

**MED PROGRAMME 2007-2013**  
**EUROPEAN TERRITORIAL COOPERATION**

**ANNUAL**  
**IMPLEMENTATION**  
**REPORT**  
**2011**

*First draft version*

*April 2012*



Programme cofinancé par le Fonds Européen  
de Développement Régional

Programme cofinanced by the European Regional  
Development Fund

# INDEX

1. IDENTIFICATION	3
2. OVERVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME	4
<b>2.1 Achievement and analysis of the progress</b>	4
<b>2.2 Information about compliance with Community law</b>	15
<b>2.3 Significant problems encountered and measures taken to overcome them</b>	15
<b>2.4 Changes in the context of the operational programme implementation (if relevant)</b>	17
<b>2.5 Substantial modification pursuant to Article 57 of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006</b>	17
<b>2.6 Complementarity with other instruments</b>	17
<b>2.7 Monitoring and evaluation</b>	20
<b>2.8 National Performance Reserve (if applicable)</b>	26
3. IMPLEMENTATION BY PRIORITY	26
<b>3.1 Priority 1: Strengthening of the capacity for innovation</b>	28
<b>3.2 Priority 2: Protection of the environment and promotion of a sustainable territorial development</b>	30
<b>3.3 Priority 3: Improvement of mobility and of territorial accessibility</b>	32
<b>3.4 Priority 4: Promotion of a polycentric and integrated development of the MED space</b>	34
<b>3.5 Priority 5: Technical assistance</b>	36
4. ESF PROGRAMMES: COHERENCE AND CONCENTRATION	37
5. ERDF PROGRAMMES /COHESION FUND: MAJOR PROJECTS (IF APPLICABLE)	37
6. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	37
7. INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY	43

## 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 2011
	Date of approval of the Annual Report by the Monitoring Committee:

➤ List of eligible ERDF regions:

- the whole territory of Cyprus, Greece, Malta and Slovenia
- the regions of Abruzzo, Apulia, Basilicata, Calabria, Campania, Emilia-Romagna, Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Lazio, Liguria, Lombardy, Marche, Molise, Umbria, Piedmonte, Sardinia, Sicily, Tuscany, Veneto (Italia)
- 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
- ESF > European Social Funds
- 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:

- MED Programme meetings 2011 (Monitoring Committees, Selection Committees, NCP meetings) (No. 1)
- Table of indicators (No. 2)
- Interim report “In itinere evaluation” (No. 3)
- CeSPI Inception report ‘capitalisation’ (No. 4)
- Communication (No. 5)
- Categorization tables (No.6)
- Complete list of programme activities in the participating countries (No. 7)

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

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

The MED Programme began in 2008 (OP approved on the 20 December 2007 – C52007 6578). 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 on-going projects.

In 2010, another 52 ‘standard’ projects were selected as the result of the 2<sup>nd</sup> call for proposals (one of these projects was deprogramed in January 2011). The same year, the programme launched its first call for strategic projects on the topics of renewable energies / energy efficiency, and maritime safety. The methodology developed for the calls for strategic projects was the fruit of several discussions and reflexions within the Monitoring Committee, and was elaborated with the help of an external expert in charge of drafting the Terms of reference for the call. The key methodological elements for the calls for strategic projects were the *Terms of reference* that established in detail the content of the call and made links with other European programmes and policies, and the *seminars of ‘brainstorming’* organised for key actors in the concerned sectors, in order to get relevant input for the contents of the call.

Another call for strategic projects was launched in 2011 for the topics of transport and accessibility; both physically and by means of new information technologies. During this 4<sup>th</sup> year of programme implementation, there were no longer open calls for all Priority Axis of the OP, but a specific methodology and framework for strategic projects, of which the programme is hoping to get experience on top-down priority projects with visibility and an impact over the whole programme space. The method is of course experimental and will give the necessary feedback to the programme

authorities, who will shortly have to determine the most relevant types of calls for the next period of programming.

Apart from programming the different priorities of the OP, the other milestones during the year 2011 were the finalisation of preparation of the integrated management of IPA funds, the effective launching of the programme level capitalisation activities, and a new campaign of *in itinere* evaluation, this time on projects programmed in 2010 and strategic projects.

The necessary modifications for the operational programme, for the audit trail and the financial circuits, including the Presage monitoring system, were carried out in order to implement an *integrated management system* of both ERDF and IPA funds within the MED programme. All preparation work was finalised by September 2011, with an advance payment system that seeks to facilitate the participation of IPA partners to MED projects, validated by the Monitoring Committee. However, while programming the first projects under this new system in October, the IPA partners were *de facto* prevented from participating to kick-off activities, as the Commission had not finalised the Financing Agreement that should be signed also by the Managing Authority and each participating IPA country. By the end of the year there was still no certainty on the timetable and no final version of the Agreement available for signatures.

With the help of a group of external experts, the programme organised two *capitalisation seminars* during the reporting year, in June with a thematic approach, and in November with a proposal to re-group the projects in clusters. The capitalisation ‘vision’ has been developing gradually; within the programme staff as well as amongst the projects, the concept has been widely discussed and different approaches and expectations identified. From the point of view of the programme, the importance of promoting and disseminating project results is underlined. It is understood that our projects do not have many links between each other and do not very often seek to share results or to exchange. The capitalisation process of the programme promotes clustering and tries to enhance the use of the results of single projects by encouraging them to learn from each other.

In parallel, we recognise the need to organise and preserve *the results of the projects* in order to provide a source of information and inspiration to future project operators. Med programme started in early 2008, in a situation where no structured information was provided from the previous period, and the projects could not be constructed on the basis of already accomplished studies / state of the art. We are convinced that such a basis for information is crucial in order to avoid overlapping and to reach more concrete results in the future. This is why the programme has started to elaborate a database with key statistical information on deliverables and results of projects, and a library of key deliverables themselves. This ‘programme memory’ will contribute to the preparation of the next operational programme and provide a baseline for new calls for proposals.

Finally, the *In Itinere evaluation* has continued through the year, and developed as expected, real methods of accompanying the programme. Whereas the programme is felicitated for its strong and flawless management and support to on-going projects, weaknesses are identified in promoting the quality of project results. It is to answer to these observations that the programme has developed the capitalisation approach that we now have. The on-going evaluation team has continued to revisit projects, during 2011 mainly the standard projects from the 2<sup>nd</sup> call that now have passed their mid-term. In the last months of the year, a new evaluation campaign was prepared, this time targeted to strategic projects and for the second time, to programme authorities. The results of these will come out during 2012.

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

- a) management and monitoring;
- b) strategic projects;
- c) integrated management of ERDF and IPA funding;

- e) capitalisation and the lessons learned
- f) *in itinere* evaluation.

#### A) Management and monitoring:

Controls carried out:

As each year, the programme audit (2<sup>nd</sup> level control) was carried out during the first half of the year. 13 structures were controlled with a random sample established by the Audit Authority. The audit was carried out by the Deloitte company, under the responsibility of the Audit Authority. The outcome was reassuring, as no irregularities were detected and the error rate of the programme was declared to be 0%. Following this, the Group of Auditors decided to lower the percentage of the expenses to be audited, to 8% in the year 2012. The programme management was deemed solid and the error risk particularly low.

The Certifying Authority carried out 4 controls on 2 projects, on the quality of certification of expenses. From an amount of 119.894,55 € controlled 0,86% was found ineligible, corresponding to 1.030,13 €.

Apart from these standard controls carried out by the programme authorities, the Commission performed controls on Italian national first level control system of four European territorial cooperation programmes, including 9 Tuscan structures being partners in MED projects. The total amount controlled in this framework was 695.709,61 €. No irregularities were found, but the Commission gave some general recommendations to improve the transparency of staff cost allocations and public procurement procedures.

As there were no particular doubts about the proper functioning of the audit trail, the Managing Authority carried out fewer on the spot visits in 2011 than in 2010, only in 4 structures, but each participating to several projects. More visits are again foreseen for 2012.

Monitoring on-going projects:

The 1<sup>st</sup> call projects programmed in early 2009, started to come to their end during 2011. Even though most of the projects that foresaw less than 36 months of operational time, had asked for (and obtained) prolongations in order to finalise their activities, the first project ended in the end of July, followed by 15 others by the end of the year. All projects from the first call will be ending during the first half of the year 2012. It seems that a vast majority of projects need three years, even if in the beginning they count for less time, in order to respect their work plan and carry out all foreseen activities. It is frequent in cooperation projects, that the launching period is long and the partnership takes time to become structured and learn to work together. It is also clearly visible that many structures are in financial difficulty, with budget cuts, and either have to proceed more slowly in their activities, or even retire from partnership, following the economic crisis.

(More of this theme, and a detailed list of modifications of projects, later in this report)

Nevertheless, the programme faced no decommitment risk in 2011 but declared to the Commission more expenses than the minimum amount needed to avoid decommitment.

In global, the programme team continues to carry out several day-to-day management tasks:

- 1) drafting of documents and *fact sheets*;



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

The closure of the projects has been anticipated by creating a Final Report, composed of three parts: a qualitative summary of project results, publishable elements to be used by the programme communication team and a table of key deliverables that the project operators wish to propose for the programme library. The final report is disconnected from the last progress report and payment claim submitted by Presage, and seeks to promote a qualitative approach to the project results. This is also a consequence of recommendations from the first evaluation report.

By the end of the year, only 5 Final reports had been received. It is becoming evident that a lot of projects have difficulty in providing the final certificates of all partnership within the two months that has been allocated to the administrative closing. This is especially true for partners in countries where the first level control is centralised.

#### B) Strategic projects:

As already mentioned, the programme launched its first call for strategic projects in April 2010, on renewable energies/energy efficiency, and on maritime safety. For the first programming of strategic projects, the Selection Committee met twice: in January 2011 Madrid, and in February in Valencia, Spain. The first meeting was held in order to discuss and exchange over the impressions of the delegations of the eligible projects, and over the programming proposal of the JTS. As there were only three projects on renewable energies and energy efficiency to be proposed for selection, the Committee could take time for a content and quality approach.

For the Maritime safety, the situation was complex and needed exchange with the selection Committee. None of the eligible projects were proposed to selection, as the JTS estimated that their quality was not sufficient for programming. In the second meeting of the selection Committee in February, the three energy projects were selected, but after discussion, the Committee decided to follow the JTS proposal and to declare the call for maritime safety without result. It was decided to launch again the call, with the same Terms of Reference and with a two-month submission time. Finally there were 6 project proposals that were submitted again, and one of them was considered a quality project. It was programmed in the meeting of the Selection Committee in October in Barcelona. There were two eligible projects evaluated for this meeting, and in order to decide over their programming, the Committee invited the Lead Partners of these two projects to an interview, in order to clarify questions that did not find their answer in the application form. Both projects could have in theory been selected, but during the interview it came out that the Lead Partner of one of them was no longer willing to take in charge of the project.

The methodology to obtain strategic projects is demanding to the project operators and also requires much effort from the programme authorities. Only four strategic projects were programmed in 2011, however, with an ERDF allocation of 20,8M€. We currently start to see the strong points of this approach but also points to improve. It is clear that by reducing the number of proposals, the programme instances can really concentrate on the content of the projects and keep higher standards in selection. The partnerships are very large, and while this can enhance the impact of the project and its visibility, it also presents a serious challenge to the management of the operation. As the budget is concentrated on few big projects instead of many smaller ones, the risk of crisis within a

partnership is higher and the impact on the programme more considerable. However, despite the constraints, it seems obvious that the programme needs flagship projects and that the method of elaborating specific Terms of Reference is bringing results as it is clearly orienting the project proposals towards a more ambitious approach.

