

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

**ANNUAL**  
**IMPLEMENTATION**  
**REPORT**  
**2012**

*Final draft version*

*May 2013*



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 2012
	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
- DATAR > 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
- TF > Task Force
- TN > Transnational
- WG > Working Group
- WP > Written Procedure

➤ Appendices:

- MED Programme meetings 2012 (Monitoring Committees, Selection Committees, NCP meetings) (No. 1)
- In Itinere final evaluation report (No. 2)
- Analysis of submitted capitalization projects by CESPI (No.3)
- Complete list of programme activities in the participating countries (No. 4)
- Annual reports of the programme's Liaison Offices (No. 5)

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

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

The programme has obviously evolved significantly. As regards the projects, calls for strategic projects were developed and implemented, as well as 'targeted' projects and a final call for (capitalisation) projects. On the programme side, a structured capitalisation strategy was launched and new follow-up tools developed (detailed later in this report). Since May 2012, Task Force meetings to prepare the 2014-2020 programme were put in place, and becoming also important forums of discussion. Significant changes have also occurred in the composition of JTS/MA teams since two years.

Short summary of preceding years of programming:

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 deprogrammed 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.

Main milestones in 2012:

During the year 2012, the programme developed a concept of Targeted Projects, using the mainly positive experience from the calls for strategic projects; the specific Terms of Reference elaborated to further define the contents of the call and what was expected from projects. Two Targeted calls were opened; one for Transport projects and another, for Renewable energy and energy efficiency topics, combining financing from the Priority axis 1 and 2. Whereas the Transport call had limited response from the stakeholders and proposals were in general of insufficient quality (only 4 projects were selected), the 'Energy' call draw in a satisfactory amount of quality applications. What also seems important to note is that for almost half of the eligible applications, the Lead Partners was a newcomer for MED programme. The call seemingly had managed to attract new participants to the programme. As a result, 12 projects were selected and another 7 placed in a waiting list, to be definitely programmed when there would again be sufficient budget available.

As the result of the transport call, the Monitoring Committee made a (difficult) decision to ask for a budget modification of the OP, transferring remaining 10M€ from the Priority axis towards the priorities 1 and 2, where the programme seemed to receive adequate response in terms of quality projects. Reducing the original budget for transport priority was the only remaining option when all types of calls launched were only receiving low and medium quality offer. The Committee came to the conclusion, supported by an analysis from the on-going evaluation team, that the definition of transport priority in the OP was too limited and could only attract a small number of stakeholders.

The programme also prepared a call for capitalization projects, launched and closed during the second half of the year. New tools such as a modified application form and a new evaluation grid were elaborated to support the new type of call, open to previously formed project clusters but also other partnerships that proposed to capitalize deliverables resulting from MED projects and from other on-going programmes. The 35 project proposals received were under the evaluation phase at the end of the year (planned to be selected in March 2013).

With the 2012 calls, the MED programme not only has committed its whole original budget but also has engaged to the call for capitalization projects, most of the ERDF returning from 1<sup>st</sup> call projects that did not spend their whole budget by the end of the operations.

During 2012, all first call projects ended their activities, but several had additional closing delays and difficulties to obtain certification of their expenses, so the actual closing process still continues in 2013. In parallel, the first projects from the second call started to end their activities during 2012.

The last programme evaluation campaign was launched and this time, also strategic projects were to be evaluated. The 'in itinere' final report is expected to be delivered in early 2013.

The Year 2012 saw also the launching of the new programming exercise (2014 – 2020). The first Task Force meeting was called upon, under the Cyprus Presidency of the Monitoring Committee, in May.

The above mentioned milestones correspond to a dynamic exercise consisting of adapting the strategy and tools established in the approved OP to the results of a continuous evaluation on the programme's achievements.

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

- a) Management and monitoring;
- b) Strategic and Targeted projects
- c) Integrated management of ERDF and IPA funding;
- d) Capitalisation and the lessons learned
- e) Conclusions of the *in itinere* evaluation.
- f) Task Force 2014-2020

#### 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. 8 operations (16 structures) were controlled with a random sample established by the Audit Authority. The audit was carried out by the Deloitte firm, 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 0,0019%. Following this, the Group of Auditors decided that the sample level will be maintained to 8% in the year 2013. 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. One of these checks was still on-going by the end of 2012, but for the other one, no ineligible amount was found.

Even if there were no particular doubts about the proper functioning of the audit trail, the Managing Authority carried out 4 on the spot visits during 2012. Altogether, 4 partners participating to 27 projects were visited.

