Complementarity with other instruments</b>	16
	<b>2.7 Monitoring and evaluation</b>	19
	<b>2.8 National Performance Reserve (if applicable)</b>	25
3.	IMPLEMENTATION BY PRIORITY	25
	<b>3.1 Priority 1: Strengthening of the capacity for innovation</b>	27
	<b>3.2 Priority 2: Protection of the environment and promotion of a sustainable territorial development</b>	29
	<b>3.3 Priority 3: Improvement of mobility and of territorial accessibility</b>	31
	<b>3.4 Priority 4: Promotion of a polycentric and integrated development of the MED space</b>	33
	<b>3.5 Priority 5: Technical assistance</b>	35
4.	ESF PROGRAMMES: COHERENCE AND CONCENTRATION	36
5.	ERDF PROGRAMMES /COHESION FUND: MAJOR PROJECTS (IF APPLICABLE)	36
6.	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	36
7.	INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY	42

## 1- Summary details

OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME	Objective concerned European Territorial Cooperation
	Eligible area concerned MED area*
	Programming period 2007-2013
	Programme reference (CCI Code) 2007CB163PO045
	Programme title MED
ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION REPORT	Reporting year 2010
	Date of approval of the Annual Report by the Monitoring Committee: 14/06/2011

➤ List of eligible ERDF regions:

- the whole territory of Cyprus, Greece, Malta and Slovenia
- the whole territory of Italy except the region of Valle d'Aosta and Trentino- Alto Adige
- the regions of Algarve and Alentejo (Portugal);
- Gibraltar (United Kingdom);
- Ceuta, Melilla, Andalusia, Murcia, Valencia, Catalonia, Aragon, Balearic Islands (Spain)
- Corsica, Languedoc-Roussillon, Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur and Rhône-Alpes (France).

➤ List of eligible IPA regions:

- the whole territory of Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia and Montenegro.

➤ List of acronyms:

- AA > Audit Authority
- AIR > Annual Implementation Report
- CA > Certifying Authority
- CBC ENPI > Cross-Border Cooperation with the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument
- SC > Selection Committee
- DB > Database
- DG > Directorate General
- DIACT > Inter-ministerial Delegation for the Development and Competitiveness of the Territories
- EC > European Commission
- EGCT > European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation
- GOA > Group of Auditors
- IPA > Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance
- JTS > Joint Technical Secretariat
- LO > Liaison Office
- LP > Lead Partner
- MA > Managing Authority
- MC > Monitoring Committee
- MS > Member States

- NCP > National Contact Points
- OP > Operational Programme
- TA > Technical Assistance
- TN > Transnational
- WG > Working Group
- WP > Written Procedure

➤ Appendices:

- Interim report “In itinere evaluation” (No1)
- Table of indicators (No2)
- Statistics of annual programme event 2010 (No3)
- Newsletters 2010 (No4)
- Brochure MED/ENPI MED (No5)

## **2 - Overview of the implementation of the operational programme**

### **2.1. Achievements and analysis of progress**

2010 marked the 3<sup>rd</sup> year since the implementation of the MED Programme. It has now reached a sufficient level of maturity to allow the first assessment of anticipated outputs defined back in 2007 when the OP was approved. Furthermore, linked to this, it is no accident that the “in itinere” evaluation process also began in 2010. The evaluation will take 36 months and aims to reposition the programme (see Interim Report delivered at the beginning of 2011) before the end of the period 2007-2013.

This chapter seeks to introduce the following sections of the report and as such, it would be useful at this stage to give a general summary of the milestones for this year.

The MED Programme began in 2008 (OP approved at the end of 2007). Two calls for proposals were issued between 2008 and 2009 with almost 950 applications received. During this period, all procedures were finalised, processes were reinforced and background documentation drafted and approved by the Monitoring Committee. Controls and reimbursements were put in place with the Managing Authority, the Certifying Authority, the Audit Authority and the Member States. In short, by the end of 2009, the MED Programme was fully operational with approximately fifty projects selected and registered.

2010 marks the mid-term of the programming period and comes at a key moment for the consolidation of management and opening up of the MED Programme to other goals in terms of substance, methodology and experimentation, all of which should become clearer, particularly in 2011 and 2012.

In an area as vast and as complex as the Mediterranean, albeit involving only the countries on the Northern shores, the programme authorities and the Monitoring Committee took up the considerable challenge of engaging in a pilot process to identify strategic projects for the area (a process already anticipated in 2008 and delivered in 2010).

This challenge began in earnest in April and coincided with the finalised enlargement of the MED Area to include a fourth IPA country - Albania (following Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia and Montenegro). From 2011, this will open the door to the possibility of a single integrated management structure dealing with both ERDF funding and IPA funding.

A third consideration came to light in 2010 which is much more political and virtual than the subjects of past debates. This is the possibility of forming a Mediterranean macro-region following the examples of the Baltic and the Danube. The Member States started to discuss what added value this could bring to the MED Programme in terms of resources, outputs, which areas to include, a framework, which structures to work with, objectives, capacities, etc. This debate is not yet over but should benefit from high-level discussions while drawing on the experimentation with strategic projects which could be the capitalisation of the MED Programme.

This takes us to the 4<sup>th</sup> key milestone of 2010 (beyond everyday programme management), that of capitalisation. As the initial results of the “in itinere” evaluation indicate, the implementation of this aspect of the programme is one of the most eagerly awaited, particularly by the project partners but also by the MS’ and the EC.

The MED Programme has faced some delays in addressing this subject after a first meeting during the annual programme event in Naples in 2009. However, a recruitment process to outsource this task has been launched in order to produce a capitalisation plan for a four year period. Work will begin in early 2011.

Finally, a 5<sup>th</sup> milestone, referred to above, was launched in 2010 and concerns programme evaluation. An external service provider was selected in late 2009 and began work during 2010. The first results, which will be covered later, are included in a draft document attached as an appendix to this report.

In summary, the different points that will be addressed in this report are as follows:

- a) management and monitoring;
- b) strategic projects;
- c) integrated management of ERDF and IPA funding;
- d) macro-region;
- e) capitalisation;
- f) *in itinere* evaluation.

#### A) Management and monitoring:

- As mentioned above, in 2010 the Programme consolidated all its processes, particularly in relation to the 2<sup>nd</sup> level controls. During the first semester, a sample of MED projects from the first call for proposals was subjected to controls conducted in Spain, Greece and France by the service provider, Deloitte & Associates. The outcome of this first year was rather satisfactory with an error rate of less than 1%. Other “quality” controls were also conducted by the Managing and Certifying Authorities (see below).
- In April, a second wave of projects was selected at the Selection Committee meeting in Santorini (27<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup> April). This closed the 2<sup>nd</sup> “traditional” call for project proposals previously opened in February 2009 for first stage applications to the programme. 52<sup>1</sup> new projects were selected across all 4 programme priorities.

The programming of these new projects means that almost 65% of ERDF funding from the MED Programme has now been committed to projects currently underway.

---

1            1 project was to be de-programmed in 2011 after almost 12 months delay in signing the grant offer agreement.

– As concerns the programme management from 2008 and 2009 onwards, current activities have also focused on:

- 1) the drafting of documents and *fact sheets*;
- 2) the reception and processing of progress reports from ongoing projects as well as modifications to budgets or partnerships;
- 3) the participation of the JTS at Steering Committees for ongoing projects;
- 4) the information and training events for projects and for MA and JTS members;
- 5) the activities conducted by liaison offices in Thessaloniki and Valencia;
- 6) the activities to improve the two websites for the Programme (PRESAGE CTE and the [www.programmemed.eu](http://www.programmemed.eu) website).

#### B) Strategic projects:

This represented the biggest challenge of 2010 and was without doubt one of the most important stages of the MED Programme so far. It involved the design, adoption and experimentation of a process to assemble and select so-called “strategic” projects using a new methodology which is neither a repetition of a *bottom up* process nor a sort of capitalisation of “good practices” concerning previously existing projects.

The official launch of the 1<sup>st</sup> call for proposals took place on the 15<sup>th</sup> of April following the final validation from the MC of specifications concerning Objective 2.2 - Renewable Energies and Objective 2.3 - Maritime Safety.

This marked the end of a process which lasted approximately 2 years. It involved a dedicated MS task force, the MC, the JTS and the MA and national experts from Northern Mediterranean countries who all took part in *brainstorming sessions* and indirect consultations. An independent expert was responsible for the coordination and drafting of the final documents.

What was interesting right from the start of this process was a sharp drop in the number of “speculative” applications (compared to a normal call for proposals) and the focusing of efforts on quality, especially in terms of objectives and anticipated outputs. The pre-application phase (unrestricted) attracted some 30 to 40 project ideas whereas at the closure of the call for proposals on the 15<sup>th</sup> of September, “only” 12 fully worked-up projects were finally submitted.

The official selection will be made in early 2011, at the Selection Committee meetings in Madrid, in January and in Valencia in February 2011 but the national expert and the JTS were already able to provide an initial evaluation in December 2010. Even though projects had focussed their efforts on reduced objectives (thanks also to new specifications, etc.), the difficulty remained of building an adequate partnership in response to the Programme’s expectations and type of activities, particularly in terms of balance between institutional partners and operational partners.

The goal of a strategic project must be that of being able to influence and have an impact on local, regional and national (mainstream) policies. For this to happen, there must be an optimum balance between policy operators and scientific or research operators. Established and experienced networks created through previous programmes are often insufficient for this.

The evaluation of this first experiment with a strategic project concept will be delivered to the Monitoring Committee in 2011, but the merit of this activity is already that of having tested a “new” methodological approach for “different” project calls for proposals which could doubtless open up a new way forward for the remainder of the programme and above all, for the 2014-2020 programming period.

### C) Integrated management of ERDF and IPA funding:

2010 also represents a turning point in the relations between the EU and the IPA countries of the MED Programme. Beyond the official entry of Albania as the 4<sup>th</sup> and almost certainly the last IPA country for this programme period, the highlight is the official request by the EC to the Programme Authorities to integrate IPA funds into ERDF management.

This same request was made to the South East Europe Programme which has its MA based in Budapest.

This therefore constitutes a new phase proposed by the EC to the MS' to facilitate and strengthen the participation of partners from IPA countries in activities supported by the MED and the SEE Programmes. It is also a symbolic message in preparation perhaps of a greater integration of funding (and perhaps regulations) from the beginning of the next programming period.

In real terms, this means that 5 million euros of IPA funding without country-specific allocations will be managed by Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur Regional Council (MED MA) on behalf of the MED MC for the period 2010-2013 and no longer under the responsibility of EU delegations in each accession country or potential accession candidate country.

The Monitoring Committee ratified the principle on the 22<sup>nd</sup> and the 23<sup>rd</sup> of June during the Chania Committee meeting and formally validated the process by a modification to the MED Programme OP which was submitted for approval to the EC in late October. The validation of the new OP by the EC is anticipated during the first quarter of 2011.

The integrated management of ERDF and IPA funds nevertheless implies significant changes to programme documentation, particularly for matters relating to contractual commitments and audit trails. The IPA countries, the EC and all the Programme authorities (MA, CA and AA) began the necessary procedures at the end of 2010 to ensure the implementation of this decision from as early as possible in 2011.

### D) Macro-region:

It is common knowledge that dialogue on a new concept of a macro-region was initiated by the Baltic States and then by the States of the Danube region. The historical reasons and the objectives pre-empting these proposals are obviously different and strictly linked to local contexts meaning that neither the Scandinavian nor the Danube cases are easily transferable to the Mediterranean.

This is why, as early as 2009, the States of the MED Area and the MA with indirect participation of the EC entered into informal and wide-ranging discussions (with no pretensions whatsoever) concerning governance of the MED Programme. This, in turn, opened the way to a wider discussion on the possibility, or not, of a Mediterranean macro-region.

Given such a vast, populated and complicated zone as the Mediterranean, the questions that arise are huge<sup>2</sup> and tremendously complex and yet there will be territorial cooperation programmes in place in 2014-2020 plus all the national programmes making a substantial collection of funding mechanisms when combined together. It is therefore imperative that there is effective and sound management at all political levels as well as for implementation procedures.

---

2 All the more so at the time of writing this report in March and April 2011.

The MED JTS met informally to discuss this subject in Brussels on the 24<sup>th</sup> of March. The key issue remained that of understanding just what “Mediterranean” meant in terms of geography, politics, society, culture, economy, etc. It is also crucial to comprehend the role of the MED Programme and what resources will be required given that decisions will be taken at the highest political levels.

Nevertheless, two aspects emerge from these reflections. The first one is the will of the EC to avoid encouraging further official experimentation (with the support of the Commission’s services) of “macro-regions” in areas other than the Baltic and the Danube. The second aspect relates to the contribution of experience and research that the MED Programme could, or should, deliver to States and regions in the MED area.