In June the programme launched its last call for strategic projects in the theme of accessibility; by means of transport and information technologies (Objectives 3.1 and 3.2). The call closed in the end of September, with 11 proposals received. Unfortunately, despite the fact that there was additional flexibility brought to the standard programme rules for the submission of strategic projects, 8 proposals proved to be ineligible. The Selection Committee was to meet in January 2012.

By the end of the year, 76% of the ERDF funds allocated to the programme (excluding the Technical Assistance budget), have already been committed to projects.

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

The preparation towards the fully integrated management system of both ERDF and IPA funds pursued in 2011. The specific IPA Subsidy contract was created, and the programme management and control system completed with the information on control systems in the participating IPA countries. An advance payment of 10% for IPA partners, to be paid by the kick-off meeting of the project, was proposed in order to facilitate the participation of these partners to projects, and validated by the Monitoring Committee. The mechanism for the advance payments was then created in the Presage system. The modified OP was validated by the Commission on the 16<sup>th</sup> of March (C2011 1706), and Technical assistance templates created. An enlargement of perimeter of controls and payments was foreseen with Deloitte/the Audit authority, and with the Certifying authority.

The description of the management and control system was updated during the second half of 2011 to reflect the integration of the management of IPA funds. The Audit Authority prepared the evaluation report and issued the compliance assessment on the 7th November 2011, subject to the signing of the "Financing agreement" between the European Commission, the Managing Authority and each of the four IPA countries participating in the MED Programme.

All modification and preparation work was completed and the programme was ready to start to implement the integrated system, while the first projects with IPA partners were selected, in October 2011. Unfortunately, despite the estimation of the Commission that the draft Financing Agreement should come out from the DG Regional Policy legal service in early 2011, the very first draft version was communicated to the MED staff only in the end of August. This draft was not yet specific for MED programme and had to undergo consultations within the programme staff and with the IPA countries taking part to the programme.

By the end of the year, the final version of the Financing Agreement was still not proposed, and the Commission could not give any timetable estimation for its finalisation. Meanwhile, as several IPA partners were taking part to strategic projects under evaluation, the programming proceeded but without the possibility to consider the costs of these partners eligible. Because of this delay corresponding the start of several strategic projects, we regret to observe that at the moment it has become even more difficult for the IPA partners to participate to MED projects, whereas the objective of all the preparation effort was to facilitate their participation!

#### D) Capitalisation and lessons learned:

Clustering process and accompanying exchange between projects:



In the Annual Report 2010, we evoked the following wish:

*It would be preferable 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.*

During 2011, we did see certain activities of the Interact programme, especially the Valencia office, towards thematic capitalisation over a larger cooperation space. But as there still is no global structure of capitalisation between ETC programmes; the MED programme launched its own capitalisation effort. A group of experts was contracted to carry out accompanying measures and to help project clusters to emerge. Two capitalisation events were organised: in June (in Rome) a thematic event with four thematic workshops for 1<sup>st</sup> call standard projects (the most advanced in implementation). The newly programmed strategic projects were also invited, as they all have a capitalisation work package and should envisage a capitalisation approach since the beginning of their activity. In November, following a proposal of clustering developed by the experts, another event was organised in Marseille.

The on-going MED projects showed a great interest towards the subject of capitalisation and an overall willingness to create clusters. In short, the majority of our projects wish to know more about what the other projects are producing, and welcomes opportunities to exchange information and experiences. This willingness has led the most active projects to spontaneously seek other partnerships, most often grouping projects financed under the same objective, and to propose structured exchange with them. It is clear that most projects expect the programme instances to facilitate this exchange, by providing information on other projects, and by proposing topics for clusters.

The Capitalisation Day in November brought together six groups of projects, the grouping being proposed by the experts in charge of the accompanying process. The programme staff was in fact hoping for clusters that would share an approach; more than just working on the same theme or sector. It was considered that the sectorial grouping, which seems the most natural for projects, does not always give real opportunities to share, as the type of project objectives and results might be very diverse. The result of this 'top down' horizontal clustering proposal was mitigated. Some of the project groups seemed more relevant and capable of structuring their exchange, whereas others did not really understand the proposal. As a result of the Capitalisation Day, several clusters started to emerge, but only part of them following the horizontal approach.

Whereas the clustering process has an aim in itself, in bringing together projects and helping them to enhance their results by joint action, it is also meant to prepare partnerships that could answer to a specific call for capitalisation projects, to be launched in 2012.

The programme library:

The JTS has started to create a database enabling to organise the 'memory' of the programme. This database contains statistical information about the project contents and deliverables, organised thematically and by types of outputs/results. The foreseen results of each project are compared with what is in reality delivered in the end. We feel that it is as necessary to provide this content information, as it is to have a clear follow-up of financial progress of a programme. We expect this structured information to be helpful in several ways, in particular it should:

- Help the project operators answering to future calls, to find information about what has been produced, and to profit from existing results
- Facilitate contacts and exchange between on-going projects
- Provide a reliable source of information for statistical analysis, both for the programme instances and for research purposes
- Provide the general public a structured way to find out about the results of the programme
- Contribute to the preparation of the next generation of the MED programme

Once the projects end, their key outputs and deliverables will be kept in the on-line programme library, and they can be consulted with both thematic approach and by types of outputs. Most often, these are state of the art studies, identification of best practises, followed by guidelines, action plans, shared strategies, memorandums of understanding, databases, and so on. By providing them to the use of future partnerships, we hope to promote a step towards concrete implementation of project results, which only few projects manage to really exploit before they come to their end. The work on this library is on-going and hopefully already provides results (at least from standard projects) in 2012 and especially in 2013, in order to contribute to the preparation of the new programming period.

#### E) In itinere evaluation:

The first interim report of the In Itinere evaluation, delivered in 2010, made observations about the programme performance. These have been detailed in the 2010 Annual Report. In 2011, the evaluation continued with sample-based interviews of the standard projects, and a new round of strategic projects evaluation started in the end of the year.

As the evaluation report had concluded, three main points of the programme seemed to need improvement:

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

During the year 2011, the programme has concentrated its efforts in these aspects. Firstly, even if the programme indicators can only be seriously reconsidered when preparing the next period, new specific indicators for strategic projects were elaborated and included in the application form.

The work on the programme library, and the separate Final report, is a first step towards content analysis, and a quality approach. As it is not possible, for the reasons of limits in the Technical Assistance budget, to foresee separate staff for content/quality issues and for basic monitoring of projects, an intermediary solution has been proposed to the Monitoring Committee and implemented. The JTS has been enlarged with two programme and project officers, a new profile reaching towards horizontal tasks and quality issues, and the staff has been re-organised in project, financial, and communication units. It is clear that in regard to the size of the programme, the JTS has been until recently too underresourced to develop any quality aspects beyond strict monitoring of projects. Now this issue has been partly addressed and the results are seen in the programme capitalisation activity.

The JTS has also created new tools for strategic calls, the Application form has been completed with qualitative information, and new flexibility in submitting project proposals has been authorized. However, this last point needs still a more profound analysis, as we have noted that the increased flexibility did not reduce the quantity of non-eligible proposals. The rules and procedures of the programme should and will be fundamentally relooked, but to ensure coherence between

existing tools and in treatment of applicants, they cannot be completely changed during this period. It is also understood that the suggestions of the evaluation team can be addressed partly during this period, and more substantially, in the preparation of the next programming.

The In Itinere evaluation accompanies the improvement process and will shortly give more observations on the efficiency of the first steps. The evolution of types of projects towards strategic projects, and its impact on programme performance, is currently under analysis.

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

By the end of 2011, 105 projects had been financed and 15 of them already finished. The three strategic projects programmed in February had all started their activities before the summer and were on-going. The fourth strategic project programmed in October was finalising the contracting procedure. The programme had reached a 76% commitment of its ERDF budget (excluding the Technical Assistance).

The first 15 standard projects that had ended their activities, reached an average level of ERDF absorption, of 87%. Taking into account the difficulties of public sector structures in the middle of an economic crisis, the programme considers this as a good score for the standard projects.

By the end of 2011, all standard calls and strategic calls for projects had been carried out. The preparation of a targeted call for innovation and energy efficiency was in its last phases, with a call foreseen in early 2012. The rest of the remaining ERDF budget shall be committed to the targeted calls, and a capitalisation call organised in 2012 should be financed with ERDF returning from the finished projects of the 1<sup>st</sup> call.

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

***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	13.681.670,86	13.681.670,86	7.824.259,35	6.913.721,40
Priority axis 2 State the fund concerned ERDF	9.181.015,06	9.181.015,06	4.721.874,10	3.893.464,27
Priority axis 3 State the fund concerned ERDF	2.781.172,77	2.781.172,77	1.013.772,14	939.491,37

Priority axis 4 State the fund concerned ERDF	5.464.484,82	5.464.484,82	4.484.166,05	3.721.670,05
Priority axis 5 (TA) State the fund concerned ERDF	2.609.944,08	2.609.944,08	1.968.045,82	1.045.644,38
<b>total amount</b>	33.718.287,59	33.718.287,59	20.012.117,46	16.513.991,46
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>1</sup> in the grand total	0	0	0	0
Total of the expenses which are part of the ERDF where the operational programmed is co-financed by the ESF in the grand total	0	0	0	0

<sup>1</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.

### ***Information on the breakdown of the use of funding by category***

This information is only partially applicable, as there is no possibility, in a transnational programme, to provide categorisation by different dimensions. As it can be seen in the initial categorisation of ERDF allocation in the OP, the territorial dimension cannot be identified following the NUTS nomenclature, as all cooperation projects include several territories. Thematic categorisation of funding, for the 2011 situation, is provided annexed to this report.

It reinforces the same message that we are receiving from data compiled in the project database: some categories foreseen in the OP have not received eligible/programmable proposals, and there are very few or no projects in these categories. By Priority, the most important categories with few projects (in proportion to what was foreseen in the OP) are the following:

In the Innovation and support to SME's; the projects treating innovation from scientific and technological point of view (categories 01 and 04) are rare, even if projects that treat innovation as a procedure, are frequent. There are only very few projects on information technologies, (categories 11-14), although quite many projects touch this domain but consider the ICT as a tool to achieve other objectives.

In Transport, in general there are few projects and multi-modality is not treated as frequently as was estimated in the OP. In Environment, there are no projects on solar energy (40) but projects dealing more generally on energy efficiency are more frequent than foreseen (43).

Finally, there are no projects dealing with cultural infrastructure (59) , and even if the projects from divers sectors address governance issues rather frequently, there are only few projects directly concerned by capacity building (81)

***Assistance by target groups – not applicable***  
***Assistance repaid or re-used – not applicable***

### ***Qualitative analysis:***

Despite the difficult economic situation touching in particular the South European countries, the MED projects have successfully continued their implementation. So far, no project has interrupted their activities because of the crisis, but it is clearly visible that most public structures are facing budget cuts and this is making the work in projects more difficult. A certain number of delays in activities are due to budget cuts and cash flow problems. This has often been combatted with a demand to allow the project to continue its activities until the 36 months, when the original duration has been shorter than 3 years. Allowing project extensions has helped many partnerships to carry out most of their foreseen activities.

In many countries, especially with centralised first level control system, the delays of certifying expenses are long, and this is creating strain in respect of submission deadlines for payment claims. But in an overall way the projects are steadily advancing and the first level projects are now almost all in the phase of organising final conferences and ending their activities.