Monitoring on-going projects:

The 1<sup>st</sup> call projects programmed in early 2009, all had ended their activities during 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. During 2012, almost all 2<sup>nd</sup> call projects that foresaw less than 36 months of operational time, had asked for prolongations. 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.

Yet again in 2012, and despite the economical crisis affecting the spending capacities of public structures, the programme 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 new *fact sheets*;
- 2) reception and processing of progress reports from ongoing projects as well as modifications to budgets or partnerships; consolidation of data bases;

- 3) participation of the JTS in launching events of new projects, 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) and further developing the programme library;
- 7) activities contributing to the development of the next programme period (Task Force meetings and public procurements for outsourcing).

The closure of the projects has been anticipated by creating a Final Report, composed of 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 (but uploadable on the monitoring tool)

, and seeks to promote a qualitative approach to the project results. This is also a consequence of recommendations from the first programme evaluation report.

By the end of the year, 24 final reports of the 1<sup>st</sup> call projects had been received. 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. This is a problematic issue and will create higher decommitment risk in 2013, when the annual budget amount is double in regard to 2012.

#### B) Strategic and Targeted projects:

Seven strategic projects were on-going during the year 2012, although the latest ones: two transport projects MEDNET and FUTURMED selected in January 2012 were only at their very beginning.

The most advanced strategic projects, (3 on energy efficiency), MARIE, ELIH-MED and PROFORBIOMED, continued their activities and have started interesting and promising joint capitalising activities. Marie and Elih-Med have been producing together a policy paper that will be presented to relevant EC departments in Brussels in early 2013, and more and more links are developing between these major projects. It seems that the most advanced strategic projects are taking the input and advice of the JTS accompanying their implementation, and seeking ways to capitalise, promote and diffuse their results through increased cooperation. Their possibilities to gain visibility and impact Mediterranean policies in their sector seem now more likely than when their activities began. However, it is clear that the spending capacity of these projects is not essentially bigger than that of standard projects, and this might create negative consequences to the decommitment risk in 2013 (double annual budget amount).

By the end of the year, almost 100% of the ERDF funds allocated to the programme (excluding the Technical Assistance budget), have already been committed to projects.

The concept of Targeted projects was developed. They were meant to be simple projects, not strategic, but more concentrated in certain themes and oriented by Terms of reference for the call. Two calls were launched during the year: one for OP Objectif 3.1, another for Objectifs 1.1/1.2, and 2.2. Altogether 23 projects were selected (19 in the innovation priorities, axis 1 and 2 and 4 in transport priority, axis 3). Their activities will start in early 2013.

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

All modification and preparation work was completed and the programme was ready to start to implement the integrated system, while the first (strategic) 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.

The Commission did not sign the Financial Agreements before spring 2012, and by June the Managing Authority had signed and the documents were sent to the four IPA countries to national signature procedures. They were finally completed by the end of 2012 for all other IPA countries except Albania, where the signature was still pending.

While waiting for their IPA partners to become eligible, the Strategic projects programmed in late 2011 and early 2012, made arrangements that allowed the ERDF partners (mainly the LP) to take in charge travel costs of these partners, and thus allow them to take part to the project meetings.

As almost all selected Targeted projects had at least one IPA partner, practically the whole IPA envelope was programmed by the end of the year. A very small amount mainly in the Priority axis 4 was still remaining for the call for capitalization projects.

As all IPA budget available for the Axis 3 had been committed in January (for IPA partners in strategic project MEDNET), the Selection Committee decided in September to allocate instead an ERDF budget to a Croatian partner taking part in a transport Targeted project. However, this budget would not become eligible before the adhesion of Croatia to the EU, in July 2013.

The programme had organized, together with the IPA national coordinations, several information and promotion activities throughout the year, and had encouraged the Lead Partners to search for IPA partners when developing new projects. The programme was successful in attracting a sufficient number of IPA partners to new projects and committed the available budget in a short time.

#### D) Capitalisation and lessons learned:

The on-going MED projects showed an 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.

Whereas a spontaneous clustering process has an aim in itself, in bringing together projects and helping them to enhance their results by joint action, another clustering process organized by the MED Programme (MA/JTS + CESPI) it was also meant to prepare partnerships that could answer to a specific call for capitalisation projects, that was launched in the summer, just after having organised 4 different specific peer reviews (1) Urban models and climate change 2) Coastal zones 3) Web based platform and 4) Transport) in June. 35 capitalization projects were received, partly from MED clusters but also from other types of new partnerships, and they were under evaluation procedure by the end of the year. It seems that more or less half of these projects propose to



capitalize also other deliverables and results than those of the MED projects, which can be seen as a positive sign of opening the partnerships to input from other EU funded programmes.