In fact, the capitalisation of the programme, trialling strategic projects and the future availability of funding to prepare new bespoke models for adoption in 2014-2020 including analysis, the creation of networks, observatories and exchanges, etc. can, or must, constitute the contribution of the MED Programme to this particular debate.

It is not simply a question of setting up a macro-scale management hub which absorbs everything but rather the effective coordination of resources by clearly defined priorities tailored to different territories. At present, it is difficult enough to generate synergies between the cohesion programmes let alone all the others!

Other discussions were held during the Selection Committee meeting in Santorini (in April) and during the Chania Monitoring Committee meeting (in June) as well as the annual programme event in Thessaloniki in September.

- On the basis of the scope of our work, three solutions are possible:
  - 1) the *status quo*, with one programme for the Northern Mediterranean and another for cross-border cooperation between the north and the south of the Mediterranean Basin;
  - 2) a return to a geographical distribution similar to the past with clearly defined zones such as the Western Mediterranean, the Eastern Mediterranean, the Adriatic, etc.
  - 3) the creation of a single area stretching from north to south and from east to west with responsibilities which are either shared or divided up between different stakeholders.

Discussion continues and is unlikely to end before 2012.

#### E) Capitalisation:

All capitalisation processes should ideally be elaborated at the same time as the launch of a programme or a project in order to guide the choices. Inevitably, it is always developed too late! It would be preferable, for example, that several programmes could participate and contribute to the same area of capitalisation in a transnational territorial cooperation. This would require coordination which could only really come from the EC or another body working exclusively towards this objective such as the Interact Programme.

As this is not possible at the moment, the MED Programme has tried to build, with a certain amount of delay, a capitalisation plan which will enable it to cover several interests simultaneously: a) capitalisation of traditional and strategic projects, b) capitalisation of good practice, c) capitalisation of the programme and finally, d) capitalisation with other programmes, especially the ENPI-MED Programme and other cross-border cooperation programmes with IPA countries.

In this regard, the role of the JTS Liaison Offices in Valencia (Spain) and Thessaloniki (Greece) will be vital.

Following a first meeting with projects selected from the 1<sup>st</sup> call which took the form of a *brainstorming* exercise, the MA and the JTS put forward a capitalisation plan to Member States. This plan takes into account the project partners requirements and the pooling of their experience as well as the interest that the States and the Commission have for macro outputs.

The plan was approved at the Chania Monitoring Committee meeting (in June).

The approval of the capitalisation plan led to a European public procurement process to select an organisation capable of supporting the JTS and the national contact points in each Member State for the research and analysis required to maximise the outputs of MED projects and to encourage potentially their impacts.

The call for tenders was issued in July<sup>3</sup> 2010, however complex selection procedures unfortunately delayed the final choice of candidate until early 2011.

The capitalisation process will last 4 years and should progress in stages from the micro to the macro, from the singular to the plural and from one programme to a vision encompassing several programmes.

The timeline is tight, but there is hope that the first conclusive assessments and feedback will arrive before the end of 2012. If programme funding is still available, the aim is to use this to launch some pilot actions during the last year of the programming period (2013) which might take account of the capitalisation but also, and most importantly, the evaluation.

#### F) In itinere evaluation:

The evaluation process started in February with an initial focus on a global vision of the MED Programme. This was done through interviews with the programme authorities and projects together with an analysis of the first two calls for proposals which were open to all priorities using a bottom-up approach (see 2010 report appendix 1).

Evaluation will continue in 2011 and 2012 with strategic approach and adjustments as well as a monitoring process and a final assessment.

In addition to a qualitative evaluation of a cross-section of projects, the analysis will also focus on governance, communication and capitalisation of the MED Programme.

A first general point worth noting is that the evaluation confirms the results of debates and discussions of the MED Programme Selection Committee and the Monitoring Committee which have been held since 2008.

Generally speaking, these are:

- a description of programme objectives which are too broad and insufficiently targeted (greater thematic focus is required);
- a lack of new partnerships in terms of long-term sustainability of existing networks and the pursuit of funding;

---

<sup>3</sup> The selection process was completed at the end of January 2011.



- output indicators which are poorly adapted to a more strategic vision of the programme;
- confusion over the implementation and differentiation between the two stages of the application procedure;
- priority given to procedures and not to the content of projects;
- evaluation and capitalisation processes which should be based on input from thematic experts;
- the complexity of procedures and management tools, especially for databases;
- insufficient communication of the programme and its projects;
- the delay to the capitalisation process;
- staffing pressures (Member States and Programme Authorities).

These observations are not exhaustive and must be seen in relation to the positive aspects which are:

- all programme bodies (authorities and Member States) actively participating in programme implementation;
- the emergence of new integrated networks;
- the improvement of management practices when compared to the past, particularly in terms of administrative and financial monitoring;
- experimentation with a new “top-down” approach for strategic projects;
- openness and collaboration with ENPI Programmes, especially ENPI CBC-MED;
- an integrated and accessible internet-based financial monitoring tool (though still quite complex): PRESAGE CTE;
- an integrated capitalisation plan for all grant-funded activities which is open to recommendations from the evaluation process;
- flexibility of programme structures and the capacity for on-going self-assessment.

The main recommendations from the concluding remarks of this interim report therefore focus on the following elements:

- 1) greater definition of programme indicators;
- 2) better analysis of project content and qualitative aspects (enhancement);
- 3) greater flexibility in the application of norms and the creation of tools.

These aspects could be addressed by the separation of roles within the JTS, between a centre for management and monitoring and a centre for coordination and capitalisation on one hand and the creation of a scientific or technical committee on the other. This would have a permanent guidance role for the content and the aim of the programme.

In conclusion, we can confirm that 2010 has seen the implementation, or launch, of all the work tasks for the programme period, but it will probably not be until 2011 and 2012 that communication and capitalisation will deliver in terms of outputs and consolidation of added-value.

It will be also important to optimise the *in itinere* evaluation as well as the contribution of Member States and all the programme authorities to innovate and experiment with new and promising ways forward the future. This must also take into account the impetus in Europe inspired by debates around macro-regions and EGCT's (European Groupings of Territorial Cooperation).

### ***Information on the physical progress of the operational programme:***

In 2010, the MED Programme succeeded in allocating approximately 65% of ERDF funding to 102 “traditional” projects through open “bottom up” calls for project proposals. 50 projects were approved in the first call and 52 were approved at the end of the second call in April.

Most of the second call projects signed their grant subsidy contracts during the summer with the exception of a limited number for which the Selection Committee had imposed a number of conditions requiring changes to partnerships or to budgets. By the end of 2010, all projects had signed their subsidy contracts except for “In Planet Med” which was withdrawn (de-programmed) in January 2011.

In 2010, all projects from the first call submitted two progress reports for payment claims. This enabled the programme to make up for lost time on the certification of partners from countries without a first-level control structure in place in 2009, at least for preparation costs. Nevertheless, significant delays still exist in the certification process for the current year (see section 2.3 below).

As concerns projects from the second call, about half of them have certified claims (preparation costs for the most part) for this year included in their first progress reports.

The following indicators therefore concern the entirety of information received by the end of 2010 from all projects approved in the first call as well as a significant number from the second call (taken from their third and first progress reports respectively). The information is both aggregated and cumulative. Data for benchmarking is not available.

Quantifiable indicators and in particular, key indicators (see Excel spreadsheet in appendix 2):

Indicators		2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total
Maritime security activities: connections	Achievement			0	0						
	Objective										1
Accessibility to islands activities	Achievement			0	0						
	Objective										21
Cross-border activities: awareness	Achievement			2	15						
	Objective										365
State: experimental activities	Achievement			25	34						
	Objective										355
State: COM activities	Achievement			25	440						
	Objective										1.459
State: distribution of tools	Achievement			22	322						
	Objective										2.279
Isolated areas authority new initiatives	Achievement			6	17						
	Objective										56
Local authorities experimental activities	Achievement			179	321						
	Objective										1.914
Local authorities COM activities	Achievement			184	1.886						
	Objective										16.368
Local authorities distribution of tools	Achievement			953	3.772						
	Objective										19.045
Local authorities Cross-border activities	Achievement			12	23						
	Objective										250
Other actors: experimental activities	Achievement			67	273						
	Objective										1.502
Other actors: COM activities	Achievement			87	2.456						
	Objective										13.701

Other actors: distribution of tools	Achievement			73	2.761						
	Objective										21.334
Joint studies	Achievement			6	57						
	Objective										573
General public: COM activities	Achievement			52.000	721.726						
	Objective										7.583.432
General public: distribution of tools	Achievement			68.060	775.100						
	Objective										1.0245.356
European institutions experimental activities	Achievement			3	28						
	Objective										275
European institutions COM activities	Achievement			13	102						
	Objective										678
European institutions distribution of tools	Achievement			10	166						
	Objective										2.328
Number of COM activities	Achievement			80	358						
	Objective										2.659
Number of COM articles	Achievement			161	741						
	Objective										3.358
Number of tools	Achievement			2.041	19.962						
	Objective										347.234
Number of Databases	Achievement			9	99						
	Objective										669
Number of connections	Achievement			10.230	236.339						
	Objective										2.546.051
Direct cross-border SME activities	Achievement			150	18						
	Objective										2.956
Indirect cross-border SME activities	Achievement			260	346						
	Objective										16.771
Web sites	Achievement			25	53						
	Objective										144
Study visits / exchanges / conferences	Achievement			195	430						
	Objective										6440
Permanent networks	Achievement			14	21						
	Objective										232
New support structures	Achievement			3	2						
	Objective										84
NGO: experimental activities	Achievement			12	111						
	Objective										910
Private sector: experimental activities	Achievement			73	364						
	Objective										3.569
Specific holders: experimental activities	Achievement			37	141						
	Objective										894
Specific holders: COM activity	Achievement			97	317						
	Objective										4.125
Specific holders: distribution of tools	Achievement			145	435						
	Objective										5.333
Work plan	Achievement			11	14						

implementati on joint methodology	Objective										297
Private sector: COM activities	Achievement			391	12.543						
	Objective										48.134
Private sector: distribution of tools	Achievement			1.036	14.135						
	Objective										99.144
Seminars- forum: involved structures	Achievement			27	64						
	Objective										1.631
New applicable services: digital	Achievement			0	0						
	Objective										33
Joint strategies and agreements	Achievement			3	23						
	Objective										404
DB systems: accessibility- risk prevention	Achievement			0	0						
	Objective										27

***Financial information (all figures are in euros)***

	Expenditure paid out by the beneficiaries included in payment claims sent to the managing authority	Corresponding public contribution	Expenditure paid by the body responsible for making payments to the beneficiaries	Total payments received from the Commission
Priority axis 1 State the fund concerned ERDF	5 134 243.79	5 134 243.79	1 586 433.65	1 383 829.65
Priority axis 2 State the fund concerned ERDF	3 423 480.56	3 423 480.56	1 078 350.47	1 070 152.89
Priority axis 3 State the fund concerned ERDF	584 504.40	584 504.40	257 695.27	255 976.96
Priority axis 4 State the fund concerned ERDF	3 408 023.55	3 408 023.55	1 036 309.13	1 039 229.75

Priority axis 5 (TA) State the fund concerned ERDF	1 314 071.31	1 314 071.31	976 158.05	928 463.33
<b>total amount</b>	13 864 323.61	13 864 323.61	4 934 946.57	4 677 652.58
Total in transitional regions in the grand total				
Total in non-transitional regions in the grand total				
Total of the expenses which are part of the ESF where the operational programmed is co-financed by the ERDF <sup>4</sup> in the grand total				
Total of the expenses which are part of the ERDF where the operational programmed is co-financed by the ESF in the grand total				

***Information on the breakdown of the use of funding by category- not applicable***  
***Assistance by target groups – not applicable***  
***Assistance repaid or re-used – not applicable***

***Qualitative analysis:***

Unfortunately, some weaknesses observed in 2009 are still valid for 2010. These included the focus of activity on management and communication, common methodologies, study visit exchanges and launching of experimental activities either at local or transnational level. In some cases there has even been a regression in activity, notably with respect to Greek and Portuguese partners and to a lesser degree, Spanish and Italian partners.

Economic difficulties have had a significant impact on all types of organisation in the Mediterranean leading to national objectives and necessities taking precedence over transnational ones.

As we will see in more detail in paragraph 2.3, a certain number of partners have withdrawn from projects part-funded by MED or have significantly reduced their budgets.

In spite of these difficulties, it must be recognised that partnerships often find solutions to problems internally to re-allocate responsibilities for the implementation and delivery of projects. Even if this has weakened the delivery rates of certain projects, at least they are pursuing their activities.