The biggest challenges, during the current programme implementation, are the strategic projects. They have large budgets, between 4 and 7M€ of ERDF, and higher number of partners, on the average over 20 structures participating from more than 6 countries. It is to be noted with satisfaction that despite the size of the partnership, the four projects programmed in 2011 have all been able to organise themselves quickly and have launched their activities rapidly after signing their contracts. However, it is clear that they face the same risks and constraints as standard projects, potentially subject to budget cuts, political constraints and

delays in certifying expenses. It remains to be seen if they can really present a risk to the programme implementation by concentration of funds to few bigger operations. In order to follow their progress in real time and to answer rapidly to any risk factors observed, each strategic project is followed by two persons from the JTS: a project officer and a financial officer. On top of this, the Managing Authority is more directly involved in their follow up, contrary to standard projects. The experience has demonstrated that the programme team is often able to facilitate solutions if problems are discovered rapidly.

The indicators of the MED programme that are shown in the OP, are grouped by Priority Axis. In Presage, the online monitoring tool, all projects choose their indicators (more detailed) in a single list. We have extracted this list with all indicators and filtered it by priority Axis and by type and unit of indicator, to find the correspondence with the OP tables.

Some indicator values in the OP are shown in terms of *number of projects*. In these cases, the value used is extracted from the programme database that contains information on all on-going and finished projects (end 2011 situation). Information is categorized by main sector of activity of the project, by means of action and by its objective, and also by deliverables, which allows extracting information in coherence with the OP indicators.

We observe, as it was already observed via our programme database, that only a few projects/activities are financed on integrated coastal zones management, on ICT solutions, and more globally, in the domain of transport. We were already aware of these lacking activities after the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> call, and the strategic project calls have already partly addressed this situation. For the rest, an analysis of our stakeholders, based on our database, is being carried out to draw conclusions on the reasons.

Finally, the extraction of indicators declared by MED partners as already realized, are in certain cases largely above those estimated in the OP. This is in particular the case for the number of SME's concerned by project activities. In a more global way, the quantity of networks, cooperation activities, joint plans and studies is far beyond the estimations of the OP dating from 2006.

Given that the programme has a big Priority Axis (1) on innovation, and that the majority of these projects work directly with enterprises, it should be considered logical that the number of enterprises involved in project activities is already beyond 1000.

*Summary tables on indicators are found in Axxex 2 of this report.*

## **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) As for the first category, the year 2011 has been a year of restructuring the JTS staff. The staff turnover rate in early 2011 was high with voluntary departures of staff members and also with the end of contract for four persons whose work contract was not renewed. This destabilized the programme team and led into risk of dysfunctioning. It has to be underlined that in an overall way the JTS was underresourced in regard to the size of the programme, and the number of calls and on-going projects. Not only the capacity of the staff to develop content issues was limited by their number, but the mere amount of staff departures put at risk the follow-up of on-going projects and treatment of payment claims.



Facing this situation, the MA proposed a restructuring and an enlargement of the JTS staff. The Monitoring Committee accepted the proposal, and an internal audit was carried out. In consequence, the staff was organised in three units: a project unit where two new staff members were recruited, a financial monitoring unit, and a communication unit. Horizontal tasks were enhanced with internal working groups, in particular for evaluation and capitalisation. The restructuring was successful and allowed to stabilize the staff and prevented the workload from concentrating on few persons only.

The Presage monitoring tool has been steadily improved throughout the programme implementation and has clear advantages, as it is online and decentralised. But the successive improvements demand a lot of effort from the programme team, and the governance of the tool is complex, as it is commanded and paid by the government level in France and several programmes use the same tool. It is not easy to gain fundamental improvements, and the team has the feeling that the tool is sometimes guiding the contents, instead of being a mere technical support. Meetings are foreseen with the Presage technical team, to discuss a more substantial improvement of the tool.

Internal difficulties have been observed equally with part of the public tenders that the MA is contracting for the programme. Firstly; it is complex for the Managing authority, to be in charge of the tender for programme audits, as they are not carried out under the responsibility of the MA but that of the Audit authority. There has been some dissatisfaction in regard to tools and methods provided by Deloitte; but after several meetings with the experts and with the AA, the latter has become more demanding towards the experts and has started to clarify the quality issues with determination.

Secondly, the programme team is also facing some difficulty with the tender for capitalisation experts. As the subject of capitalisation is experimental, and there is a diversity of objectives and approaches towards the issue, it has provided difficult to obtain from the group of capitalisation experts, the type of tools that the MA/JTS is demanding. It seems that the programme staff has a different understanding of capitalisation especially in regard to accompanying projects, than have the capitalisation experts. Clarifying the situation and better focusing the command are underway, with principal means of bilateral meetings and exchange with the experts.

- b) The premium external difficulty continues to be the consequence of the economic crisis to public structures. These form the main target beneficiary group of our programme, and are in much difficulty in finding and committing budgets for cooperation activities. Even though all on-going projects continue their activities, there is a relatively high rate of changes of partners, following from the incapacity of certain structures to continue financing project activities. In the medium term, the ERDF absorption rate of the projects is likely to suffer from these difficulties, and the risk could be particularly high for strategic projects. This is a global situation that goes beyond the control of the programme instances, hence the only way to address them is to follow closely our on-going projects and try to facilitate solutions, in cooperation with national delegations, whenever difficulties arise.

The delays in certifying expenses, as already mentioned, extend the closing procedure of the finished projects. By the end of the year, only the very first projects that ended in July and in August, had submitted their final reports and claims, and even for these projects, there still were certifications pending in some partner countries. The closure of a project is supposed to start, with all the financial elements sent to the JTS, within two months after the end of

activities. In reality, this period is much longer and extends beyond 6 months in many cases. The consequences are not yet so harmful, in regard to the finishing projects of the 1<sup>st</sup> call, but towards the end of the programming period there will be more difficulties. If the national control systems in centralised countries cannot speed up the procedures, at some point the programme will be compelled to close operations where all partners have not been able to certify all their expenses. This means money in reality spent for project actions, lost for the partner and unused for the programme.

Finally it has also been quite hard to obtain enough eligible strategic projects in the two calls launched in 2011. The ineligibility rate remains high despite numerous programme efforts to reach out towards the project operators and disseminate information, and regardless of the programme maturity. The additional flexibility brought to submission procedures has not changed the situation either. The analysis on reasons to this situation has not yet been finalised, however, there are two plausible reasons: Either the ‘extra large’ partnership demands too much effort from the Lead Partner who does not manage to obtain from the partners, and to verify, all administrative elements, or then, the partnerships do not put enough serious effort to the exercise of submitting a strategic project. This is a plausible reason for errors, as the calls for strategic projects have a single submission of a final application, without a pre-application. They do submit a simple project idea, but there is no two-step validation procedure, and thus all the effort put into the full application can be futile if the project is not selected in the end.

In order to draw conclusions and seek solutions, we still need to see if the targeted projects (also launched with Terms of reference and a one-step procedure) face the same problematic, or if it is inherent to strategic projects.

**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**

***Collaboration with INTERACT –Med Lab Group***

The draft legal package suggests for next ETC programming period a thematic concentration and it supports cooperation with the Union’s neighbouring 3rd countries. By these means, the Joint Capitalisation Pilot Action will be a platform to analyse projects, policies, etc. in the field of energy in the Mediterranean area, including the whole geographic area (ETC and neighbouring programmes and the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM).

In regards with this joint Pilot Action, in order to define and to shape it, the Liaison Office of Valencia has participated to the several meetings that were held in Valencia in 2011:

- Concrete topic: “Energy Efficiency in Buildings”;
- Methodology to start the analysis;
- Visual impact: a 1 minute promotional video;
- Broaden the scope considering also IPA programmes.

As to the JTS team members, they have actively participated to the seminars and training sessions organized by INTERACT in 2011:

1. Workshop IPA CBC Public procurement in shared management: Brussels, 24<sup>th</sup> February 2011;
2. Project application and Assessment in ETC Programmes: Prague, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2011;
3. European Cooperation: Growing Smart: Budapest, 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> May 2011;
4. Future Working Group on Programme Management: Amsterdam, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2011;
5. European Transnational Cooperation Strategic approach: Rome, 11<sup>th</sup> November 2011.

### *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, “will 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 it coordinates the existing implementation tools”.

The activities developed by the Liaison Office in 2011 showed a slight difference from the previous years. It is important to underline some relevant facts:

- The ENPI CBC MED Programme approved their 1st call of standard projects and mostly all of them signed their subsidy contract and started some activities, also it launched its strategic and 2nd standard calls. Even so, there is a lack of information between ENPI programme and the MED LO Office and data is not provided, what makes difficult the coordination between programmes.
- The Spanish Delegation held the programme’s presidency for 2011, which meant that many activities were organised in Spain and coordinated by the Liaison Office Valencia.
- MED Programme capitalisation activities started with CESPI as external expert.
- The debate on the future EU funds is open and now any contribution to is very welcome and useful, in this sense, the MED programme contributed to the Joint Transnational Event during the Polish Presidency and the LO in Valencia suggested a closer collaboration between INTERACT Med Lab Group and the MED programme to develop a Joint Capitalization Action in the Mediterranean Sea in the field of energy efficiency in buildings.

Taking into account the above mentioned situation and the Liaison Office Working Plan; the activities developed by the LO for 2011 were mostly related to Communication and Capitalisation. A detailed description of such activities is provided in the next paragraphs:

#### *I. Liaison Office Valencia in the MED activities:*

- The L.O carried out daily administrative work (translations, reports, expenses control, etc.)
- The L.O. followed up the monthly coordination meetings between the JTS, MA and LO in Marseille.

- It supported the Spanish Presidency and JTS in organising the MED Programme Selection and Steering Committees (Valencia, 22nd -23rd of February 2011).
- Currently, the LO by mandate of the Spanish Presidency coordinated together with the JTS and Generalitat de Catalunya and Spanish Presidency, all the logistical aspects for MED 7th Steering and Selection Committees and Annual Event 2011 (Barcelona, 17th, 18th,19th of October 2011). To coordinate 3 trips were organised to Barcelona in order to coordinate with all the people involved. (May, July, September 2011).
- It took part on the JTS Strategic Projects WG, Capitalisation WG and Future WG collaborating to the related documents and brainstorming sessions. In this regard the LO participated in several capitalisation, future WG and strategic projects meetings and seminars :
  - Informal meeting of NCP to discuss the Energy efficiency and Maritime risks Strategic projects, organised by the Spanish Presidency of the MED Programme, on the 18th of January 2011, in Madrid (Spain).
  - MED launching seminar of the 2nd and 3rd Strategic Calls related to accessibility, axes 3.1 and 3.2, and Maritime Safety on the 7th of April and 5th of July, in Marseille (France)
  - VI Med Lab Group seminar on capitalisation: natural risks-fire prevention and maritime risks, organised by Interact Valencia, on the 20th of April in Genoa (Italy).
  - At Marie SP kick off meeting on the 20th of May, in Barcelona (Spain).
  - 1st and 2nd Future WG meetings, on the 6th of July and 29th of November, both in Marseille (France).
  - 2nd seminar for capitalisation of the MED programme in the topics of innovation and accessibility-transport, organised by the JTS and CESPI (external expert) on the 30th of June and 1st of July in Rome (Italy).
  - In Capitalisation meetings between the MA, JTS, CESPI(external expert), on the 20th of September and 30th of November of 2011, both in Marseille (France).
- The LO together with the JTS took part of a working Group, to support the MED Programme's participation in the Joint Transnational Event, which was held next September, in Katowice (Poland). This event was jointly organised by the 13 ETC Transnational Programme and for its coordination several Steering (general aspects) and Communication Groups (video, website, press, exhibition) meetings, were carried out in the headquarters of the programmes involved (Brussels, Copenhagen, Porto, Munich) The LO attended to these meetings representing the MED Programme. Its aim as in the Open Days Conference was to demonstrate the territorial impact of the transnational programmes and projects all around Europe and neighbours.
- As every year, the LO participated in the Regional Open Days, to mention in particular the conclusion Conference and final meeting of the Joint Transnational Working Group.
- It participated at FEPORTS Capitalisation Seminar, on maritime transport, the 11th of September 2011, in Valencia (SPAIN)

- The LO , also as a capitalisation activity, participate at the Conference organised by the Sicilian Region and CRPM “Vecchi e nuovi Attori nel Mediterraneo che cambia: il ruolo dei Popoli, delle Regioni e dei Soggetti locali, dei Governi e delle Istituzioni sovranazionali, in una strategia integrata di sviluppo condiviso”, where EU Institutions and European and neighbourhood countries participants were present. Catania, 8th and 9th of December of 2011 (Italy).

### *II. Liaison Office Valencia in joint activities with ENPI CBC MED*

- 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. In particular checked projects from both programmes in order to find complementarity and for future capitalisation purposes.
- It also up dated the KEEP data base with MED information and the common EuroMediterranean Data base with MED and ENPI CBC MED approved projects, to check multiple participation, detect clusters and information to foster capitalisation in the Mediterranean area.
- It developed the content for the Liaison Office MED-ENPI CBC MED web space.
- Following the idea of the 1st brochure of the LO, a comparative tool and very useful for project partners and stake holders , the LO started had drafted its 2nd Brochure “MED and ENPI CBC MED PROGRAMMES STRATEGIC CALLS. Around 1000 brochures were printed in EN and FR version. And the 1st brochure was reedited and printed 1000 copies also in both languages.
- To feed and support both programmes newsletters (Liaison Office space) with basic and updated information of the MED and ENPI CBC MED.
- It 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.
- The L.O. also participated at the bilateral meeting between MED-ENPICBC MED, organised by the French delegation of the ENPI Programme, on the 15 of April 2011, in Marseille (France)
- It also participated as observer at the ENPI CBC MED Steering Committee, on the 13th and 14th of April in Marseille (France), where the new call of Strategic Projects was discussed and the situation of the standard projects up dated.

### *Liaison Office Thessaloniki*

The Thessaloniki Liaison Office 2011 achievements were based on the work done in 2010. The successful integration of the IPA funds by the programme produced a new situation in the management. The main concerned parties are the potential IPA partners. Therefore the LO’s main objective was to inform them and the potential Lead Partners with all possible ways. In parallel the LO served as a Liaison between the LPs and the IPA partners in order to facilitate the partner search and the matchmaking process between them.

The most effective way for the awareness raising is the organization of events. The LO contributed to the organization of a joint transnational (for all 4 IPA countries) and to several national level

information events in the IPA countries. The identification and invitation of the potential IPA stakeholders was the first step after which the LO produced an IPA partners' database (this contains the contact details, the nature and interested thematic area of more than 200 potential IPA partners by this time) with the objective to ensure the highest participation in the first ever MED IPA event. This event was held in Tirana last March and was connected to the opening of the second call for strategic projects and to the reopening of the call on maritime safety.

After the Tirana seminar that was a complete success the LO concentrated its activities on two objectives. Firstly to contact the LPs of the maritime safety project ideas in order to convince them about the added value of involving IPA partners, and secondly to connect the LPs with the chosen IPA partners.

The success in the maritime safety call implicated to follow the same route also in the case of the transport and ICT call. In the meanwhile the LO area became operational on the website and the IPA partner database was further developed and was used as a tool for partner search.

This time the LO contributed to organization of National Info days in the IPA countries. The first National Information seminar was held in Croatia in Sibenik within the frame of the "Days of the regional development". Later another seminar was also organized in Croatia in Zagreb exclusively dedicated to the MED Programme. During this seminar besides the presentation of the call and the programme the LO also presented the already submitted project ideas and collected which participant interested in which proposal. The participation was very high in both events and finally Croatia had the most partners in the submitted project proposals. However the LO could not appear physically in the Montenegrin info days it helped the organization by providing the necessary information on the project ideas. Then in close cooperation with the Montenegrin NCP the LO received "identification forms" from the interested Montenegrin partners indicating which project interests them and who they are in general. As a result of the above activities besides one in all other submitted project proposals there are IPA partners.

After the closure of the call for strategic projects the LO turned to the capitalization and elaborated a detailed proposal on the capitalization activities regarding IPA. Within the proposal the LO concentrates on the added value of the IPA partners, the EU integration and on the importance of the interaction with other IPA related programmes. During the Capitalization Day in Marseille in November the LO presented partly the proposal to the participants. In parallel the LO made several proposals to the external experts on the involvement of the IPA issue in the clustering process. These proposals are under negotiations at this moment.

Besides the call for proposals and the capitalization, the LO also contributed to the communication activities. The LO together with the JTS and the MA represented the MED Programme in the Joint Transnational Conference in Katowice at the enlargement workshop. It had also contributed to the organization of the MED Annual Event. Finally the LO could conclude the content of a brochure about the added value of IPA partners to the programme. This brochure contains the activities and achievements of all IPA partners so far in the programme. This publicity tool will be a fine instrument during the 2012 activities.

## **2.7. Monitoring and evaluation**

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

#### Analysis of periodic payment claims

The description of management and control systems in compliance with Article 71 of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 requires the examination of periodic payment claims which include the



payment claim 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 (checkgrid) has been created for the assessment of requests for payment.

This checkgrid 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 which person in the JTS. It also enables the auditor to see the payment claim in its entirety and the respect of submission deadlines established in the Subsidy Contract.

Progress report assessment focuses primarily on compatibility between the activities undertaken and those anticipated and described in the workplan (in the application form). Differences between planned activities and those delivered, are also examined in each 6-month period, as are differences between budgeted and incurred expenditure. If these differences are not justified in the report, clarification and additional justification of this are requested from the Lead partner.

Similarly, the checkgrid 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 annexes which prove that the activities described have actually taken place (e.g., meeting agendas, attendance lists, notes of meetings, studies published, folders disseminated, edited promotional material, etc). The websites for each project are also checked.

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 51 projects from the second call for proposals had to submit their payment claims on the 30<sup>th</sup> of June and by 31<sup>st</sup> of October, in compliance with the deadlines established for the projects from each of the two calls. The 3 first strategic projects (Objective 2.2) were to submit their first claims in October. More flexibility and individual submission timetables have been given to strategic projects, as they combine large partnerships.

All of the projects from the first and second call for proposals submitted payment claims in 2011, and all three strategic projects have certified expenses for the first claim. Assessment of these payment claims enabled the effectiveness of the checkgrid to be verified and improved, with a new version adopted internally in October. By the end of 2011, practically all projects from the 2nd call had submitted the last claim of the year foreseen in the Subsidy Contract, whereas 17 were still missing from the first call. This is at least partly due to the end of the projects and the tendency to regroup the semestrial payment claim with the last one.

Assessment of the payment claim as mentioned above enables the project manager to verify the operational and financial progress of the project, completing the follow-up on a daily basis with the Lead partners.

In parallel to this type of monitoring, the JTS improved the existing monitoring system which enables to have an overall view of operations (financial) progress from the running projects. This allows to identify different problems which can be addressed in a proactive manner and to give precise information to national-level coordination bodies for better follow-up.

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

The JTS uses 3 common tables for all the projects within the same call for proposals:

1. A table for certified amounts compared to progress of activities 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 partner lagging behind.  
The table also enables problems to be detected at a national level on which the national authorities are systematically 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 were to be completed in 2011, but as extensions were asked for, only 15 finished by the end of the year. Ending projects require special monitoring in order to prevent any significant underspending.

### **Participation in project Steering Committees and Final Conferences**

In 2011, JTS members attended 17 project Steering Committees in an effort to provide better technical supervision of approved projects.

1. Med Governance: Rome, 23rd March 2011
2. ICS, Iktimed, Wide: Ancona, 29th March 2011
3. Philoxenia: Larnaca, 7th and 8th April 2011
4. Smilies: Syros, 28th and 29th April 2011
5. Agro-environmed: Avignon, 17th May 2011
6. Qualigouv: Marseille, 26th May 2011
7. Free-MED: Île sur la Sorgue, 17th June 2011
8. SEATOLAND: Valletta, 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2011
9. Elih-MED: Larnaca, 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2011
10. Sylvamed: Chania, 29th and 30th September 2011
11. CYCLO: 4<sup>th</sup> October 2011
12. MEDIWAT: Marfa, 5th October 2011
13. TEXMEDIN: Prato, 10<sup>th</sup> November 2011
14. FREIGHT4ALL: Naples, 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2011
15. Proforbiomed: Ptuj, 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24th November 2011
16. C.U.L.T.U.R.E: Pisa, 24<sup>th</sup> November 2011
17. MARIE: Marseille, 25th November 2011

The JTS has also participated to the kick-off meetings of the MED strategic projects:

1. Elih-MED: Rome, 16th and 17th May 2011
2. MARIE: Barcelona, 20 May 2011
3. Proforbiomed: Murcia, 6th and 7th July 2011

Equally, the JTS has participated to the Final Conferences of the projects ending in 2011:

1. Teenergy Schools: Lucca, 7th April 2011
2. CAT-MED: Málaga, 1st July 2011
3. Med Governance: Barcelona, 7th July 2011
4. MED-IPPC-NET: Bruxelles, 14th September 2011
5. INNOVATE MED: Bruxelles, 15th September 2011
6. CHORD: Bruxelles, 15th September 2011
7. RURURBAL: Barcelona, 25th November 2011

In compliance also with the description of management and control systems of the MED Programme, **on-the-spot** visits are carried out by the MA/JTS. The structures visited are decided following a common methodology which was previously validated by the Monitoring Committee in 2009. The visits enable 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 (quality of project management). Each on-the-spot assessment is summarised in a report using a template which was also approved by the Monitoring Committee in 2009.

In 2011, following the very low irregularity rate observed by other controls, and the general workload of the MA/JTS staff under restructuring, few visits were performed:

1. **PACA Region:** Marseille, 10<sup>th</sup> March 2011

**Projects concerned by the check:**

IC MED

MED GOVERNANCE

CREPUDMED

NOVAGRIMED

FORET MODELE

MAREMED

ENERMED

2. **Marche Region:** 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> March 2011

**Projects concerned by the check:**

CYCLO

IKTIMED

ICS

MAREMED

WIDE

3. **Slovenian First Level Control system:** 12<sup>th</sup> April 2011 - a compliance and performance check
4. **Piraeus Port Authority:** 4<sup>th</sup> October 2011

**Projects concerned by the check:**

MEMO

CLIMEPORT

TERCONMED

PORTA

SEATOLAND

**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 following events and activities included the participation of the MA/JTS staff:

On 15th March 2011, the MED MA and JTS participated in the IPA seminar that was held in Tirana (Albania) to inform about the second call for Strategic projects that had been launched

During the seminar, the Albanian National Coordination presented the challenge of the new integrated phase for the IPA countries. The Thessaloniki Liaison Office and the National Coordinators of the IPA Countries explained the participation of the IPA structures under the non-integrated phase. The MA presented the transition to the integrated management of the ERDF/IPA funds and the JTS the technical characteristics of the opened call at that moment. Around 60 people participated to this seminar, which proved the enormous expectations of the IPA structures regarding the MED Programme.