Given that some of the first projects approved following the first call are due to complete their activities in the first quarter of 2011 (before the maximum 36 months duration assigned to each call), the MA/JTS checked the feasibility and the objectives for these projects in late 2010.

<sup>4</sup> Fill in this field where the operational programme is co-financed by the ERDF or the ESF if used is made of the possibility set out in article 34, paragraph 2 of the (EC) regulation no. 1083/2006.

Some of them have modest levels of underspending and the proposal is to offer the possibility of extensions to these projects in order to make up for initial delays in implementation.

In addition, it should be noted that the delays in starting-up and implementing projects approved following the second call are far fewer than for the first call. Experience gained by the programme authorities and the Member States together with the knowledge and ability to address difficulties have no doubt contributed to speeding up implementation procedures for second call projects. The presence of the same authorities during the two calls (an advantage in this case, but a risk in others) which are now familiar with the programme is also a factor.

The hope is that the most recent projects can fulfil their commitments better than their predecessors.

More generally, it can be seen that quantitative indicators are progressing across all priorities and objectives, but as the interim *in itinere* evaluation report indicates, they are poorly adapted to a good qualitative understanding of project progress.

As it stands, the task of the evaluation process is to provide new, better structured and concrete indicators while, crucially, the capitalisation process must deliver a macro analysis of outputs from MED projects and of eventual clusters.

The expected assistance from the programme is given to projects to highlight their outputs although these must first of all be correctly identified, which is the task of the project partners.

Furthermore, for greater visibility, the MA/JTS has introduced a section in the progress report dedicated to describing the progress of each partner in each project. This information is available in the PRESAGE CTE database and can also be accessed by the Member States in order to monitor the input from projects in each geographical area.

Nevertheless, the project partnership must provide this information in a form specifically designed for communication but above all it should be regular and up to date in a way allowing it to be used by the programme. Some difficulties are observed on this.

## **2.2. Information about compliance with Community law – not applicable**

### **2.3. Significant problems encountered and measures taken to overcome them:**

The difficulties encountered by the programme are of two main categories:

- a) internal difficulties;
  - b) external difficulties.
- a) For the first category, it could be said that in comparison to 2009, there has been a striking improvement from an ICT point of view whether this is for the PRESAGE-CTE database website or for the communication website [www.programmemed.eu](http://www.programmemed.eu).

On the other hand, this does not imply that the programme communication is yet satisfactory. The efforts made to reinforce the ICT side prevented a similar improvement in other common tools with the exception of the newsletter, which was by website improvements transformed to an electronic format. The availability of resources to meet promotion and publication requirements must be done through public procurement procedures and this will be one of the tasks to undertake in 2011.

Concerning the first category, it should be noted that the considerable delay built up during the launch and closure of the “capitalisation” tendering exercise (this will now start in 2011 with a modified timetable adapted to the 12 month delay) will at least have the advantage of encouraging a more harmonious capitalisation with strategic projects which will probably be operational during the first quarter of 2011.

As concerns internal difficulties, the evaluation underlined the importance of too much reliance on human resources, especially the JTS where the difficulty is two-fold:

- A high staff turnover whether this be for staff leaving, sick leave and or maternity leave together with difficulties in replacing and training staff and continuity in monitoring programme activities;
- Too few staff to deal with the increasing number of projects selected and the subsequent control activities which must be carried out as a result of this.

This objective difficulty was exacerbated in the second quarter when three staff gave notice to leave their posts. Their replacements were only secured towards the end of the year with the positions filled in 2011. The remaining staff had to take on an increased workload with only 7 employees instead of the 10 as identified in the staff organisation chart.

The MA also raised the issue of increasing workload and by the end of the year, an additional vacancy was created in the service to help with the processing of payments and certification.

In conclusion, we underline a positive development in internal communication between different programme structures including the national contact points and the Commission which now operates much more efficiently and effectively. In comparison to the first two years of activity, informal information channels have been established beyond official periods for the different Committees. It is still possible to make further improvements but the collaboration is now visible and tangible at all levels and this is an important backup for project partners.

b) As concerns the second category, external difficulties, two aspects stand out:

- Difficulties linked to the first level controls in certain countries where delays already encountered in 2009 accumulated despite close collaboration between the projects, the JTS and the NCP's;
- The economic crisis that has hit the Mediterranean countries with significant repercussions at the level of service provision for the MED Programme, bringing unexpected management difficulties concerning the flexibility of procedures.

The two sub-categories mentioned are potentially harmful to the programme for different reasons and at different levels.

Firstly this prevents organisations from being reimbursed within a reasonable time period with potential impacts on their cash flow (delays starting from the moment when each organisation has certified its own invoices). This has encouraged certain Member States as well as the MA to request a feasibility study concerning the availability of advance payments. This raises questions of feasibility from a regulatory point of view, if it is realistic at this point of ERDF funding committed and, above all, how to cover this advance payment and how might it be repaid in the event of any irregularities.

The second sub-category comes into play at an earlier stage of project implementation and directly affects it. It concerns both the involvement and commitment on a political, human and financial level of an organisation which may not accept its withdrawal from the project at the

last moment, or when formal notice is given to leave the project by the other partners, with negative impacts on image.

The consequence in both cases is that delivery of the project concerned slows down or even comes to a complete halt.

The influence this has on the programme will depend on the number of projects affected by these circumstances and the rapidity and the quality of mitigating action. It is no coincidence that the number of written procedures for modifications to projects has grown substantially in 2010 and looks set to continue in 2011.

#### **2.4. Changes in the context of the implementation of the operational programme (if relevant) – not applicable**

#### **2.5. Substantial modification under Article 57 of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 (if relevant) – not applicable**

#### **2.6. Complementarity with other instruments**

##### **Liaison Office Valencia**

According to the Operational Programmes (OP), the Liaison Office (L.O.) for E.U. MED PROGRAMME(MED) and ENPI CBC Mediterranean Sea Basin (ENPI CBC-MED), located in Valencia, should ensure the coordination between both programmes (MED and ENPI CBC-MED) in order to develop synergies and maximise their respective contribution. It will also realise **communication** work with project partnerships, it contributes to **capitalisation** and coordinates **the existing implementation tools**".

Because of the ENPI CBC Mediterranean Basin Programme approval has been delayed for procedural reasons and their managing structures were not yet set up, the working plan proposed by the Liaison Office for 2010, was slightly changed.

Regarding the main tasks of the LO office; the activities developed by the LO during 2010 were the following:

##### **I. General activities related to the MED Programme:**

- The L.O carried out daily administrative work (translations, reports, expenses control, etc.)
- The L.O. followed up the Programme Selection Committee, the Monitoring Committee and the monthly coordination meetings between the JTS, MA and LO in Marseille
  - Programme Selection Committee: 2<sup>nd</sup> call for proposals- second phase, on the 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> of April 2010, in Santorini (Greece).
  - Monitoring Committee of 2010, the 23 and 24<sup>th</sup> of June in Hania, Crete (Greece)
- With regard to support the MA and JTS, during the 2nd call of standard projects the L.O. has been involved in the "second reading" procedure.
- It took part on the JTS Strategic Projects WG and Capitalisation WG collaborating to the related documents
- L.O also participated in several meetings and seminars organised by the MED programme:
  - 1st meeting of the National Contact Points (NCPs) on the 4th February 2010, in Brussels.



- 1<sup>st</sup> Technical Meeting between the SEE and the MED Programme about the organization of the joint Annual event on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of April 2010, in Thessaloniki, Greece. Organized by the Liaison Office MED-IPA.
- Seminar on Strategic Projects on the 27<sup>th</sup> of May 2010, in Marseille.
- “Brainstorming Seminar on Strategic Projects ( 2<sup>nd</sup> call ), on the 16<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> of November 2010, in Marseilles (France)

## II. Coordination activities related to the ENPI CBC MED Programme and tools implementation:

- The L.O. followed up ENPI’s CBC Med Programme, in order to ensure the necessary compatibility between MED and ENPI MB Programmes, according to the article 9.3 of the ENPI Regulation.
- The L.O. designed a Calendar tool using the Google system, in order to share information with MED, ENPI CBC MED, Interact, other EU Institutions events and CRPM.
- It also up dated the common EuroMediterranean Data base, to check multiple participation, detect clusters, in the Mediterranean area, for the 2<sup>nd</sup> call for proposals. Currently this data base has information of the following programmes: MED, SEE, INTERREG IV C, SUDOE and Atlantic Space. Although ENPI CBC MED was not included as no projects have been yet selected, this tool also was facilitated to the ENPI CBC MED programme in order to crosscheck some stakeholders or proposals before their 1st JMC was held and projects were selected.

## III. Communication Activities:

- The L.O. edited and printed 12 page brochure “ MED and ENPI CBC MED Programmes in 10 key Points”, comparing both programmes. EN and FR versions.
- During the open calls of the Med Programme, the L.O. informed the potential beneficiaries about MED or ENPI CBC-MED key features; in order to steer them to the right programme. These consultations have been usually through out email and telephone consultations, but also bilateral interviews were held.
- The L.O. also collaborated in the MED Annual Event 2010 organisation, held in Thessaloniki, by coordinating participants and guests from the following programmes and organisations: ENPI-CBC MED, Mediterranean countries NCP, INTERACT, Mediterranean Policy think-tank and LO Hosting Authority.
- The participation representing the MED Programme in different INTERACT’s events was also part of the Liaison Office’s activities:
  - “III Lab group for a Mediterranean Platform”, in Barcelona and the “IV Mediterranean Lab Group. Seminar on Natural Risks” on the 28th of September 2010, in Marseilles. Both organised by INTERACT-Valencia.
  - 1st meeting of the pilot group for measuring the achievements of ETC programmes.” On the 21<sup>st</sup> of January 2010, in Brussels. Organised by INTERACT-Viborg.
- It contributed to the MED Newsletter 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> issue by feeding the L.O. Valencia space with information on the L.O. activities and latest news of ENPI CBC Med.
- In representation of the MED Programme, the L.O. also attended the conference “Celebrating 20 Years of Territorial Cooperation and looking beyond 2013” on the 30 September - 1 October 2010, in Tournée (Belgium), during the EU Belgium Presidency .
- The L.O. also enjoyed the “OPEN DAYS 2010 – European Week of Regions and Cities”, on the 4<sup>th</sup> -7<sup>th</sup> of October: towards Europe 2020, as the MED Programme representative. 100 brochures were handed out.
- During the second semester of 2010, the L.O. started its collaboration to the Joint Transnational Cooperation Event together with other members of the MED Programme. The

first meeting the LO attended was during the 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> of November, held in Katowice (Poland)

#### IV. Capitalisation:

- The Liaison Officer, contributed to the MED's Capitalisation Plan and meeting defining the capitalisation strategy between MED-ENPI CBC Med.

As the 1<sup>st</sup> call of ENPI CBC MED projects were pre-selected in December 2010, no capitalisation activities between both programmes have been developed during this period. During the coordination meetings between ENPI CBC Med and MED programmes, their Managing Authorities and JTS considered that not before the end of 2011-12 would be possible to see results in the case of ENPI CBC MED Programme.

#### **Liaison Office Thessaloniki**

The Thessaloniki Liaison Office was reopened in March 2010. The LO became immediately operational and developed activities in the following fields:

- Transition from the ancient regime of managing IPA funds to the integrated way
- Communication-capitalization
- Development of strategic partnerships

In the beginning of 2010 on the request of the Commission the Managing Authority started to observe the possibility of advancing from the present transitional to the integrated way of managing the IPA funds. The LO provided its contribution and assistance to the process. First of all it has contacted the national coordination of all the four MED IPA countries and the respective EU Delegations in order to learn their experience with the ancient regime and study their needs and objectives towards the new system. On the basis of this the LO elaborated a proposal for the integration of the IPA funds which was endorsed by the Monitoring Committee in Chania in June 2010. By this act the Monitoring Committee officially entitled the Managing Authority to develop the necessary instruments for the integrated management.

As the Commission initiative addressed the SEE Programme as well the LO played the role of the coordination between the two programmes. The LO organized a meeting between the Commission, the SEE and the MED MA/JTS in Thessaloniki to clarify the details regarding the integration and the future steps. During the annual event of both Programmes, the Commission underlined the necessity of modifying the Operational Programmes. Afterwards the LO elaborated a proposal for the modifications of the MED OP and assisted the JTS in the modification and development of the other relevant programme documents (Implementation Guide, Audit trail, IPA Subsidy contract, Partnership Agreement).

The LO also took part in the communication by:

- Developing and operating a network of the MED IPA countries' National Coordinations
- Contributing to the organization of the Annual Event of the Programme in Thessaloniki by coordinating the joint SEE and MED part

The LO in close cooperation with the National Coordination of the IPA countries (especially with Montenegro) the MA/JTS and the potential IPA partners contributed successfully to the

development of partnerships in strategic projects as well. The office by providing information about the offered opportunities of the strategic call and the themes tackled by the submitted draft projects, served as a liaison between the draft strategic projects the potential IPA Partners the IPA national coordinations and the MA/JTS.