The MED MA and JTS took advantage of this seminar to organise a meeting with the National Coordinations of Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia and Montenegro, with the participation also of the First Level Control responsables in Albania and Montenegro. The main items of the agenda were the management of the IPA Technical Assistance, the possibility of pre-financing for IPA partners under the integrated phase and the organisation of the national First Level Control systems.

**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. **SHIFT:** Redistribution of ERDF grant approved on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2011.
2. **MED TECHNOPOLIS:** Change to the project partnership and redistribution of ERDF grant approved on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2011.
3. **INNOVATE-MED:** Redistribution of ERDF grant approved on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2011.
4. **CHORD:** Redistribution of ERDF grant approved on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2011.
5. **ETHIC:** Withdrawal of a partner and reduction in ERDF grant approved on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2011.
6. **SMILIES:** Change to the project partnership and extension to the project duration approved on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2011.
7. **RIMED:** Withdrawal of a partner and redistribution of ERDF grant and reduction of ERDF grant approved on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2011.
8. **PLANET DESIGN:** Change to the project partnership, redistribution of ERDF grant and extension to the project duration approved on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2011.
9. **MET 3:** Extension to the project duration approved on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2011.
10. **TRANSit:** Extension to the project duration approved on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2011.
11. **Med Lab:** Extension to the project duration approved on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2011.
12. **BIOLMED:** Redistribution of ERDF grant and extension to the project duration approved on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2011.
13. **In.FLOW.ENCE:** Change to the project partnership approved on 11<sup>th</sup> Mars 2011.
14. **INS MED:** Withdrawal of a partner and extension to the project duration approved on 18<sup>th</sup> Mars 2011.
15. **CYCLO:** Redistribution of ERDF grant approved on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2011.
16. **COASTANCE:** Change to the project partnership, redistribution of ERDF grant and reduction in ERDF grant approved 5<sup>th</sup> Mars 2011.
17. **MEDOSSIC:** Extension to the project duration approved on 12<sup>th</sup> April 2011.
18. **WINNOVATE:** Change to the project partnership, redistribution of ERDF grant and extension to the project duration approved on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2011.
19. **NOVAGRIMED:** Extension to the project duration approved on 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2011.
20. **DEVELOP MED:** Withdrawal of a partner and extension to the project duration approved on 10<sup>th</sup> May 2011.
21. **PROTECT:** Redistribution of ERDF grant approved on 26<sup>th</sup> May 2011.
22. **Teenegy Schools:** Redistribution of ERDF grant approved on 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2011.
23. **PAYS.MED.URBAN:** Extension to the project duration approved on 20<sup>th</sup> June 2011.
24. **TEXMEDIN:** Extension to the project duration approved on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2011.
25. **I.C.E.:** Extension to the project duration approved on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2011.
26. **AGRONVIRONMED:** Withdrawal of a partner, reduction in ERDF grant and extension to the project duration approved on 26<sup>th</sup> July 2011.
27. **MED GOVERNANCE:** Redistribution of ERDF grant approved on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2011.
28. **INNOVATE-MED:** Redistribution of ERDF grant and extension to the project duration approved on 29<sup>th</sup> July 2011.
29. **TRANSit:** Extension to the project duration approved on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2011.
30. **MED TECHNOPOLIS:** Withdrawal of a partner approved on 13<sup>th</sup> September 2011.
31. **Free MED:** Extension to the project duration approved on 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011.
32. **RURURBAL:** Redistribution of ERDF grant, reduction in ERDF grant and extension to the project duration approved on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2011.
33. **CHORD:** Redistribution of ERDF grant approved on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2011.
34. **I.C.E.:** Budgeted modification up to 10% approved on 27<sup>th</sup> September 2011.
35. **Innonautics:** Budgeted modification up to 10% approved on 27<sup>th</sup> September 2011.
36. **PORTA:** Withdrawal of a partner approved on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2011.

37. **ENERMED:** Redistribution of ERDF grant approved on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2011.
38. **C.U.L.T.U.R.E:** Change of Lead Partner, redistribution of ERDF grant, reduction in ERDF grant and extension to the project duration approved on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2011.
39. **MED-IPPC-NET:** Budgeted modification up to 10% and extension to the project duration approved on 15<sup>th</sup> November 2011.
40. **MEID:** Withdrawal of a partner approved on 17<sup>th</sup> November 2011.
41. **QUBIC:** Redistribution of ERDF grant approved on 18<sup>th</sup> November 2011.
42. **MEDISS:** Reduction in ERDF grant and extension to the project duration approved on 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2011.

Since 2010, 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, last year the JTS noticed an increase in the modifications to project proposals previously approved by the Selection Committee. During 2011 this upward trend has continued and showed the relevance of these modifications for the subsistence of some projects.

These requests mainly concern withdrawals and replacements 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 particular, the majority of modification approved in 2011 concerned projects from the first call for projects that requested a prolongation of the project's duration in order to achieve all activities planned and a redistribution of the budget among partners to adapt it to partnership needs. In very specific cases (8 projects) a reduction of the ERDF grant, those reductions have had an impact into programming tables.

Finally the MA/JTS proposed the possibility of make a budget adjustment (budget lines/components) at the end of the project; on condition that the adjustment does not modify the total budget of the partner and that the total amount of modifications that the project has undergone during its life span is not exceeding the (already applied) threshold of 30% of its total eligible budget. This proposal was accepted by the Selection Committee on the 20<sup>th</sup> September 2011.

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

The description of management and control systems of the MED Programme states that the Certifying Authority "will assess the quality of certifications with specific controls called "Certification Quality Checks."

In 2011, the following projects were controlled:

#### **MAREMED** (October 2011)

- PACA Region (France)
- Conférence des Régions Périphériques Maritimes d'Europe (CRPM) –Commission Interméditerranéenne (France)

The results of this control were expressed in a report which gave a satisfactory conclusion after the contradictory procedure, with no ineligible expenditure found.



## TOSCA (October 2011)

- Pôle Mer PACA - Toulon Var Technologies (France)
- Conseil National de la Recherche – Institut des Sciences Marines (Italy)

The results of this control have been expressed in a report which led to the ineligibility of 1030.13€

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

The number of projects having declared expenditure to the European Commission in 2010 (47 in total) constituted the basis for a sampling exercise undertaken by the CICC in January 2011 which was then validated by members of the Group of Auditors in February 2011.

6 operations out of 47 were controlled in 2011. This control involved 6 Lead partners and 7 partners, based in 5 countries participating to the MED Programme (Spain, Italy, France, Slovenia and Cyprus) for an amount of € 1.630.146,49, corresponding to 26,2% of the expenditure declared to the Commission in 2010 (€ 6.224.988,26).

The projects selected were:

Under the random sample:

- MED NET IPPC operation
- FREE MED operation
- CAT MED operation
- DEVELOP MED operation
- QUALIGOUV operation

Under the complementary sample:

- Technical Assistance

No irregularity was detected within the framework of the audit works. The error rate was 0%.

As the annual control report indicates, the results of the operation controls led to the conclusion that there was a high level of reasonable assurance concerning the correctness of the system and the effectiveness of implemented management and control systems.

The Group of Auditors met in Marseilles on the 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2011, where the results of the auditing exercises undertaken in 2011 were presented and a workplan for audits in 2012 was established.

## **2.8. National performance reserve - Not applicable**

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

The MED Operational programme has 4 priority axis for projects (and the fifth for Technical assistance), with altogether 10 Objectives. Apart from the thematic classification, the observations from the In Itinere evaluation identify three types of projects: network projects, innovation projects and ‘atypical projects’. These were detailed in the 2010 Annual report. The difference between the two first categories, that constitute the main types of our projects, seems to be that networking projects propose a continuous ‘discussion forum’ that carries out networking activities throughout the programmes and programming periods, whereas the ‘innovation projects’ punctually develop a transferable product, method or strategy. The first category is problematic when it tries to combine a durable activity with punctual financing, but it can, through a maturing process, reach good visibility and promote serious transnational policies. The weakness of more punctual innovation projects is that they do not always reach concrete implementation but finish on the level of the ‘prototype’ and disappear without continuity. However, if their results were sustainably promoted and put into practise, their value added would considerably increase.

**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 2011, 45 projects from both the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> “traditional” calls were part-funded under priority 1. 7 projects of the axis 1 of the 1<sup>st</sup> call ended their activities by the end of the year. The priority has

been quite popular, with a spontaneous response to the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> call that committed over 85% of the total budget allocated to the Priority 1. The remaining budget, 8,6M€, would not have been sufficient to open a call for strategic projects, which is why the programme MC decided to allocate it to a Targeted call under this theme. The Targeted call preparation started in 2011, but the call is only launched in 2012, as other calls for Strategic projects preceded it during the reporting year.

The projects under Priority 1 overwhelmingly treat the conditions of the SME, either by direct accompanying measures or by cooperation of public authorities for legal and policy frameworks that facilitate the creation or the competitiveness of enterprises. The concept of innovation is largely understood from the point of view of procedures and methods: only a few projects concentrate on technological innovation. Mostly the projects deal with concepts such as KBE (Knowledge-based economy), BA (Business angels), eco-concept, among others. They attempt to provide solutions to lack of financing mechanisms, access to innovation, clustering, internationalisation and market search, using and testing methods that are claimed to be innovative.

The Priority 1 projects provide technical and regional analysis, identify best practises, and propose coordinated solutions such as guidelines, strategies and action plans. There are three main approaches:

- By sector of activity: (farming, furniture design, textile industry, cultural enterprises, promotion of aromatic plan products..)
- Non-sectorial approach, concentrating on legal, logistic, technological solutions for enterprises
- Framework cooperation between public authorities and the private sector

Roughly 20% of these projects have finalised their activities by the end of the reporting year. In order to gather precise information on what the project have achieved and if all foreseen outputs and results have been implemented, the JTS has started to compile both the baseline and the target value information, allowing in the medium term both statistical and quality analysis on project and programme results. As all 1<sup>st</sup> call projects end in 2012, we hope to possess in some months, an inclusive database of about half of the Priority 1 projects, and provide the first full analysis in next year's reporting.

*An example of project:*



AGRO-ENVIRONMED

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

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

Objective 1.1: Dissemination of innovative technologies and know-how

The main objective of the AGRO-ENVIRONMED project is to encourage eco-innovation in Agro-food sector companies of the Mediterranean, particularly SMEs, by the creation of a platform which promotes the transfer of technologies and best environmental management practices.

AGRO-ENVIRONMED developed project activities in 5 agrofood subsectors: Olive oil, Wine, Meat, Fruit and Vegetables and Dairy Product involving Regional Authorities, Technology & Innovation Centres, Public Agencies, Entrepreneurs Associations and Research Centres, representing 11 regions and 6 countries within the Mediterranean area (France, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain and Slovenia).

The project presented its online multilingual platform <http://agro.geoenvi.org/> during its final conference on February 29th 2012. For each selected subsector of the agro-food sector the platform offers a catalog of Best Available Technologies and Best Environmental Practices in the matter of “Raw Material Consumption”, “Air Emissions”, “Noise Emissions”, “Water Consumption”, “Waste Water Emissions”, “Energy Consumption” and “Waste”. The database includes a list of Technological Providers and SMEs that have successfully implemented the BEP or BAT. The project also developed a joint methodology to transfer technologies and initiatives to SMEs.

This project will transfer the results of the project into a sample of SMEs within the sub-sectors, validating the results of implementing eco-innovative measures in the MED SMEs. 90 companies have been involved and 10 will carry out the pilot activities.

In terms of communication and capitalization activities, in addition to the Website, newsletters, articles and brochures, the project’s organized national conferences and partners made bilateral contacts with authorities.

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

Most problems encountered by MED projects are not priority-specific. As already stated earlier, cooperation projects are frequently subject to political, economic and cultural problems that affect at least one partner and cause delays and constraints in implementing activities. The economic crisis has obliged most public structures to cut annual budgets and created difficulties in their participation to project activities. Treasury problems are common and can cause departures from the project partnership, of structures that can no more implement activities. This concerns equally public authorities. Political changes affect local and regional authorities and can prevent them from implementing activities, as they need to wait for the new power structure to establish. A major reform of public sector in Greece has made many structures to disappear, to merge with other existing institutions, and created delays in projects while the formal modifications have been submitted and treated.

Cooperation projects can also suffer from lack of efficient information circulation, being very much dependent on the efficiency and motivation of the Lead Partner. Sometimes the human resources allocated to the project are not sufficient to carry out efficiently the project activities. While the economic and political problems are beyond the control of the partner structures but also that of the programme management, the problems arising from the weak coordination of the LP are most often detected by the JTS during the follow-up and monitoring of the project. In these cases, the JTS seeks to participate to the project meetings or otherwise contribute by reaching out to the LP and identifying main problems with him. Several solutions can be proposed, from mediation between partners, to modification of budget lines to the profit of sufficient human resources. This

accompanying work is often carried out in cooperation with the national coordination of the LP country.

\*\*\*

### 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:

The biggest priority with 34% of the global ERDF allocation to the programme, the Priority 2 has been popular and received numerous proposals during the 2 first calls for projects, but not evenly distributed between the four Objectives under the priority. Most projects proposed and selected are found under Objective 2.1, protection of natural resources and heritage, while the objectives for promotion of renewable energies and combating maritime and other natural risks, have not spontaneously received lots of proposals. Of 31 projects selected under the Priority Axis 2, more than half (17) concern the Objective 2.1. Following this situation, after two first calls, the MC decided to launch a call for Strategic projects, for renewable energies and energy efficiency, and another for Maritime Safety projects.

It has been rather surprising that in an area such as the Mediterranean, combating natural risks has received such a weak answer. Structures working for protected areas such as natural parks are almost totally absent from partnerships, and protection of coastal zones is not particularly addressed by projects.

Following the call for Strategic projects, three major projects were selected in February 2011 for the Energy theme. For the Maritime safety, although five full applications had been received, three of them were ineligible and the others did not show sufficient quality to be programmed. The Selection Committee decided to reopen the call. All these full proposals were resubmitted, together with a completely new proposal. After the evaluation of the projects, the Selection Committee programmed one strategic project on Maritime Safety, in October.

An example of project



CAT-MED

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

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

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

The CAT MED Project (Changing Mediterranean Metropolises Around Time) is aimed at identifying operational solutions that can be used to change urban behaviours so as to lower the environmental impact of urbanisation and limit greenhouse gas emissions (GHG).

The project built a common geographic information system from identified indicators and data available on the participating territories.

With key players in sustainable development such as urban utilities service companies - water, transport, energy, waste management - public agencies, energies, urban planning, etc. - national government agencies, the regional authorities, the local authorities, chambers of commerce, universities, etc. and with institution in charge of transport, urban planning, urban projects, citizen participation, environment, etc, the partners created working groups to contribute to building the Green Apple model).

Sharing the indicator system build within the project and a methodological guide to sustainable neighbourhoods, this institutional network of cities thus created helped building the cooperation online platform (GIS) <http://www.catmed.eu/systeme-transnational-indicateurs/plateforme-transnationale.html> that gathers the project results. The pilots took place in 12 cities.



In terms of communication and capitalization activities, in addition to website, articles, publications, transnational seminars and final conference, the project had cities authorities signed a political charter for sustainable urban development on February 7<sup>th</sup> 2011.

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

\*\*\*

## 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:

The ERDF allocation for the Priority 3 amounts to 20% of the global budget of the programme. In the two open calls for standard projects, *only 21 project proposals* out of almost 950 submitted, were proposed on the Priority 3. Eight projects were selected, four in the first call and four in the second. The Objective for the accessibility by new technologies was even less successful, and only two projects have been selected under it. The projects under Objective 3.1 mostly treat the questions linked to port authorities, either the connections between ports and their hinterlands, or customs clearance and other procedures where harmonization of models and software could bring more efficiency and competitiveness. Only one project is more targeted to urban mobility.

The first call projects being in the final phase of their implementation, their final results should be soon available for a global analysis. A positive feature is that practically all these

projects have joined the initiative of one active partner (taking part in several of them) to develop a joint cluster. This initiative is one of the most advanced in the context of capitalisation, and has emerged in parallel with the launching of the programme level capitalisation process.

*Example of project*



BACKGROUNDS

<http://www.backgrounds-project.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

BACKGROUNDS aims at developing a governance model involving ports and port infrastructures within the Mediterranean basin and targeting a better integration of existing poles (small and medium hubs as well as larger ones) with their own territories and the relevant productive clusters. Thus the project aims to providing tools to face functional, operational and organizational problems related to the traffic of goods and passengers in port regions. These instruments should reduce roads congestions through the implementation of a common communication protocol.

Based on databases on the demand of goods and passengers transports, on a Harbour system analysis and studies on intermodal transport costs models, logistic chains, opportunities offered to local production systems by the globalized traffic, the project established a Network model of Sea Roads and Intermodal Interconnections with the involved territories. It resulted in the creation of a web GIS software to describe the freight flows of goods and passengers between the ports (Online Tool) <http://www.backgrounds.imet.gr/>. This tool addresses to a series of stakeholders such as regional decision makers, port operators, consignees, local producers, shipping agencies, transporters and forwarders to the wider public, and enable to visualize the existing road/ rail and maritime network in the background area. It also provides freight and passenger traffic data from the background ports and trade data from the catchment areas of the background ports. Through the tool, it is possible to evaluate the optimum routes (in terms of cost) and to create forecasts and scenarios for the assessment of potential new sea routes throughout the backgrounds basin.

The scenarios are being tested and will enable to provide economical and environmental assessments.

In terms of communication and capitalization activities, the project will disseminate a network model among operators and users as well as handbook on good practices. In addition, it will build an online knowledge community the themes “Accessibility, transport, logistics, security”.

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

The weak number of proposals received for Priority 3 projects has constituted a problem to the programme to use relevantly the ERDF allocation to this priority. Whereas all programme stakeholders agree that the theme is of major importance to the programme space, the lack of interest of the potential partner structures is manifest. Beyond port authorities, accompanying structures such as the chambers of commerce, and regional authorities, the participation is extremely rare from the national level authorities that mostly have the necessary competence to treat the transport and accessibility issue on the transnational scale.

During the reporting year, the MC decided to enhance this priority by launching a call for Strategic projects. Eleven full applications were submitted, and this amount could theoretically have been sufficient to provide enough quality projects in order to commit the available budget. However, eight of these proposals proved to be ineligible. The reasons for this situation are not known exactly and not yet thoroughly analysed, but it is likely that the partner structures have not been able to invest enough time and resources to elaborate complex proposals with large partnerships, as the call had a one-step submission procedure that required much effort and thus contained a high risk for the partnership to fail to be selected.

The programming of the projects proposed under this call was to take place in early 2012.

\*\*\*

## 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:

The Priority 4 is financially the smallest priority, with only 10% of the ERDF budget allocated to it. This limited budget was mostly consumed during the 1<sup>st</sup> and the 2<sup>nd</sup> standard calls, leaving less than 1M€ left in the budget. The subjects of integrated development, and territorial governance, have been very popular amongst stakeholders and especially public authorities. A high number of proposals were received in particular for the Objective 4.1., during the open calls. The theme allows cooperation in territorial planning and governance, which seems to be much in demand. The projects under this Objective are from several sectors and focusing on the governance aspect. Of the 17 projects programmed under the Priority 4, only three are under the Objective 4.2, which is surprising in regard to the importance of cultural heritage in the MED cooperation area.

### *Example of project*



PHILOXENIA

[http://philoxeniamed.tpa-kepi.gr/index\\_fr.html](http://philoxeniamed.tpa-kepi.gr/index_fr.html)

### **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 project Philoxenia foresaw the financial, technical and cultural support of 90 persons, wishing to install themselves in the rural areas to create their own micro-projects and also to contribute to the vitality of these territories.

It aimed at implementing a Common Operational Mechanism of reception of activities building an online toolbox that includes tutorial and guides such as the Methodological guide to familiarise candidates for installation in Mediterranean rural areas and their tutors with individualised tutoring.

Thus the partners provided an individualised tutoring to new arrivals, who wished to create their own micro-activities in the five rural target zones, taking into account their personal life, their professional project and the interaction of the two with the reception territory of Philoxenia.

In terms of communication and capitalization activities, the project has organized a capitalization seminar on March 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> 2012 in Lithopos, Greece in addition to their website and publications. The aims of this event are to share the know-how of Philoxenia project partners with the other EU speakers in the matter of welcoming policies and the various experimentations which have been already hold or are still in process, to define the content of the transfer as regards the welcoming policies and the territorial attractiveness in the European Union, to know the methods for the implementation of these policies according to the needs, contexts and strategies of each actor and to spread good practices of Philoxenia project to others participants in the seminar.

The seminar gathered a quite large public from potential candidates for installation in the countryside to local, regional and national authorities.

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

Projects under this priority have been in many cases proposed by partnerships constituted by Regions and other territorial administrations. They have potential to policy impact by coordinated activity of Regions, but have a high vulnerability risk towards political changes amongst the partner structures, during the project duration. These cause stagnation of activities and with changing political objectives, can undermine the result of the project. The delivery of results is better guaranteed when the partnership also includes other type of structures than administrations, as the concrete implementation tasks are easier to delegate from institutional to operational partners.

There is no immediate action that can be taken towards ‘overpolitization’ of governance projects. In medium term, evaluation and selection criteria sensitive towards different profiles of partner structures can guarantee more stability to the project implementation.

\*\*\*

## **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)	13 (2MC+3 SC+1G AO+1N CP+5CA P+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 2011 was XX

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 2011

- 2008 and 2009 Annual report abstracts on the MED website – 14/01/11
- Capitalisation MED public procurement – proposal final assessment – 18/01/11
- Final validation ToRs strategic projects – 25/03/11
- Minutes 6<sup>th</sup> Monitoring Committee – 18/04/11
- Framework consultation MC MED – 19/05/11
- Advance payment for IPA partners – 01/06/11
- Documents to add to the 2<sup>nd</sup> call for SP – 03/06/11
- Approval 2010 Med Annual report – 10/06/11
- Minutes of the MS informal meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> July – 25/07/11
- Minutes 7<sup>th</sup> Monitoring Committee – 29/11/11

Other consultations and notifications from the MA to Committee in 2011 :

- Seminar MED in Albania AND annual exam of the programme – 01/02/11
- Orientations proposal following the last MC meeting – 14/03/11
- JTS recruiting interviews (project officer) – 18/03/11
- Departure and replacement in the JTS staff (financial officer) – 29/04/11
- Discussion paper for the informal meeting on the 6<sup>th</sup> July – 23/06/11
- Information about Polish Presidency working meeting and invitation – 17/08/11
- JTS coordinator recruitment organisation and results – 27/10/11
- IPA financing agreement draft – 01/12/11
- Decision jury JTS (assistant and programme/project development manager) – 07/12/11
- MA/JTS Management – 16/12/11

### National activities delivered:

*For more information on the MED National Contact Points activities and tasks during 2011, please refer to the annex 6. Only public events, meetings and seminars organized by national delegations are listed below.*

#### France

In 2011 the French National Contact Point carried out the following public activities on the national level:

- Preparation and organization of the national committees' "first call strategic projects "(January 2011 and October 2011);
- Attendance and organization of the national committee on the future programmes MED and ENPI (November 2011);
- Preparation and organization of a meeting with the MED national partnership (November 2011).