## **2.7. Monitoring and evaluation**

### **Controls in compliance with Article 60 of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006**

#### Analysis of periodic payment requests

The description of management and control systems in compliance with Article 71 of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 requires the examination of periodic payment requests which include the request for payment per se, a progress report, certification from the auditors for each of the partners and appendices. As was indicated last year, an internal monitoring tool (see checklist hereafter) has been created for the assessment of requests for payment.

This checklist starts by covering all the assessment stages right from the beginning to identify at which moment each of the parties has been assessed and by whom from the JTS. It also enables the auditor to see the request for payment in its entirety and the respecting of submission deadlines established in the offer of grant.

Progress report assessment focuses primarily on compatibility between the activities undertaken and those anticipated and described in the workplan contained in the application form. Differences between planned activities and those delivered are also examined as are all differences between budgeted expenditure and actual expenditure. If these differences are not justified in the report, clarification and additional justification of this are requested from the lead partner.

Similarly, the checklist enables the certification of expenditure of all project partners to be assessed thereby guaranteeing that the specifications of the first level control systems (terms and conditions for certification by auditors, certification processes, eligibility of expenditure, etc.) of the Member States have been respected by all the partners.

In addition, lead partners must append their progress reports with documents and other appendices which prove that the activities described have actually taken place (e.g., meeting agendas, attendance lists, notes of meetings, studies published, brochures disseminated, edited promotional material, etc). The websites for each project are also checked.

As previously mentioned in paragraph 2.1 of this report, 52 projects were approved in 2010. The 50 projects from the first call for proposals were required to submit two payment claims on the 31<sup>st</sup> of May and the 30<sup>th</sup> of November. The 52 projects from the second call for proposals had to submit their first payment claims on the 31<sup>st</sup> of October in compliance with the deadlines established for the projects from each of the two calls.

All of the projects from the first call for proposals submitted at least one payment claim in 2010, while 33 submitted two. 22 projects from the second call succeeded in submitting their first payment claim before the end of 2010. Assessment of these payment claims enabled the effectiveness of the checklist to be verified and improved.

In fact, this tool was slightly simplified during 2010, particularly with respect to the sections dealing with the assessment of certain aspects which could no longer be modified in PRESAGE CTE monitoring tool. A certain number of improvements in the tool made the assessment of

documents included in payment claim easier, even if this meant requesting many changes from the service provider. The assessment of payment claims could therefore be carried out with greater efficiency.

Quarterly assessment of the payment claim as mentioned above enables the project manager to verify the operational and financial progress of the project which ties up with the work done on a daily basis with the lead partners.

In parallel to this type of monitoring, the JTS developed a monitoring system which enables it to have an overall view of project progress from the two calls for traditional project proposals. This allows to identify different problems which can be addressed in a preventative manner and to give precise information to national-level coordination bodies for better follow-up.

These tables also enabled objective monitoring which is not limited to the person following the project (in the JTS) by facilitating the take-up of the project by another member of the team, if required.

The JTS used 3 common tables for all the projects in the same call for proposals:

1. A table for certified amounts compared to progress made by partner. This table enabled a rapid assessment to be made of each partner and therefore to identify, in liaison with the lead partners, any problematic partner.  
The table also enabled problems to be detected at a national level on which the national authorities were alerted in order to find a coordinated solution.
2. A table to monitor progress reports. This table provides the total amount certified for each project for the period concerned, the cumulative total since the start of the project and the level of progress (in %) when compared to the total budget allocated to the project.
3. A table to monitor the financial progress of projects finishing in 2011. 28 projects from the first 'traditional' call for proposals will be completed in 2011. These projects require special monitoring in order to prevent any significant underspending. It was during the fourth quarter of 2010 that this particular table was adopted integrated the previous table with financial data from PRESAGE, expenditure yet to be certified by the projects.

### **Participation in project Steering Committees**

Aside from the documentary assessment, the monitoring of project activities approved is also done by the participation of members of the JTS at different project Steering Committee meetings.

This direct involvement enables face to face contact with the lead partner and the other project partners and to see at first hand the context of project activities. This includes the activities undertaken, the expenditure incurred and therefore the real level of delivery compared to what was anticipated as well as any eventual difficulties the projects might experience. Each attendance at a Steering Committee meeting is summarised in an activity report using an internal document template.

In 2010, JTS members attended 14 project Steering Committees in an effort to provide better technical supervision of approved projects.

1. **Cat-Med:** Aix en Provence 25<sup>th</sup> February 2010

2. **MEMO**: Marseille, 29<sup>th</sup> April 2010
3. **Teenergy Schools** : Grenada, 27<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup> May 2010
4. **Flormed** : Toulon, 1<sup>st</sup> July 2010
5. **Macc Bam**: Athens, 7<sup>th</sup> July 2010
6. **Philoxenia**: Athens, 8<sup>th</sup> July 2010
7. **Ethic**: Brignoles (France) 2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> September 2010
8. **Waterloss**: Thessaloniki, 21<sup>st</sup> September 2010
9. **Cat-Med**: Marseille, 4<sup>th</sup> October 2010
10. **Med Technopolis**: Toulon, 5<sup>th</sup> October 2010
11. **Protect**: Faro, 14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> October 2010
12. **Med Emporion**: Barcelona, 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2010
13. **IKTIMED**: Barcelona, 21<sup>st</sup> October 2010
14. **MET3**: Aix en Provence, 24<sup>th</sup> November 2010

In compliance also with the description of management and control systems of the MED Programme, **on-the-spot** visits were made in 2010 by the MA/JTS. 7 organisations participating to altogether 26 projects received visits in 2010. The structures visited were decided following a common methodology which was previously validated by the Monitoring Committee in 2009. The visits enabled assessments to be carried out with the beneficiaries of procedures put in place by the project partners to deliver the approved projects in compliance with the decision of approval and the Subsidy contract. Each on-the-spot assessment is summarised in a report using a template which was also approved by the Monitoring Committee in 2009.

The on-the-spot visits undertaken in 2010 concerned the following organisations and projects:

1. **Université Européenne des Saveurs et des Senteurs**: Forcalquier (France), 20<sup>th</sup> April 2010  
**MEDISS** Project
  
2. **Instituto Andaluz de Tecnología**: Seville (Spain), 11<sup>th</sup> May 2010  
  
**Agroenvironmed** Project  
  
**Med IPPC Net** Project
  
3. **Larnaca District Development Agency**: Voroclini (Cyprus), 8<sup>th</sup> June 2010  
  
**DEVELOP-MED** Project  
  
**MEDLAB** Project  
  
**MEDOSSIC** Project  
  
**PHILOXENIA** Project  
  
**RIMED** Project  
  
**SMILIES** Project

**WASMAN Project**

4. **Paragon Europe:** Mosta (Malta), 9<sup>th</sup> June 2010

**DEVELOP-MED Project**

5. **Marseille-Provence Chamber of Commerce and Industry :** Marseilles (France), 4<sup>th</sup> November 2010

**INS MED Project**

**SECUR MED PLUS Project**

**MACC BAM Project**

**MEMO Project**

**SHIFT Project**

**IRH MED Project**

**IP SMEs Project**

**KnowInTarget Project**

**2Ins Clusters Project**

**PORTA Project**

**Responsible MED Project**

**HIDDEN Project**

**SCORE Project**

**TEMA Project**

6. **Naples Chamber of Commerce:** Naples (Italy), 30<sup>th</sup> November 2010

**SHIFT Project**

7. **Confindustria Palermo:** Palermo (Italy), 1<sup>st</sup> December 2010

**ETHIC Project**

## **Coordination activities with national delegations**

In addition to the monitoring of project activities, coordination activities with national delegations were undertaken to inform the relevant partners about procedures and financial eligibility rules to follow.

The Spanish National Coordinating Body, The Ministry of Economy and Finance, organised an financial seminar on the 15<sup>th</sup> October of 2010 for all lead partners and Spanish auditors for MED projects approved following the 2<sup>nd</sup> call for proposals. During the seminar, the Spanish National Coordinating Body presented the certification process as well as common errors made in the certification of project expenditure from the 1<sup>st</sup> call so that lessons could be learned for the future. The MED JTS also presented rules concerning eligible expenditure as well as the PRESAGE CTE which is the monitoring tool for the MED Programme.

On the 15<sup>th</sup> April 2010, the Italian National Coordinating Body organised an information seminar for all MED project lead partners, project partners and Italian auditors (1<sup>st</sup> Call) on first level controls and eligibility of expenditure. The Italian National Coordinating Body presented its decentralised system for certification, the procedure for the approval of the beneficiaries' First Level Controllers and the procedure to activate the *Fondo di Rotazione* (a special National Funding instrument). The Italian Manual for Financial Reporting and Control was presented.

On the 18<sup>th</sup> of October 2010, the Italian National Coordinating Body organised an information seminar for all MED project lead partners, project partners and Italian auditors (2<sup>nd</sup> Call) on first level controls and eligibility of expenditure. The Italian National Coordinating Body presented its decentralised system for certification, the procedure for the approval of the beneficiaries' First Level Controllers and the procedure to activate the *Fondo di Rotazione* (a special National Funding instrument). The Italian Manual for Financial Reporting and Control was presented. The MED JTS presented the programme eligibility criteria and gave a presentation of the PRESAGE CTE certification process.

On the 8<sup>th</sup> of December 2010, The Cypriot National Delegation held a seminar for the first level controllers at which the MED JTS also presented the general points of the first level controls for the programme, the rules for eligible expenditure, the financial process and a range of common errors seen in the certification of expenditure. In addition, the Planning Office explained the national specificities for Cyprus while the Treasury Department, which is responsible for public procurement exercises, outlined the different terms and conditions applying to competitive tendering.

The Greek National Delegation also took the initiative to hold a seminar on the 24<sup>th</sup> of September 2010 for first level controllers, this time at a transnational level, taking advantage of the annual programme event which was being held in Thessaloniki at the same time. The MED JTS gave a general presentation of system in place for the first level controls, rules on eligibility of expenditures, the financial process, the PRESAGE CTE monitoring tool and ways to avoid common mistakes.

## **Modifications to approved projects**

For all modifications to the decision to approve selected projects, the Selection Committee gave a favourable opinion to the following changes:

1. **CAT-Med:** Change to the project partnership approved on 29<sup>th</sup> March 2010
2. **IC-MED:** Change to the project partnership approved on 29<sup>th</sup> March 2010
3. **Biolmed:** Change to the project partnership approved on 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2010
4. **Waterincore:** Change to the project partnership approved on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2010
5. **Zero waste:** Change to the project partnership approved on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2010
6. **Agrisles:** New partner added and reduction in ERDF grant to an existing partner approved on 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2010
7. **Philoxenia:** Withdrawal of a partner and redistribution of ERDF grant approved on 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2010.
8. **Limit 4Weda:** Change to the project partnership approved on 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2010
9. **MEDEEA:** Change to the project partnership approved on 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2010
10. **R&D Industry:** Change to the project partnership approved on 7<sup>th</sup> September 2010
11. **Waterloss:** Change to the project partnership approved on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2010
12. **Qubic:** Change to the project partnership approved on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2011
13. **Reinpo Retail:** Change of lead partner approved on 15<sup>th</sup> November 2010
14. **Backgrounds:** Withdrawal of a partner and redistribution of ERDF grant approved on 18<sup>th</sup> November 2010
15. **Med Governance:** Extension to the project duration approved on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010

Since the start of 2010, several partners have tried out different solutions to address economic and administrative difficulties in order to respect their original commitments to either their project implementation or, in a wider sense, the strategic repositioning of their organisation. In fact, the JTS has noticed an increase in the modifications to project proposals previously approved by the Selection Committee.

These requests mainly concern withdrawals from projects and/or the reduction in funding commitments as well as extensions to implementation timetables. In this particular case, all requests resulted in written procedures for the attention of the Selection Committee, and involved a consequent administrative procedure to set up these changes.

In accordance with discussions which took place during the Chania Monitoring Committee meeting on the 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> of June, the MA/JTS proposed an overall procedure which did away with a specific case by case written procedure for the replacement of a partner or extension to project start-up dates, when a certain number of criteria were respected. This flexibility was approved by the Selection Committee on the 21<sup>st</sup> of September 2010, but the reduced number of written procedures is still not fulfilled as most of the projects do not meet all the criteria.

### **Controls in compliance with Article 61 of Regulation (CE) No 1083/2006**

In the description of management and control systems established for the MED Programme the Certifying Authority will assess the quality of certifications with specific controls called “control of certification quality”.