#### Italy

In 2011, the Italian National Contact Point carried out the following public activities on the national level:

- Joint organisation with National Committee of a brainstorming meeting for Italian potential partners - Second Strategic call – April 21<sup>st</sup>, 2011 – May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2011;
- June 13<sup>th</sup>, 2011– TN MED – dissemination seminar – Regione Molise - Campobasso;
- December 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>, 2011– dissemination seminar – Regione Siciliana – Catania.

### **Malta**

The Maltese National Contact Point attended a number of project meetings and events organised by Maltese partners.

### **Portugal**

In 2011 the Portuguese National Coordination carried out the following public activities:

- Realization of one training seminar for partners and external controllers, held in Lisbon on the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> of May, with the purpose to raise awareness on the eligibility of expenditure, on public procurement procedures control and on first level control procedures.

### **Slovenia**

The Slovenian National Contact Point carried out the following public activities on the national level:

- Four thematic workshops were organised to which stakeholders from different levels were invited. Topics of the workshops, which were implemented from February till April 2011 were the following: Workshop Development potentials of nature and culture conservation areas, Workshop Daring Slovenia (Innovation), Workshop Accessibility, Workshop Natural risks.
- Programme MED, its events and calls were promoted also at other events dedicated to transnational territorial cooperation programmes in organisation of the Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning. Programme MED was in 2011 presented in this way at national info days and conference dedicated to South East Europe, Central Europe and Alpine Space programme, as well as at the national ESPON conference in Ljubljana. Programme MED was also presented through contribution of Ms. Margarita Jančič at the transnational eLivingLab conference dedicated to Danube Strategy which was held in Ljubljana.



## **Spain**

The Spanish National Contact Point carried out the following public activity on the national level:

- Organization of Information Day for the external auditors of the projects, with the support of Interact Point.

## **Greece**

The Greek National Contact Point attended a number of project meetings and events organised by Greek partners in Greece.

## **Cyprus**

The Cypriot National Contact Point carried out the following public activities:

- Organisation of Information Day in Cyprus concerning the 2nd Call for Strategic Projects, May 2011.

## **Gibraltar**

The Gibraltar National Contact Point attended a Seminar organised by the EU Programmes Secretariat in conjunction with the Gibraltar Chamber of Commerce and the Gibraltar Federation of Small Businesses where all EU co-funded programmes were presented and promoted including dissemination of brochures and literature to the local business community and potential partners (6th October 2011).

## **Croatia**

The Croatian National Contact Point carried out the following public activities:

- national information events, such as the Information day for potential applicants in the Strategic Call for proposals in the Axis 3, Measure 1, in September, in the premises of the NA/Ministry for Regional Development, Forestry and Water Management, in Zagreb;
- in close cooperation with the Programme's IPA LO, a presentation of the various aspects of the Programme was organized during the National day of regional development, in May in Sibenik, to interested participants from mostly Croatia' coastal counties and the respective development agencies ;

- Programme MED was also promoted at other events dedicated to transnational territorial cooperation programmes in organisation of other national stakeholder institutions, such as the Central Finance and Contracting Authority, In Zagreb in June.

### **Albania**

The Albanian National Contact Point carried out the following public activities:

- Realization of a seminar for IPA countries, held in Tirana on the 15th of March 2011, on “Integrated Management with the ETC MED Programme”.

### **Bosnia and Herzegovina**

The Bosnian National Contact Point carried out the following public activities:

- Organisation of an informative seminar on the MED programme for potential applicants in BiH (20th of January 2011 in Sarajevo). Benefits of the Territorial Cooperation Programmes were presented through the example of Spain. An overview of preparation, implementation and management of MED Projects was given by the experienced Spanish experts.

## **7. Information et publicité**

### **7.1 Participation and contribution to joint events**

#### ***7.1.1 Joint Transnational Conference***

The MED Programme actively participated in the organisation of the first conference jointly arranged by the 13 Transnational Cooperation programmes. This event took place on 15th and 16th September 2011 in Katowice, Poland, and featured high level speakers and panels including EU Commission representatives and Polish Ministries. It was arranged in cooperation with and hosted by the Silesian Region and the city of Katowice and as an accompanying event of the Polish Presidency of the EU Council.

The aim was to jointly demonstrate how transnational cooperation helps to improve quality of life in European regions. The conference focused on two main questions: What has been achieved by transnational cooperation so far and what is the future potential?

The event reached almost 1000 people (including the online audience participating via live stream).

The MED programme participated very actively in all operational working groups responsible for the event preparation: the ‘content’ and ‘communication’ groups as well as the ‘steering committee’. The MED staff was responsible for the development and coordination of media relations as well as for the setup, coordination and management of the conference website [www.transnational-cooperation.eu](http://www.transnational-cooperation.eu) including the live streaming. Since only 600 persons could participate on spot, the live streaming was an essential tool to achieve an active participation in all Member States.

Various MED projects were presented in workshops, exhibition and the event videos. However, it has never been the aim to promote individual projects or programmes, but to highlight examples of added value of cooperation in all areas.

#### ***1.1.2 Open days 2011***

The conclusions of the first Joint Conference were jointly presented during the OPEN DAYS 2011 during a workshop organised and held by the 13 programmes. Since this workshop took place only shortly after the publication of the Commission’s legislative package of the new programming period, the programmes managed to give voice to their conclusions and to actively demonstrate and discuss added value and impact of transnational cooperation with the representatives of the Commissions, the Parliament and Polish Presidency of the EU Council.

#### ***1.1.3 Continuation of joint efforts in event organisation***

The MED Programme intends to continue and actively participate to these cooperative activities with other programmes.

Thus, it initiated a joint communication training for project partners together with the Alpine Space Programme in Marseille in spring 2012.

Moreover, the MED Programme actively supported the development of joint activities of ETC programmes initiated by INTERACT resulting in the organisation of the European Cooperation Day 2012.

In late 2011, first discussions on a possible joint (annual) event in 2012 together with the ENPI CBC MED Programme were initiated, too.

## **7.2 Organisation of MED Programme events**

### **7.2.1 MED Annual event 2011**

Beside the Joint Transnational Conference in Katowice, the MED annual event in Barcelona was one communication highlight of the year 2011.

For the first time, the MED annual event focused on one specific theme. In order to allow a thematic focus, but also crosscutting discussions on the future programming period in general, the theme of INNOVATION was chosen. The event offered the possibility to inform about how the EU aims to boost 'smart growth' and how Territorial Cooperation in the Mediterranean can contribute to reach this aim.

Moreover, the participants found out on past and present developments: what has been reached by the Med's "classical" projects aiming to innovate in various fields, what is about to be implemented by the pioneer strategic projects selected in 2011? Two project panels were presented, focusing on INNOVATION and on ENERGY EFFICIENCY. These presentations offered a baseline to discuss and further shape the targeted call (on innovation/energy) launched in 2012.

The event was participated by 300 persons.

### **7.2.2 Transnational IPA Seminar**

After the decision on a new management system integrating IPA funds in a shared management with ERDF funds, a first MED IPA seminar was organised in March 2011 in Tirana, Albania aiming to inform potential IPA partners about opportunities and modalities of the new management system of IPA funds within the MED Programme. Around 70 potential IPA partners participated to the event.

### **7.2.3 Applicants' seminars**

Two transnational applicants' seminars were organised for the open calls on strategic projects in Marseilles:

In April 2011, a first launching seminar for the call for strategic projects on priority 3 offered general technical information as well as individual consultation on project contents during the draft project phase, the first step compulsory period between April and May 2011.

In July 2011, a second seminar was organised aiming to inform project developers that submitted a draft project about improvement potentials and to identify possible synergies between the various proposals.

### **7.2.4 (Lead) Strategic project partner seminars**

Four strategic projects had been approved in 2011. Thus, a small, but very intense facilitation format for technical seminars had been chosen. In April and December 2011, the JTS invited lead, but also workpackage responsible project partners to bilateral project meetings in Marseilles.

### **7.2.5 Capitalisation Events**

As already mentioned above capitalisation events have been organised. A first serie of four thematic workshops (one for each thematic priority) took place in Rome in late June/beginning July 2011. The workshops were - as a starting point - only offered to first call projects in an advanced stage. In

November 2011, a clustering and capitalisation day was organised in Marseilles. Around 100 project partners participated and actively exchanged in several thematic working groups.

### **7.3 Online publications and website**

#### **7.3.1 Website improvements and management**

Various website amendments and modifications were started in 2011 and have partly been finalised, partly to be finalised in 2012 (e.g. illustrative modifications on the starting page and improvement of the menu, updates in the project database, installation of an online registration form and a photo gallery etc.).

#### **7.3.2 Social networks**

The programme started to create sites and/or profiles within the following social networks: Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn. Thus, digital networks with MED projects, ETC programmes and other relevant platforms have been created. Additional efforts will be undertaken to develop online exchange platforms and discussion forum for the projects.

#### **7.3.3 Online Newsletter**

Three online editions of the MED Newsflash were published and disseminated to the contact list, in June, October and December 2011:

After the decision on the new shared management integrating IPA funds, the the June edition focused on IPA informing on the management system, the responsible contact persons, relevant IPA events etc.

The October Newsflash focused on the MED capitalisation with descriptions on the ongoing capitalisation process on programme level, best-practise capitalisation examples from the MED project world and capitalisation with the ENPI MED CBC Programme.

The third Newsflash resumed on the MED year 2011 and provided an outlook on activities planned for 2012.

### **7.4 Other activities**

The MED image brochure has been updated and reprinted: some facts and figures on ‘what happened so far’ have been integrated.

Moreover, the MED Programme’s corporate design was completed and refreshed (e.g. creation of combined logo versions for projects, logos for the Liaison Offices, image for the capitalisation activities etc.).

### **7.5 Evaluation of communication activities**

#### **7.6 Evaluation of communication activities**

With the annual report 2010, provided in 2011, the programme’s communication approach and activities were evaluated. The main conclusions:

Tools to better identify and target stakeholders shall be developed, in general a more targeted communication approach shall be followed.

Media and public relations shall be better developed.

Project partners shall be provided with more exchange possibilities as well as support and guidance for their project communication.

A boost of communication efforts and improvement of the aspects mentioned above requires updates in the programme's communication strategy in coordination between the transnational and national level. Relevant actions are about to be implemented.

\*\*\*

### **Projects ongoing in 2011:**

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 for traditional projects and Strategic projects (Priorities 2.2 and 2.3) is shown below together with their total budgets.