The Certifying Authority carried out a “control of certification quality” exercise in March 2010 on expenditure from the TERCONMED Project. The organisations concerned were the lead partner (FEPORTS – Spain) and a project partner (Port Authority of Marseilles - France).

The results of the control were expressed in a report which gave a satisfactory conclusion. A total of €23,675.23 was audited including €17,756.42 ERDF. The control was comprehensive and only



€36.06 (corresponding to the travel costs budget line) had to be deducted from the payment claim of the TERCONMED Project.

### **Controls in compliance with Article 62 of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006**

As it has already been mentioned in previous annual reports, the Group of Auditors for the MED Programme selected the Deloitte firm to carry out second level controls in compliance with Article 62 of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006.

The team at Deloitte carried out a system audit in 2009 at the Managing Authority, the Joint Technical Secretariat and the Certifying Authority. In the absence of any payments claims from project partners on the date of the system audit which took place in September and October 2009, the performance of the system of the Certifying Authority could not be assessed.

Following a request from the Group of Auditors, a **complementary system audit** was undertaken at the Certifying Authority during **May and June 2010** to assess performance in normal working conditions for payment claims submitted by programme operators.

As concerns **operation controls**, a first wave of sample controls was launched in **2010**. The number of projects having declared expenditure to the European Commission in 2009 (6 in total) constituted a basis for a sampling exercise undertaken by the CICC in January 2010 which was then validated by members of the Group of Auditors in February 2010.

The projects selected were:

- **Sostenuto**: Lead Partner (AMI – France) and a project partner (University of Valencia – Spain)
- **Waterincore**: Lead Partner (ANATOLIKI- Greece) and a project partner (ASAEL - Spain)

A total of €127,466.27 was audited, representing 7.57% of expenditure declared in 2009. The total expenditure deemed to be irregular in the sample was €207.45, making a rate of error of 0.16%.

No systematic errors were detected in the audit exercise. As the annual control report indicates, the results of system audits and operation controls led to the conclusion that there was a reasonably high level of confidence in the regularity of the system and the effectiveness of management and control systems put in place.

The Group of Auditors met in Paris on the 29<sup>th</sup> of October 2010 where the results of the auditing exercises undertaken in 2010 were presented and a workplan for audits in 2011 was established.

### **2.8. National performance reserve (and for the 2010 annual implementation report only, if relevant) - Not applicable**

### **3 – Implementation by priority (see Excel spreadsheet No2, Indicators by priority and by objective)**

As expected, work on the capitalisation task will begin in 2011 making it easier to do a full assessment of each priority. As it stands, it is still worth outlining the nature and typology of projects currently being delivered.

Among the hundred or so projects spread across the 4 priorities and 10 objectives, after the “in itinere” evaluation (see part 3, page 37 and thereafter), three distinct types of projects can be defined which seem to be representative of the activities part-funded by the MED Programme:

### 1/ “Network” projects:

**In this type of project, there are often multi-stakeholder partnerships** that involve a series of stakeholders, each with the capacity to contribute something to the project. The partnerships can be local authorities, consular bodies, social partners, associations as well as research and professional training centres, including universities. The participation of political decision-makers such as local, regional or national authorities guarantees a sustainable partnership. This type of project is not always designed to set up new networks. Members of existing networks can also form new networks if they wish to work in complementary areas or to optimise their collective expertise in new subject areas. In this way, a network project is often the renewal of a project or an assemblage of similar projects.

Regardless of the type of network formed, the objectives of a “network” project are to **strengthen the links between various “stakeholders” involved** in the project to improve the quality, the Mediterranean dimension and the visibility of activities or issues of mutual interest.

### 2/ “Innovative” projects:

These are projects in which partners transfer or develop innovative practices.

Innovation transfer projects: these enable responses to be found for identified training requirements in a particular sector of the economy by adapting **innovative tools** implemented by another project partner. The partners of such a project commonly develop the following activities:

- socio-cultural, legal, linguistic, methodological adaptation of the innovative practice selected.
- trialling results obtained with target groups identified by the project;
- the integration of these results into the working practices of the stakeholders;
- institutional recognition of the results by regional, national and European systems and/or professional training sectors;
- dissemination activities are vital to the success of this type of project, particularly through the involvement of target groups right from the design stage of the projects.

Innovation development projects: in this case, **innovation designates** the adoption of a new approach to resolve problems which traditional approaches cannot address. This type of project must improve the quality and the promotion of innovation in such as way as the tools, methods and concepts developed by the project can be used or adapted by the project partners according to their specificities.

### 3/ “Atypical” projects:

Projects can be atypical for three reasons:

- Their partnership does not have the characteristics of a network projects or an innovative project.
- The form of outputs is neither the constitution nor the strengthening of a network, or the development or transfer of an innovative method.
- The theme of the project is unique or rarely addressed as part of the programme.

#### 3.1. Priority 1: Strengthening innovation capacities

##### 3.1.1. Achievement of targets and analysis of progress

Information on the physical and financial progress of the priority

For each quantifiable indicator in the priority, including key indicators: (see Excel spreadsheet, appendix 2, Indicators by priority and by objective)

Indicators		2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total
Indicator 1 Selected Projects	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										
Indicator 2	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										
Indicator 3	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										
Indicator 4	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										
Indicator 5	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										

#### Qualitative analysis:

In 2010, 45 projects from both the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> “traditional” calls were part-funded under priority 1. Most come under objective 1.2 which encourages cooperation between economic development and institutional stakeholders.

Some of the projects selected in April 2010 just had enough time to submit an evaluation report to declare preparation costs.

For 2009 projects, the past year has enabled them to consolidate their governance frameworks, to begin the organisation of work by appropriate public procurement exercises and to start the communication process. The level of certified expenditures has increased as it was expected but not necessarily in line with the level anticipated in the grant agreement, with most projects behind by one quarter, on average.

These observations apply to all the MED projects and not just to those under priority 1.

In greater detail, it can be seen that for priority 1, there are projects which propose many pilot and experimental activities and which resemble so-called “innovative” projects. These are projects which are less “institutional” and/or networks with a partnership mix between scientific, administrative and private sector stakeholders (limited by “de minimis”) which are quite diverse and strong.

*An example of an ongoing project:*



**InsMed**

<http://www.insmed.eu/>

### **Priority 1: Strengthening innovation capacities**

Objective 1.1: Dissemination of innovative technologies and know-how

InsMed aims to structure an industrial sector in eco-design and construction based on the effective management of water and associated energy and to disseminate these innovative techniques in the MED area.

To achieve this, the project carried out a study and a benchmarking exercise of best practice in eco-construction at an international level. These studies must also lead to the identification of technical and regulatory constraints which discourage property development companies from designing eco-building sites and project managers from operating them.

There followed the development of a first version of the InsMed analysis with the aim of an in-depth understanding of the activities of businesses in the sector, their position in the value chain for eco-construction and from this, the ability to create synergies and national, international contacts required for their future development. The InsMed analysis was tested on 11 businesses in 4 countries concerned by the project.

InsMed has now put its Eco-construction and water management value chain on-line at <http://marketplace.insmed.eu/valuechain.en.html>. These maps out the stakeholders and the key technological applications thereby putting the offer in touch with the demand.

As concerns communication and raising the awareness of public and private sector stakeholders, the project has produced a range of information brochures and has participated in numerous construction industry fairs (such as Batimed – 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup> March 2011 in Marseille and Innovate Building – 5<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> April 2011 in Paris) and has put a website on-line.

#### ***3.1.2. Significant problems encountered and measures taken to overcome them***

The problems which have been referred to on several occasions are not strictly linked to the priority. They are more transversal.

It should be remembered that there were delays in the first level control procedures in a certain number of countries which had immediate consequences on payments (reimbursements). In addition, there was also the downgrading of numerous partners, sometimes lead partners, who requested a reduction in their financial contribution and therefore their commitment to the implementation of a project due to the economic crisis and/or strategic decisions made by their management teams.

These financial difficulties not only affected small organisations in the voluntary sector but also local (regional) authorities which amongst other things, froze public procurement exercises or the travel budgets of their employees.

Faced with these difficulties, the only solution that the programme authorities and the Member States could offer was increasing flexibility in certain procedures, particularly those enabling modifications to the project proposal (budgets and partnerships). This involved encouraging and simplifying the procedures if required as well as closer contact and more targeted monitoring for any requests for assistance in an effort to speed up reimbursements thereby reducing cash flow problems.

The Member States showed confidence in the MA and the JTS in responding to technical requests in a timely fashion which enabled all requests from project partners to be resolved positively.

But in spite of all the efforts at all levels, starting with ongoing projects, the results and the project schedules are taking a long time to materialise.

\*\*\*

## 3.2. Priority 2: Environmental protection and promotion of a sustainable territorial development

### 3.2.1. Achievement of targets and analysis of progress

Information on the physical and financial progress of the priority

For each quantifiable indicator in the priority, including key indicators: (see Excel spreadsheet, appendix 2, Indicators by priority and by objective)

Indicators		2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total
Indicator 1 Selected Projects	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										
Indicator 2	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										
Indicator 3	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										
Indicator 4	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										

Indicator 5	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										

Qualitative analysis:

In 2010, 31 projects are currently ongoing under priority 2 which is the biggest of all the four priorities in the operational programme.

Aside from the difficulties and analysis already covered in priority 1, the closure of the second “traditional” call for proposals confirmed the problems experienced by the programme to engage the right stakeholders in objectives 2.2 and 2.3. These concern renewable energy/energy efficiency and maritime safety respectively and in consequence, they were themes chosen for the first call for strategic projects for the MED Programme!

It can also be noted that there was a strong imbalance between the first objective of the priority (protection and enhancement of natural resources and heritage) and the three others in terms of projects selected: 17 for the first objective, 6 for the second, 3 for the third and finally, 5 for the fourth objective. This is also due to a massive response from project partners for objective 1 while the other three did not necessarily connect with all, or any, of the appropriate target groups. This issue will probably require careful consideration in the evaluation.

*An example of an ongoing project*



**SHIFT**

<http://www.shiftmed.eu/pages/home>

**Priority 2: Environmental protection and promotion of a sustainable territorial development**

Objective 2.1: Protection and enhancement of natural resources and cultural heritage

The aim of SHIFT is to propose an IQM (Integrated Quality Management) model that encourages sustainable development through a transnational partnership between fragile Mediterranean regions such as coastal or island areas.

The development of sustainable tourism in the Mediterranean, particularly in environmentally sensitive areas, is the only way to preserve the natural, cultural and social heritage of these places. Indeed, the absence of integrated planning coupled with decades of pressure from seasonal tourism development has put the very future of this fragile environment in question. Consequently, European regions from four Mediterranean countries have decided to get together in one common project, the SHIFT Project.

The objective is to monitor sustainable development in the Mediterranean by redistributing on the one hand the pressure from tourism over a longer season and towards different segments of the market stemming from the cultural and natural diversity of the region. On the other hand, the idea is to develop sustainable tourism locations together with the promotion of an offer that is both specialised and of high quality.

The project partners are aiming for “total quality” comprising ethical, strategic and commercial criteria which are the key to the competitive quality of tourist destinations.

Based on this assessment, the project partners developed two thematic itineraries in their areas based on concepts of food and wine and natural and cultural heritage.

An integrated communication strategy was also launched through a website ([www.shiftmed.eu](http://www.shiftmed.eu)), educational seminars were organised for tour operators on the islands in the Bay of Naples (Capri-Procida-Ischia) and those of Thassos and Samothrace (Greece- September 2010). In addition, integrated quality management workshops for local island-based tourist businesses in the provinces of Naples and Marseille were held in their respective regions.

### ***3.2.2. Significant problems encountered and measures taken to overcome them***

See above, para 3.1.2.

\*\*\*

## **3.3. Priority 3: Improvement of mobility and of territorial accessibility**

### ***3.3.1. Achievement of targets and analysis of progress***

Information on the physical and financial progress of the priority

For each quantifiable indicator in the priority, including key indicators: (see Excel spreadsheet, appendix 2, Indicators by priority and by objective)

Indicators		2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total
Indicator 1 Selected Projects	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										
Indicator 2	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										
Indicator 3	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										
Indicator 4	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										
Indicator 5	Achievement										

	Objective										
	Baseline										

### Qualitative analysis:

Only 10 projects were selected for priority 3 among the 101 projects selected between 2009 and 2010 and only 2 of these (both from the second call) for objective 3.2 (support for the use of information technologies for a better accessibility and territorial cooperation). For this objective, it can at least be assumed that the theme is being addressed in a transversal way across all the other objectives in the OP in the form of tools for anticipated outputs.

On the other hand, objective 3.1, (maritime accessibility, multimodality and intermodality) has eight ongoing projects (four from the first call and four from the second call) which appear to be ‘suffering’ from the complexity of the subject which is prone to essentially national expertise where the private sector is fundamental but in strong competition (ports) and the financial requirements for investment and research are massive.

The outputs that have been identified for the moment from the projects approved under the first call (the four projects in all) focus mainly on “network” activities, exchanges/visits and communication while experimental activities and/or pilot actions are experiencing delays.

A new pilot action for priority 3, this time with a more “top down” than “bottom up” approach, will probably be introduced in 2011<sup>5</sup> using a strategic project format.

### *Example of an ongoing project*



### **DevelopMed**

<http://www.developmed.eu/>

### **Priority 3: Improvement of mobility and of territorial accessibility**

Objective 3.1: Improvement of maritime accessibility and of transit capacities through multimodality and intermodality

The DEVELOPMED Project aims to promote the strategic integration of Mediterranean ports by the evaluation of a common development strategy. This will enable competitiveness improvements to the Mediterranean maritime system, to develop links between major regional ports and to establish a Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T).

---

<sup>5</sup> The call for project proposals was opened in 1st April 2011.



To achieve this, the DEVELOPMED project intends to promote dialogue and cooperation to define a common Mediterranean policy for transport network planning, investment in infrastructure and development of the region. Meetings between the project partners coupled with the production of communication instruments including seminars, workshops and conferences as well as a website all work towards these objectives for the establishment of synergies and the exchange of information between stakeholders.

The project has published 5 reports on strategic positioning and identifying potential of MED to position the Mediterranean in the global maritime market, especially in legal and financial frameworks, and to target actions to improve the competitiveness of ports. A study about the “Analysis of global trends in the maritime market and positioning of the Mediterranean region” has also been published.

For the future, the project will focus on defining integrated development priority scenarios and on the development of an institutional context for future cooperation on transnational and inter-regional policy issues including the definition of roles and responsibilities for the development of a competitive and effective Mediterranean maritime system.

Finally, the DEVELOPMED Project also intends to disclose and capitalise on the results obtained to ensure the sustainability and the transferability of the project.

### ***3.3.2. Significant problems encountered and measures taken to overcome them***

See above, para 3.1.2.

\*\*\*

## **3.4. Priority 4: Promotion of a polycentric and integrated development of the Med space**

### ***3.4.1. Achievement of targets and analysis of progress***

Information on the physical and financial progress of the priority

For each quantifiable indicator in the priority, including key indicators: (see Excel spreadsheet, appendix 2, Indicators by priority and by objective)

Indicators		2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total
Indicator 1 Selected Projects	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										
Indicator 2	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										
Indicator 3	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										
Indicator 4	Achievement										

	Objective										
	Baseline										
Indicator 5	Achievement										
	Objective										
	Baseline										

### Qualitative analysis:

Priority 4 has not really evolved in terms of new projects given the limited funding still available after the first call for project proposals. Of the 15 projects approved, only 3 come from the second call and these all come under objective 4.1: “Coordination of development policies and of territorial governance”. Finally, only three projects came in under objective 4.2: “Strengthening of identity and enhancement of cultural resources...”.

This priority attracted the interest of numerous local and regional stakeholders, particularly local (regional) authorities and the grant allocation which had been awarded to it was clearly underestimated when compared to the expectations of the project partners.

The question which arises for the future is to know if the themes of territorial governance and cultural enhancement will, or will not, figure in transnational programmes and if so, in what way and with what resources?

It is clear that in the Mediterranean, these types of problems remain an absolute priority in the different regions, but it must be identified how their effectiveness can be maximised and how can they benefit from all the existing networks so that genuine innovation remains for the time being a subject that is completely open.

### Example of an ongoing project



### **CrepudMed**

<http://crepudmed.blogspot.com/>

### **Priority 4: Promotion of a polycentric and integrated development of the Med space**

#### Objective 4.1: Coordination of development policies and of territorial governance

The whole of continental Europe is confronted with the problem of metropolitan development which results in increased urbanisation and urban sprawl. This phenomenon of urban sprawl is based on dynamics which go far beyond administrative frontiers leading to the development of huge areas which change the borders and relationships between urban and rural regions. The regions and stakeholders from Mediterranean metropolitan areas are particularly concerned with these issues and are in a privileged position to engage and come forward with approaches to revamp regional planning on a large scale.

The objectives of CrepuMed are to draw up strategic and methodological frames of reference for the renewal of the planning process at the scale of large regions. This involves the construction and comparison of multi-level forms of governance, the planning of polycentric development in metropolitan areas in operational terms, making economic development a component of sustainable urbanisation and the attractiveness of regions and finally, to build alternatives to mobility using cars (all-car model).

A methodological guide and a benchmark were produced by the scientific committee (Polytechnic University of Catalonia) in order to make an initial assumption. The project partners subsequently produced their first elements for consideration according to the *knowledge-process-booking project* framework. Barcelona and Val de Durance also drafted specifications for urban design consultations.

As for communication, the project acquired a website ([www.crepumed.eu](http://www.crepumed.eu)) and has already held two conferences in Marseille and Bologna in April 2010.

### 3.4.2. Significant problems encountered and measures taken to overcome them

See above, para 3.1.2.

\*\*\*

## 3.5. Priority 5: Technical assistance

### 3.5.1. Achievement of targets and analysis of progress

Information on the physical and financial progress of the priority

for each quantifiable indicator in the priority including key indicators:

Indicators		2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total	
Indicator 1:	Achievements	Number of meetings held on transnational level**										
		7 (6 Task force + 1 kick off conference)	10 (2 MC+ 2SC+ 1GOA+ 4WG + Annual event)	10 (2MC+ 2SC+ 2GOA+ 1WG+ 2BS+ + 1 Annual event)	7 (1MC+1 SC+1G OA+1W G+1BS+ 2PCN+1 Annual Event)							34
	Target	30										
	Baseline											
Indicator 2:	Achievement	Number of operations										
	proposed		1 <sup>st</sup> call 531	2 <sup>nd</sup> call 447	3 <sup>rd</sup> call 12	/						
	eligible		1 <sup>st</sup> call 277	2 <sup>nd</sup> call 330	3 <sup>rd</sup> call 6	/						
	financed		/	1 <sup>st</sup> call 50	2 <sup>nd</sup> call 51	3 <sup>rd</sup> call 3					104	

	Target	150
	Baseline	

*\*\*MC = Monitoring Committee; SC = Selection Committee; GOA = Group of Auditors ; WG = Working Group ; BS = Brainstorming of strategic projects*

The total sum of Technical Assistance directly committed by the MA/JTS for 2010 was 1 215 968.67€ (amount under first level control) from a total budget of 15 455 306.00€ for the entire period.

Qualitative analysis:

See point 6. Technical Assistance

### ***3.5.2. Significant problems encountered and measures taken to overcome them***

\*\*\*

#### **4. ESF Programmes: compliance and concentration**

Not applicable

#### **5. ERDF/Cohesion Fund Programmes: major projects (if relevant)**

Not applicable

#### **6. Technical assistance**

In compliance with Article 46 of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006, TA funding can cover activities related to the preparation, management, monitoring, evaluation, information and control of the operation programme as well as activities to strengthen administrative resources required for the implementation of funding. In this framework, all the activities undertaken for the management of the programme on a daily basis comply with this priority of the OP and are therefore detailed elsewhere in the present report. It is therefore deemed unnecessary to repeat them in this section. Nevertheless, a list of written procedures from the Monitoring Committee is included hereafter as well as a list of important notifications which have not been subject to a decision.

#### **MED Monitoring Committee Written Procedures 2010**

- Validation of the TA budget and MA/JTS workplan + Valencia Liaison Office for 2010 – 8<sup>th</sup> January
- Informal consultation on the terms of reference for the 1<sup>st</sup> call for strategic project proposals – 13<sup>th</sup> January
- Terms of reference for the 1<sup>st</sup> call for strategic project (part 1) – 15<sup>th</sup> February
- Procedure for recovery irregularities – 19<sup>th</sup> February
- Terms of reference for the 1<sup>st</sup> call for strategic project (part 2) - 5<sup>th</sup> March
- Documents for the 1<sup>st</sup> call for strategic project proposals – 6<sup>th</sup> April partial closure and 14<sup>th</sup> April final closure
- Extension to the funding allocation for 2<sup>nd</sup> programming of traditional projects – 17<sup>th</sup> May

- Extension to the deadline for the 1<sup>st</sup> call for strategic project proposals – 18<sup>th</sup> May
- 2009 Annual Report – completion of part 1 on 18<sup>th</sup> June and final closure at Committee meeting
- Terms of reference for the “capitalisation” public procurement – 12<sup>th</sup> July
- Minutes from the Monitoring Committee meeting in Chania (22<sup>rd</sup>-24<sup>th</sup> June) – 8<sup>th</sup> September
- Closure of the “flexible administrative procedure” for 1<sup>st</sup> call strategic projects – 15<sup>th</sup> September
- Closure of the MA proposal “steps to take” for the preparation of the future programme – 30<sup>th</sup> September
- Closure of discussions and WP to designate the Selection Committee as the authority responsible for the programming of strategic projects – 27<sup>th</sup> October
- Closure of the consultation to modify the MED OP to include the management of IPA funding for the 4 IPA countries participating in the MED Programme (the OP is not included with this WP) – 29<sup>th</sup> October
- Closure of discussions + WP for the recruitment of JTS staff – 16<sup>th</sup> November
- Closure of the validation of conclusions from the brainstorming sessions for the 2<sup>nd</sup> call for strategic projects – 14<sup>th</sup> December

#### Other consultations and notifications from the MA to Committee in 2010

- Invitation to an informal committee meeting to discuss a Mediterranean macro-region – 25<sup>th</sup> January
- Date of the annual programme event – 1<sup>st</sup> February
- Forms and documents for the certification of TA expenditure – 17<sup>th</sup> February
- Identification of TA payments – 18<sup>th</sup> February
- Summary of controls carried out – 23<sup>rd</sup> February
- Problems encountered in the certification of project expenditure – 26<sup>th</sup> February
- Dates of Monitoring Committee and annual programme event – 18<sup>th</sup> March
- Amendments to the MED subsidy contract – 7<sup>th</sup> April
- New TA “certification” kit – 7<sup>th</sup> April
- Information on future recruitment MA/JTS – 30<sup>th</sup> June
- Convocations to “strategic projects” working group – 18<sup>th</sup> August
- Proposal + information: joint event for 13 transnational cooperation programmes – 30<sup>th</sup> September
- Minutes from the “strategic projects” working group meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> September in Thessaloniki – 8<sup>th</sup> October
- Agenda for brainstorming sessions for the 2<sup>nd</sup> call for strategic project proposals – 26<sup>th</sup> October

#### National activities delivered:

##### France

#### Participation in the different MED Programme committees

- Preparation and participation in programme monitoring and selection committees:
  - 4<sup>th</sup> selection committee meeting for the 2<sup>nd</sup> call for traditional projects, 27<sup>th</sup> – 28<sup>th</sup> April (Santorini, Greece);
  - 5<sup>th</sup> monitoring committee meeting, 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2010 (Chania, Greece);

- Participation in strategic projects working group meetings (renewable energy, maritime safety).
- Preparation and participation in the National Contact Point meeting, 4<sup>th</sup> February (Brussels).
- Preparation and participation in the strategic projects lead partners seminar, 27<sup>th</sup> May (Marseille)
- Participation in the annual MED Programme event, 22<sup>nd</sup>-23<sup>rd</sup> September (Thessaloniki, Greece).

#### Coordination of national partnership

- Organisation, participation and coordination of preparatory meetings for the launch of the 1<sup>st</sup> call for strategic project proposals on the prevention of maritime risks, the improvement of energy efficiency and the promotion of renewable energies, 12<sup>th</sup> April (Marseille);
- Working meetings with the State services on strategic projects (DIRM 13<sup>th</sup> January, DREAL 21<sup>st</sup> January, DIRECCTE 7<sup>th</sup> April)
- Preparation, organisation and coordination of the national committee, 21<sup>st</sup> April (Marseille);
- Participation, organisation and coordination of the capitalisation seminar, 15<sup>th</sup> June (Marseille).

#### First level control

- Approval of 45 first level controllers
- Assessment and validation of national co-funding of 65 project partners;
- Updating of the vademecum terms of reference;
- Drafting of recommendations on procedures for public procurement;
- Drafting of a guide outlining the quality certification control;
- Administrative and financial monitoring of 120 French participants.

#### Support for project partners

- Assistance in the development of projects and support to partners during the launch of the 2<sup>nd</sup> call for traditional project proposals;
- Support and notification to successful applicants from the 2<sup>nd</sup> call (rules on eligibility of expenditure, status, match funding, public procurement, etc.).

#### Information and publicity

- Notification of the national partnership and to partners concerning all programme events and activities, coordination of written procedures;
- All documentation concerning national events linked to the programme included under a “national information” heading on the MED Programme website.