**TRADITIONAL PROJECTS - 1ST CALL**

Priority	Objective	Internal reference	Acronym	ERDF	National co finance	IPA Croatia	Croatian co finance	IPA Montenegro	Montenegrin co finance	Total eligible budget
1	2	1G-MED08-012	AGRISLES	932 500,00	282 625,00					1 215 125,00
1	1	1G-MED08-014	AGRO-ENVIRONMED	972 953,76	310 674,99					1 283 628,75
3	1	1G-MED08-034	BACKGROUNDS	1 075 999,00	340 678,00					1 416 677,00
1	1	1G-MED08-040	BIOLMED	1 119 382,47	354 747,49					1 474 129,96
4	2	1G-MED08-046	C.U.L.T.UR.E	1 078 335,86	359 445,28					1 437 781,14
2	4	1G-MED08-048	CAT-Med	1 628 225,00	542 741,67					2 170 966,67
4	2	1G-MED08-052	CHORD	987 750,01	329 249,99					1 317 000,00
2	2	1G-MED08-060	CLIMEPORT	1 239 221,00	371 233,00					1 610 454,00
2	4	1G-MED08-062	COASTANCE	1 320 636,61	417 687,53	48 940,00	8 636,47	68 000,00	12 000,00	1 875 900,61
4	1	1G-MED08-069	CREPUDMED	1 104 000,00	368 000,00					1 472 000,00
3	1	1G-MED08-085	DEVELOP-MED	1 015 698,20	304 673,80					1 320 372,00
1	2	1G-MED08-117	ETHIC	659 051,61	219 683,87					878 735,48
1	2	1G-MED08-129	Flormed	1 400 000,00	466 665,00					1 866 665,00
4	1	1G-MED08-133	FORET MODELE	976 500,00	325 500,00	45 900,00	8 100,00			1 356 000,00
2	1	1G-MED08-134	FREE-MED	940 770,00	313 590,00					1 254 360,00
1	1	1G-MED08-161	I.C.E.	1 175 164,99	361 763,70					1 536 928,69
1	2	1G-MED08-164	IC-MED	1 424 998,50	474 999,50					1 899 998,00
1	2	1G-MED08-182	INNOVATE-MED	822 559,50	274 186,50					1 096 746,00
1	1	1G-MED08-185	INS MED	917 317,00	305 773,00					1 223 090,00
1	2	1G-MED08-216	MACC BAM	1 072 500,00	357 500,00					1 430 000,00
4	2	1G-MED08-231	MED EMPORION	1 238 949,00	412 983,00					1 651 932,00
4	1	1GMED-08-264	Medgovernance	1 208 148,75	402 716,25					1 610 865,00
2	1	1G-MED08-273	MED-IPPC-NET	930 000,00	293 727,20					1 223 727,20
1	1	1G-MED08-276	MEDISS	1 230 900,00	410 300,00					1 641 200,00
1	1	1G-MED08-280	MedLab	1 300 000,00	379 867,00					1 679 867,00
1	2	1G-MED08-289	MEDOSSIC	905 579,00	221 002,00			10 901,25	1 923,75	1 139 406,00
2	3	1G-MED08-307	MEMO	1 008 750,00	318 991,00					1 327 741,00
1	1	1G-MED08-309	MET3	1 286 250,00	428 750,00					1 715 000,00
4	1	1G-MED08-349	NOVAGRIMED	1 355 037,00	501 682,47					1 856 719,47

4	1	1G-MED08-370	PAYS.MED.URBAN	1 224 999,00	408 333,00					1 633 332,00
4	1	1G-MED08-376	Philoxenia	1 567 323,00	398 266,00					1 965 589,00
1	1	1G-MED08-377	Planet Design	989 437,50	329 812,50					1 319 250,00
2	4	1G-MED08-387	PROTECT	1 171 105,00	364 435,00	64 260,00	11 340,00			1 611 140,00
4	1	1G-MED08-392	QUALIGOUV	1 363 500,00	454 500,00					1 818 000,00
1	2	1G-MED08-395	QUBIC	1 273 749,00	424 583,00					1 698 332,00
1	2	1G-MED08-419	RIMED	1 061 222,50	306 007,50					1 367 230,00
4	1	1G-MED08-425	Rururbal	1 278 334,12	426 111,38					1 704 445,50
2	3	1G-MED08-437	SECUR MED PLUS	1 222 500,00	394 167,00					1 616 667,00
2	1	1G-MED08-445	SHIFT	898 707,00	299 569,00					1 198 276,00
1	2	1G-MED08-454	SMILIES	1 263 500,00	392 300,00					1 655 800,00
1	1	1G-MED08-458	SOSTENUTO	1 179 210,00	355 578,51			112 000,00	19 764,00	1 666 552,51
2	1	1G-MED08-463	SusTEn	1 210 500,00	384 300,00					1 594 800,00
2	2	1G-MED08-477	Teenergy schools	999 500,00	306 500,00					1 306 000,00
3	1	1G-MED08-478	TERCONMED	1 162 628,00	369 206,00					1 531 834,00
1	1	1G-MED08-482	TEXMEDIN	1 426 312,50	475 437,50					1 901 750,00
3	1	1G-MED08-495	TRANSit	1 013 152,50	286 840,12					1 299 992,62
4	1	1G-MED08-511	WASMAN	1 250 095,00	366 866,00					1 616 961,00
2	1	1G-MED08-515	WATERinCORE	773 375,00	235 125,00					1 008 500,00
1	2	1G-MED08-525	WiNNOVATE	1 152 950,00	368 670,00					1 521 620,00
2	1	1G-MED08-533	ZERO WASTE	1 000 000,09	305 596,80					1 305 596,90

\*\*\*



**TRADITIONAL PROJECTS - 2ND CALL**

Priority	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
2	1	2G-MED09-003	2Bparks	1 623 500,00	490 500,00					2 114 000,00
1	2	2G-MED09-004	2InS Clusters	1 369 800,00	438 200,00					1 808 000,00
2	1	2G-MED09-015	AGROCHEPACK	880 300,00	277 700,00					1 158 000,00
2	1	2G-MED09-026	APICE	1 711 065,00	570 355,00					2 281 420,00
1	2	2G-MED09-062	CreaMED	1 005 000,00	295 000,00					1 300 000,00
3	1	2G-MED09-069	CYCLO	696 250,00	208 750,00					905 000,00
2	4	2G-MED09-070	CypFire	1 012 000,00	318 000,00					1 330 000,00
1	1	2G-MED09-086	EASY FINANCE	739 250,00	231 750,00					971 000,00
1	2	2G-MED09-091	ECOMARK	1 260 443,57	401 251,86					1 661 695,43
1	1	2G-MED09-093	ecomovel	725 833,49	241 944,51	66 515,90	11 738,10			1 046 032,00
1	2	2G-MED09-098	EMMA	933 017,48	311 005,85					1 244 023,33
2	2	2G-MED09-102	ENERMED	1 165 600,00	368 400,00	22 935,79	4 047,49			1 560 983,28
2	1	2G-MED09-103	enerscapes	1 393 625,00	366 875,00					1 760 500,00
2	4	2G-MED09-117	FOR CLIMADAPT	1 300 500,00	433 500,00					1 734 000,00
3	2	2G-MED09-119	FREIGHT4ALL	1 287 000,00	413 000,00					1 700 000,00
1	2	2G-MED09-139	HIDDEN	1 230 000,00	410 000,00					1 640 000,00
1	2	2G-MED09-148	ICS	1 365 000,00	455 000,00					1 820 000,00
1	2	2G-MED09-152	IKTIMED	1 419 075,00	432 425,00					1 851 500,00
4	1	2G-MED09-157	In.FLOW.ence	1 483 074,05	443 034,25					1 926 108,30
1	2	2G-MED09-164	InnoNauTICs	739 125,00	246 375,00					985 500,00
1	1	2G-MED09-174	IP-SMEs	820 275,00	273 425,00					1 093 700,00
1	1	2G-MED09-175	IRH-Med	742 620,37	247 540,13	54 730,31	9 658,29			1 054 549,10
1	2	2G-MED09-189	KnowInG	1 362 892,50	454 297,50					1 817 190,00
1	1	2G-MED09-190	KnowInTarget	1 336 100,00	425 900,00					1 762 000,00
3	2	2G-MED09-196	LiMIT4WeDA	1 268 100,00	356 900,00					1 625 000,00
3	1	2G-MED09-199	LOSAMEDCHEM	1 301 053,00	367 127,00					1 668 180,00
2	1	2G-MED09-209	MAREMED	1 498 600,00	483 400,00					1 982 000,00

1	1	2G-MED09-225	MED TECHNOPOLIS	1 500 000,00	500 000,00					2 000 000,00
2	2	2G-MED09-241	MEDEEA	1 142 532,65	314 181,11					1 456 713,76
2	1	2G-MED09-262	MEDIWAT	1 139 000,00	341 000,00					1 480 000,00
1	2	2G-MED09-263	MED-KED	948 488,22	285 469,64					1 233 957,86
2	1	2G-MED09-270	MEDPAN NORTH	1 814 915,00	565 910,00					2 380 825,00
4	1	2G-MED09-282	MedStrategy	833 531,00	257 524,00					1 091 055,00
1	1	2G-MED09-291	MEID	958 532,00	305 644,00			59 500,00	10 500,00	1 334 176,00
2	1	2G-MED09-302	MODELAND	1 364 004,50	417 425,50					1 781 430,00
2	1	2G-MED09-327	OSDDT-Med	1 028 662,25	326 108,75					1 354 771,00
4	1	2G-MED09-328	OTREMED	1 281 400,00	413 600,00					1 695 000,00
1	2	2G-MED09-331	PACMAN	1 224 441,50	384 928,50					1 609 370,00
3	1	2G-MED09-348	PORTA	1 111 155,00	345 849,00					1 457 004,00
1	1	2G-MED09-353	R&D Industry	1 059 125,00	293 375,00					1 352 500,00
1	2	2G-MED09-357	REINPO RETAIL	979 550,00	312 450,00					1 292 000,00
1	2	2G-MED09-362	Responsible MED	1 034 052,50	324 637,50					1 358 690,00
2	2	2G-MED09-381	SCORE	1 278 057,75	388 579,25					1 666 637,00
3	1	2G-MED09-382	SEATOLAND	1 274 850,00	388 150,00					1 663 000,00
2	1	2G-MED09-410	SylvaMED	974 589,50	303 536,50					1 278 126,00
1	2	2G-MED09-419	TEMA	840 718,07	280 239,35					1 120 957,42
2	3	2G-MED09-425	TOSCA	1 758 750,00	586 250,00					2 345 000,00
2	1	2G-MED09-445	WATERLOSS	1 436 841,00	409 947,00					1 846 788,00
1	2	2G-MED09-447	WIDE	1 172 530,50	390 843,50					1 563 374,00
1	2	2G-MED09-451	WOODE3	952 404,00	295 188,00					1 247 592,00
2	2	2G-MED09-452	ZeroCO2	1 403 560,73	467 853,58					1 871 414,31

\*\*\*

**STRATEGIC PROJECTS - 1ST CALL - PRIORITY 2.2**

Priority	Objective	Internal reference	Acronym	ERDF	National co finance	IPA Montenegro	Montenegrin co finance	Total eligible budget
2	2	1S-MED10-002	MARIE	4 511 098,00	1 402 782,00	123 454,00	21 786,00	6 059 120,00
2	2	1S-MED10-009	PROFORBIOMED	4 239 550,85	1 347 632,15			5 587 183,00
2	2	1S-MED10-029	ELIH-Med	7 375 972,00	2 282 124,00			9 658 096,00

\*\*\*

**STRATEGIC PROJECTS - 1ST CALL - PRIORITY 2.3**

Priority	Objective	Internal reference	Acronym	ERDF	National co finance	IPA Fund	IPA National co finance	Total eligible budget
2	3	2S-MED11-01	MEDESS-4MS	4 716 158,15	1 318 159,60	95 200,00	16 800,00	6 146 317,75

\*\*\*