#### Others

- Participation in various meetings :
  - Open seminar for the CATMED Project;
  - UESS, CCIMP, CCINA meetings, etc.
- Participation in site visits to the Single Managing Authority:

- UESS, 20<sup>th</sup> April (Forcalquier);
- CCIMP, 4<sup>th</sup> November (Marseille)
- National technical assistance:
  - Consolidation of the claims for payment for national technical assistance expenditure for 2009 (receipts, spreadsheet formats, drafting of letters and technical notes, etc.);
  - Preparation for certification of expenditure and interface with first level controllers;
  - Transfer of combined payment claims (State and PACA Regional Council) to the Single Managing Authority.

### Italy

The Italian National Contact Point carried out the following activities, in coordination with the Italian regions:

- Provision of information on the Programme (telephone and email);
- Providing consulting and assistance to the potential Italian project partners in the matter of preparing projects, searching for partners, solving problems of eligibility of expenditure and public procedures for procurement, eligibility of bodies for the second phase of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Call and for the First Strategic call;
- Technical Assistance to the Mixed Commission State-Regions for First Level Control - Italy in drawing up the Italian Manual for First Level Control TN MED and participation in meetings;
- Assistance to Italian Beneficiaries in TN MED for FLC (telephone/email);
- Support to Italian Beneficiaries for financial management of projects on PRESAGE system;
- Organisation of Information Seminar on FLC – Italian Beneficiaries First Call TN MED – 15 April 2010;
- Participation in meeting with external Evaluation of TN MED Programme 3 June 2010 and preparation of Interview replies;
- National Committee Meetings on 27 January 2010, 30 March 2010, 6 April 2010 (Italian Working Group – Strategic Projects), 15 April 2010, 18 May 2010, 16 June 2010, 9 November 2011
- Participation in national level meetings on ETC representing the TN MED NCP as follows:
  - 1 February 2010 – ENPI MED – TN MED Committee Meeting
  - 29 March 2010 – National Seminar on Strategic Projects in ETC – presentation of TN MED Strategic Projects
  - 9 April 2010 – Meeting in Potenza on Strategic Projects
  - 15 July 2010 - ENPI MED
  - 19 August 2010 – Meeting in Ancona on Strategic Projects
  - 25 November 2010 – ETC National Coordination Committee meeting
  - 26 November 2010 – Seminar on the Future of Cohesion Policy - Rome
  - 6 December 2010 – ETC National Coordination Committee meeting
  - 9 December 2010 - ENPI MED
- Participation in Transnational meetings and committees organised by the Programme – Santorini 27-28 April 2010, Marseilles 25-27 May 2010, Crete 23-24 June 2010, NCP meeting Marseilles 16 November 2010, Brainstorming 2<sup>nd</sup> Call Strategic Projects 16-17 November 2011;
- Hosting and Participation of NCPs meeting in Brussels 4 February 2010;
- Participation at Strategic projects meeting organised by Interact - Presentation of MED SP methodology 4 February 2010
- Participation in the Regions for economic change Seminar - Brussels - 20 May 2010

- Coordination of drafting of national documents to propose Transnationality;
- Follow-up to Capitalisation Event on Thematic Poles – draft methodological paper;
- Contribution to Strategic Projects Working Group (and coordination with the expert);
- Coordination of national consultations for all Programme documents sent in written procedure and discussed in transnational committees;
- Contribution to documents prepared for the discussion on the Macro-Region and participation in the meeting with the European Commission in Brussels – 24 March 2010
- Participation in the Seminar - Territorial Cooperation and macro-regions in the Mediterranean - Brussels – 6 May 2010 and the Seminar organised by the CRPM “Europe and its neighbourhood: towards macro-regions? Developing an EU strategy for a Macro-Region in the Mediterranean – Brussels 1 July 2010;
- Planning for Communication and Dissemination Events to be held in 2010;
- Organisation of the National Seminar -Territorial Cooperation in the Mediterranean Basin - Strategic Projects and orientation for MED cooperation post 2013 – 17 June 2010 Bari.
- Organisation of the National Seminar -Territorial Cooperation in the Mediterranean Basin - Strategic Projects and orientation for MED cooperation post 2013 – 17 June 2010 Bari.
- Organisation of the National Seminar – Strategic Projects in the MED space TN MED – 28 September 2010 Bologna.
- Organisation of Information Seminar on FLC – Italian Beneficiaries Second Call TN MED – 18 October 2010.

### Malta

- The Maltese National coordination participated actively in all Selection and Monitoring Committees and gave its contribution to the written procedures as required.
- Contributed to the drafting of the second call for strategic projects in the following manner: (a) liaised with Maltese experts from the relevant ministries with regard to the documents circulated by the JTS; (b) participated in a preparatory meeting and a Strategic projects applicants seminar, which were held in May, (c) attended a brainstorming session in connection with the call held in November in Marseille together with two representatives from Transport Malta.
- Coordinated the first call for MED strategic projects and assisted Maltese partners / potential partners in this regard.
- Ensured that the budget for staff costs of all Maltese partners does not exceed the 35% threshold stipulated in the national guidelines.
- Continually liaised with the JTS staff about any queries or any technical problems faced by Maltese partners.
- Submitted a Technical Assistance claim (claim number 4) amounting to €4,975.86 and made slight modifications to the third claim as requested by the JTS. The TA expenses claimed by Malta (those incurred until the end of June 2010) were reimbursed by the MED Paying Authority during this year.
- Liaised with the JTS about the 2011 National Event to be held in Katowice, Poland.
- Kept partners informed with the latest news and developments concerning the Programme (e.g. information days and templates).
- Updated and developed national templates when and as necessary.
- Constantly updated the Planning and Priorities Coordination Department web site with any notices and information of potential interest to Maltese persons/entities.
- Contributed to and participated in the systems audit carried out by the MA/JTS on one of the Maltese partners (Paragon Europe).



- Carried out bi-lateral meetings with Maltese entities that are partners in projects selected under the second call for standard projects as part of the project monitoring exercises carried out periodically by the Territorial Cooperation Programmes Unit.
- Carried out the first level control and issued the verification of nine claims.
- Held an information session about first level control for project partners and controllers in collaboration with INTERACT.

### Portugal

The actions and activities of the Portuguese National Coordination, i.e. the Financial Institute for Regional Development, for 2010 were the following:

#### **PROGRESS ACHIEVED IN THE IMPLEMENTING OF THE PROGRAM**

1. Progress in the implementation of National Correspondent Information System. During the year of 2010 all the informations concerning the MED Program, namely, projects approved, auditors validated by project and payment requests validated by the first level control were uploaded in the National Correspondent Information System;
2. Validation and authorization of 20 auditors as auditors of the first level control (materialization of the system of decentralization of the first level control);
3. Validation of 9 payment requests verified by the auditors previously validated;
4. Publication of the Guideline n° 950 by the Portuguese Statutory Auditors, on the month of July. The aim of this guideline is the establishment of rules and principles that should guide the work done by the auditors of the first level control. The guideline is related to the protocol celebrated between the Financial Institute for Regional Development and the Portuguese Statutory Auditors on July 2009, concerning the first level control.

#### **INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES**

5. Two training seminars held in Lisbon on the 29<sup>th</sup> March and on the 3<sup>rd</sup> November, with the purpose to raise awareness on the eligibility expenditure, on public procurement procedures control, to clarify other potential doubts that beneficiaries and auditors may had and to avoid most common errors;
6. Providing information, by email and telephone, concerning the Programme procedures, expenditure eligibility, public procurement rules and principles and compliance with internal procedures of the first level control;
7. Divuligation of the achievements of Portuguese European Territorial Cooperation 2009-2010, including the MED Program, through the Financial Institute for Regional Development's newsletter of March 2011;

#### **PARTICIPATION IN COMMITTEES AND SEMINARS OF THE PROGRAM**

8. Participation of NC in the Selection Committee, held in Santorini on the 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> April;
9. Participation of one expert (from the Port of Sines) in one of the sessions of the brainstorming seminar concerning strategic projects, held in Marseille on the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> of November.

## Slovenia

### **The Slovenian National Contact Point of MedProgramme carried out the following activities:**

- In 2010 National Contact Point Slovenia focused on consulting and informing potential beneficiaries about programme goals, aims and priorities. Information was given using individual consultation, phone consultations and e-mail.
- A web portal [www.cilj3.mop.gov.si](http://www.cilj3.mop.gov.si) was widely exploited for sharing information about the Med Programme. There is a special section of web portal designated for the MedProgramme where all relevant information about the programme is available.
- News were sent to web page members in a form of 22 newsletter editions.
- In 2010 Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning had a contract with University of Ljubljana, Faculty of arts to carry out activities of National Secretariat for four Programmes of transnational territorial cooperation, including MedProgramme.
- In 2010 Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning organized a transnational conference: "Potentials for territorial cooperation with Western Balkans". The conference that was held in Maribor from 19<sup>th</sup> till 20<sup>th</sup> April 2010 was well visited.
- In 2010 Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning printed 1700 informational booklets in Slovenian and English languages. A special compartment of the booklets was designated especially for MedProgramme.
- National Contact Person of the MedProgramme, Tomaž Miklavčič, participated in transnational meetings organised by the Programme.
- National Contact Person of the MedProgramme, Tomaž Miklavčič presented the MedProgramme at:
  - Workshop on various aspects of fuel-efficient driving on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2010 in Maribor.
  - 1<sup>st</sup> Fair on Water Experiences on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2010 in Ljubljana.
  - Meeting of Associations of Slovenian Municipalities and Croatian towns that was held in Podčetrtek, Slovenia on 21<sup>st</sup> April 2010.
  - Workshop: "Transport and environment through EU projects" in Portorož, Slovenia on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2010.
  - Conference: "For better development decisions in the Alps" in Bovec, Slovenia on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2010.

## **7. Information et publicité**

### ***The website***

The project database has been further completed and improved. An interactive map far more efficient than the former map has been installed offering the opportunity to consult all the projects region by region to have a maximum of efficiency and facilitate the searches. This map also visualises the difference between the MED and the IPA area.

Moreover a series of 21 Factsheets with short and concise technical information on project implementation has been developed and offered for download on the website.

In order to further promote interim project results and to motivate capitalisation and networking activities among the MED projects, a 'project focus' as well as a 'project news' area were developed. Projects use the announcement possibilities only partly. In order to further promote activities and results, the website will be completed by an event calendar and a project result section.

### *Newsletter*

Two semestrial Newsletter were published, in June 2010 and in December 2010 informing on various programme and project news as well as on newly approved projects of the second call and interim results of first call projects. In addition, a new web based 'Newsflash' has been published initially in December 2010 informing programme and project news. This new format shall allow spreading shorter, but more frequent news.

### *Events*

As for the previous years, the Programme organised a certain number of public events intended for its target groups:

#### *LP Seminar*

A seminar for second call Lead Partners was held in May 2010 in Marseille. Procedures and obligations related to the project implementation were presented. The event was attended by 77 partners.

The seminar was assessed through a questionnaire: the objectives of the seminar were well clear (satisfaction level: 83%) and met the participants' expectations (satisfaction level: 80%). In general the participants agreed with a percentage of 77% that the objectives of the seminar have been reached. The satisfaction level as regards specific technical input: Progress report: 76% / First Level Control: 80% / Financial issues: 72% / Information and Publicity: 76%

The satisfaction level could be increased if concrete questions would be collected with the registration of participants and thus answered in detail and by using suitable explanation tools. A participant's proposal that could be also taken into consideration is to explain the technical details with more concrete examples in order to better understand the high quantity of technical information given.

#### *Applicants Seminar*

In the framework of the first call for strategic projects an applicants' seminar was held in May 2010 in Marseille for 45 interested partners offering technical information, but also thematic and project generation related exchange.

#### *First Level Control Seminar*

A half day transnational First Level Control seminar was held in September 2010 in Thessaloniki.

In addition, national technical seminars (e.g. technical seminars on first level control organised by the National Contact Points in Spain and Italy as well as a project management seminar for Italian partners) were actively joined and supported by the JTS.

#### *Project Generation Seminars*

In November 2010, two brainstorming sessions were held in Marseille bringing together national experts in transport and ICT fields in order to prepare the 2nd Strategic call of the MED Programme. Each session counted around 40 participants willing to exchange on the main programme needs as well as on the actions to carry out on the various themes discussed.

### *Annual Event*

The organisation of the 2010 annual event in September 2010 in Thessaloniki illustrates the highlight of the 2010 communication activities. The event was jointly organised with the ETC South East Europe Programme 2007-2013 and presented an excellent occasion for first capitalisation activities between both programmes and their projects.

More than 350 participants attended the event.

In the first part of the event the future of cooperation in the two programmes spaces towards 2020 was reflected. A round table discussion was followed by several sessions dedicated to the cooperation with IPA countries of the Balkans. Potential IPA partners learnt how to participate to the programmes and about the integrated management system.

In the framework of the day dedicated to the MED Programme only, the state of the art of programme and project implementation as well as upcoming steps were presented. The (upcoming) first call for strategic projects was outlined. A round table dedicated to the perspectives of cooperation in the Mediterranean for the next programming period, and more specifically for the MED programme followed this session.

Finally, a project exhibition presented the projects from the 2nd call for proposals and allowed to communicate on the first significant results of projects from the first call.

The annual event was assessed (through a questionnaire) with an average satisfaction level of almost 70%. The individual sessions were assessed with very similar satisfaction levels.

It was stated that more interaction should have taken place and more time should have been dedicated to discussions and exchanges. These comments (together with the interim results of the in itinere programme evaluation) will be taken on board when planning the next event, namely the annual event 2011. It will be arranged around a thematic focus and follow an exchange oriented approach. Discussions based on the clusters developed during upcoming capitalisation clusters will be deepened and an active exchange in a 'partners' café' will be animated.

\*\*\*

### **Projects ongoing in 2010:**

All information concerning current projects is available from a database on the programme website at the following address: [http://www.programmemed.eu/projets/base-de-donnees.html?no\\_cache=1](http://www.programmemed.eu/projets/base-de-donnees.html?no_cache=1). This includes a tab for project statistics and budgets by beneficiary.

A list of ongoing projects from the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> calls is shown below together with their total budgets.

# Projets en cours 1er appel

Priorité	Objectif	Référence interne	Acronyme	ERDF	Total des contributions ERDF	Financement IPA Croatie	Total des contributions financement IPA Croatie	Financement IPA Monténégro	Total des contributions Financement IPA Monténégro	Montant du projet
1	1	1G-MED08-482	TEXMEDIN	1 426 312,50	475 437, 50	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 901 750,00
1	1	1G-MED08-014	AGRO-ENVIRONMED	1 058 721,00	339 264,07	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 397 985,07
1	1	1G-MED08-185	INS MED	917 317,50	305 772,50	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 223 090,00
1	1	1G-MED08-458	SOSTENUTO	1 179 210,00	357 201,00	0,00	0,00	112 000,00	19 764,00	1 668 175,00
1	1	1G-MED08-377	Planet Design	989 437,50	329 812,50	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 319 250,00
1	1	1G-MED08-309	MET3	1 286 250,00	428 750,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 715 000,00
1	1	1G-MED08-280	MedLab	1 300 000,00	379 867,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 679 867,00
1	1	1G-MED08-276	MEDISS	1 290 000,00	430 000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 720 000,00
1	1	1G-MED08-161	I.C.E.	1 175 164,99	361 763,70	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 536 928,69
1	1	1G-MED08-040	BIOLMED	1 119 382,47	354 747,49	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 474 129,96
1	2	1G-MED08-164	IC-MED	1 424 998,50	474 999,50	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 899 998,00
1	2	1G-MED08-216	MACC BAM	1 072 500,00	357 500,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 430 000,00
1	2	1G-MED08-289	MEDOSSIC	905 579,00	221 002,00	0,00	0,00	10 901,25	1 923,75	1 139 406,00
1	2	1G-MED08-129	Flormed	1 400 000,00	466 665,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 866 665,00
1	2	1G-MED08-182	INNOVATE-MED	822 559,50	274 186,50	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 096 746,00
1	2	1G-MED08-117	ETHIC	882 439,50	294 146,50	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 176 586,00
1	2	1G-MED08-525	WINNOVATE	1 152 950,00	368 670,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 521 620,00
1	2	1G-MED08-419	RIMED	1 061 222,50	306 007,50	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 367 230,00
1	2	1G-MED08-454	SMILIES	1 263 500,00	392 300,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 655 800,00
1	2	1G-MED08-395	QUBIC	1 273 749,00	424 583,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 698 332,00
1	2	1G-MED08-012	AGRISLES	932 500,00	282 625,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 215 125,00
2	1	1G-MED08-533	ZERO WASTE	1 000 000,09	305 596,81	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 305 596,90
2	1	1G-MED08-273	MED-IPPC-NET	930 000,00	293 727,20	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 223 727,20
2	1	1G-MED08-445	SHIFT	898 707,00	299 569,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 198 276,00
2	1	1G-MED08-515	WATERinCORE	773 375,00	235 125,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 008 500,00
2	1	1G-MED08-463	SusTEn	1 210 500,00	384 300,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 594 800,00
2	1	1G-MED08-134	FREE-MED	940 770,00	313 590,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 254 360,00
2	2	1G-MED08-477	Teenergy schools	999 500,00	306 500,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 306 000,00

2	2	1G-MED08-060	CLIMEPORT	1 239 221,00	371 233,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 610 454,00
2	3	1G-MED08-307	MEMO	1 008 750,00	318 991,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 327 741,00
2	3	1G-MED08-437	SECUR MED PLUS	1 222 500,00	394 167,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 616 667,00
2	4	1G-MED08-387	PROTECT	1 171 105,00	364 435,00	64 260,00	11 340,00	0,00	0,00	1 611 140,00
2	4	1G-MED08-048	CAT-Med	1 628 225,00	542 741,67	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	2 170 966,67
2	4	1G-MED08-062	COASTANCE	1 320 636,61	417 687,53	48 940,00	8 636,47	0,00	0,00	1 795 900,61
3	1	1G-MED08-478	TERCONMED	1 162 628,00	369 206,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 531 834,00
3	1	1G-MED08-034	BACKGROUNDS	1 075 999,00	340 678,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 416 677,00
3	1	1G-MED08-495	TRANSit	1 013 152,50	286 840,12	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 299 992,62
3	1	1G-MED08-085	DEVELOP-MED	1 015 698,20	304 673,80	0,00	0,00	68 000,00	12 000,00	1 400 372,00
4	1	1G-MED08-376	Philoxenia	1 567 323,00	398 266,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 965 589,00
4	1	1G-MED08-392	QUALIGOUV	1 363 500,00	454 500,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 818 000,00
4	1	1GMED-08-264	Medgovernance	1 208 149,00	402 716,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 610 865,00
4	1	1G-MED08-425	Rururbal	1 286 209,11	428 736,39	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 714 945,50
4	1	1G-MED08-511	WASMAN	1 250 095,00	366 866,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 616 961,00
4	1	1G-MED08-069	CREPUDMED	1 104 000,00	368 000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 472 000,00
4	1	1G-MED08-370	PAYS.MED.URBAN	1 224 999,00	408 333,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 633 332,00
4	1	1G-MED08-133	FORET MODELE	976 500,00	325 500,00	45 900,00	8 100,00	0,00	0,00	1 356 000,00
4	1	1G-MED08-349	NOVAGRIMED	1 355 037,00	501 682,47	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 856 719,47
4	2	1G-MED08-052	CHORD	987 750,00	329 250,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 317 000,00
4	2	1G-MED08-231	MED EMPORION	1 238 949,00	412 983,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 651 932,00
4	2	1G-MED08-046	C.U.L.T.UR.E	1 195 152,00	398 384,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 593 536,00

\*\*\*

# Projets en cours 2ème appel

Priorité	Objectif	Référence interne	Acronyme	ERDF	Total des contributions ERDF	Financement IPA Croatie	Total des contributions financement IPA Croatie	Financement IPA Bosnie-Herzégovine	Total des contributions financement IPA Bosnie-Herzégovine	Montant du projet
1	1	2G-MED09-175	IRH-Med	742 620,37	247 540,13	54 730,31	9 658,29	0,00	0,00	1 054 549,10
1	1	2G-MED09-291	MEID	958 532,00	305 644,00	0,00	0,00	59 500,00	10 500,00	1 334 176,00
1	1	2G-MED09-225	MED TECHNOPOLIS	1 500 000,00	500 000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	2 000 000,00
1	1	2G-MED09-174	IP-SMEs	820 275,00	273 425,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 093 700,00
1	1	2G-MED09-353	R&D Industry	1 059 125,00	293 375,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 352 500,00
1	1	2G-MED09-093	ecomovel	725 833,49	241 944,51	66 515,90	11 738,10	0,00	0,00	1 046 032,00
1	1	2G-MED09-190	KnowInTarget	1 336 100,00	425 900,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 762 000,00
1	1	2G-MED09-086	EASY FINANCE	728 250,00	242 750,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	971 000,00
1	2	2G-MED09-062	CreaMED	1 005 000,00	295 000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 300 000,00
1	2	2G-MED09-419	TEMA	840 718,07	280 239,35	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 120 957,42
1	2	2G-MED09-189	KnowInG	1 362 892,50	454 297,50	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 817 190,00
1	2	2G-MED09-447	WIDE	1 172 530,50	390 843,50	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 563 374,00
1	2	2G-MED09-362	Responsible MED	1 034 052,50	324 637,50	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 358 690,00
1	2	2G-MED09-152	IKTIMED	1 419 075,00	432 425,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 851 500,00
1	2	2G-MED09-091	ECOMARK	1 260 443,57	401 251,86	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 661 695,43
1	2	2G-MED09-357	REINPO RETAIL	979 550,00	312 450,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 292 000,00
1	2	2G-MED09-451	WOODE3	952 404,00	295 188,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 247 592,00
1	2	2G-MED09-331	PACMAN	1 224 441,50	384 928,50	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 609 370,00
1	2	2G-MED09-098	EMMA	933 017,48	311 005,85	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 244 023,33
1	2	2G-MED09-148	ICS	1 365 000,00	455 000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 820 000,00
1	2	2G-MED09-139	HIDDEN	1 230 000,00	410 000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 640 000,00
1	2	2G-MED09-164	InnoNauTICs	739 125,00	246 375,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	985 500,00
1	2	2G-MED09-004	2InS Clusters	1 369 800,00	438 200,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 808 000,00
1	2	2G-MED09-263	MED-KED	948 488,22	285 469,64	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 233 957,86
2	1	2G-MED09-003	2Bparks	1 623 500,00	490 500,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	2 114 000,00
2	1	2G-MED09-270	MEDPAN NORTH	1 814 915,00	565 910,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	2 380 825,00
2	1	2G-MED09-209	MAREMED	1 498 600,00	483 400,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 982 000,00

2	1	2G-MED09-262	MEDIWAT	1 139 000,00	341 000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 480 000,00
2	1	2G-MED09-445	WATERLOSS	1 436 841,00	409 947,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 846 788,00
2	1	2G-MED09-410	SylvaMED	974 589,50	303 536,50	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 278 126,00
2	1	2G-MED09-302	MODELAND	1 364 004,50	417 425,50	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 781 430,00
2	1	2G-MED09-015	AGROCHEPACK	880 300,00	277 700,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 158 000,00
2	1	2G-MED09-327	OSDDT-Med	1 028 662,25	326 108,75	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 354 771,00
2	1	2G-MED09-026	APICE	1 711 065,00	570 355,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	2 281 420,00
2	1	2G-MED09-103	enerscapes	1,393,625.00	366 875,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 760 500,00
2	2	2G-MED09-241	MEDEEA	1,142,532.65	314 181,11	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 456 713,76
2	2	2G-MED09-102	ENERMED	1 165 600,00	368 400,00	22 935,79	4 047,49	0,00	0,00	1 560 983,28
2	2	2G-MED09-381	SCORE	1 278 057,75	388 579,25	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 666 637,00
2	2	2G-MED09-452	ZeroCO2	1 403 560,73	467 853,58	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 871 414,31
2	3	2G-MED09-425	TOSCA	1 758 750,00	586 250,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	2 345 000,00
2	4	2G-MED09-070	CypFire FOR	1 012 000,00	318 000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 330 000,00
2	4	2G-MED09-117	CLIMADAPT	1 300 500,00	433 500,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 744 500,00
3	1	2G-MED09-069	CYCLO	696 250,00	208 750,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	905 000,00
3	1	2G-MED09-348	PORTA	1 111 155,00	345 850,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 457 005,00
3	1	2G-MED09-199	LOSAMEDCHE M	1 301 053,00	367 127,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 668 180,00
3	1	2G-MED09-382	SEATOLAND	1 274 850,00	388 150,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 663 000,00
3	2	2G-MED09-196	LiMIT4WeDA	1 268 100,00	356 900,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 625 000,00
3	2	2G-MED09-119	FREIGHT4ALL	1 287 000,00	413 000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 700 000,00
4	1	2G-MED09-328	OTREMED	1 281 400,00	413 600,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 695 000,00
4	1	2G-MED09-282	MedStrategy	833 531,05	257 523,95	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 091 055,00
4	1	2G-MED09-157	In.FLOW.ence	1 483 074,05	443 034,25	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1 926 108,30