To further analyse the typology of capitalization projects proposed under this first ‘experimental’ call, the external experts for capitalization (CESPI) were asked to provide a global analysis (Annex4). The positive aspect seems to be that almost half of these project proposals combine partners from both MED projects and from other ETC or thematic programmes, like IVC, 7FP, Life, SEE, SUDOE, and others. This means that the key message of opening up the partnerships to complementary experiences from other programmes and areas (external MED countries), has been heard. At the same time, only part of the proposals have well identified their target groups and their message from the very start: most proposals still keep on the level of sharing tools and outputs within the enlarged partnership, and do not really foresee larger transferability of results. Nevertheless these new partnerships are globally speaking a step to the right direction. The capitalization projects will be selected in March 2013.

The programme library:

The JTS has elaborated a database enabling to organise the ‘memory’ of the programme. This database contains detailed 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. The storage of this data allows the statistical treatment of what are the final outcomes of the projects and the programme as a whole, answering a double purpose: the analysis and evaluation of projects and programme’s achievements but also providing a comprehensible set of outputs available for further dissemination and (re)use. 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. This follow-up of project contents in order to build the database that feeds the online library will be helpful in several ways, in particular:

- Helping the project operators answering to future calls, to find information about what has been produced, and to profit from existing results
- Facilitating contacts and exchange between on-going projects
- Providing a reliable source of information for statistical analysis, both for the programme instances and for research purposes
- Offering the general public a structured way to find out about the results of the programme
- Contributing 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 through a userfriendly search engine covering several possibilities concerning both thematic approach and 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.

So far the ‘library’ only contains outputs and results from closed projects (1<sup>st</sup> call projects in 2012), but it will progressively include the results of all projects financed within the programme. The library is accessible online in the address: [www.programmemed.eu/library](http://www.programmemed.eu/library)

E) *In itinere* evaluation:

The first interim report of the In Itinere evaluation, delivered in 2010, made observations about the programme performance. 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, as already indicated in the 2011 report, the programme had concentrated its efforts in these aspects by working in particular on new indicators for strategic projects, enlarging its team with officers in charge of horizontal tasks and quality issues, and re-organising its staff in different units. Although most suggestions from the intermediate report cannot be substantially addressed during this period, the programme carried on with its 2011 efforts to improve its implementation.

During the year 2012, the programme management:

- 1) carried on with the indicators defined for the strategic calls. The results are not available yet.
- 2) have brought new tools and procedures in addition to a systematic quality review of project final reports of the first classical call. This includes databases on key aspects and deliverables of projects to follow accurate added-value, realisations and outputs of the projects as well as to shed light on project quality performance. Thanks to the databases, first statistical data could be compiled and a crossed gap analysis of the programme realisations could be performed to support the task force decision making. The collection and compilation of data is still going on and will enable the programme to dispose of a full picture of its projects accurate realisations and outputs. Projects will also benefit from these data through the Library of the programme (based on the database of deliverables produced by former and on-going projects).  
By the end of 2012, new follow-up approach has been designed and will be tested with pilot target projects starting in 2013.
- 3) carried on with the revision of application forms and procedures when launching the calls in 2012 (targeted calls and capitalisation call) although, as already mentioned, many of the suggestions from the evaluation report can only be partly addressed during this period.

During 2012 the In Itinere team carried out the last evaluation campaign, including also the evaluation of Strategic projects, and a new evaluation on the improved programme procedures. The Final Report was provided (Annex3) to conclude the three-year-long evaluation and accompanying experience.

Both the expert team and the programme management found that this long accompanying and follow-up of the programme by external evaluators was an extremely useful method of improving its implementation (as demonstrated in the report that shows how the programme took and will take into account the findings of the evaluation team).

The programme evaluation team has also accompanied the Task Force in its start up of new programming, and provided situation analysis such as benchmarking study between MED projects and those of thematic programmes (7FP, Life, Marco Polo...)

#### F) Task Force

In order to face the upcoming new programming period with sufficient preparation, the MC 2012 Presidency (Cyprus) proposed to establish a Task Force (TF), having the objective of elaborating the new MED OP 2014-2020. The first meeting was held in May, and the TF decided to organize its work through internal Rules of Procedure, which then were proposed by the MA.

The Task Force also decided to ask for external expertise in moderating the meetings and drafting the OP, in defining programme specific indicators, in carrying out a SWOT analysis of the new programme space, and also for Ex ante evaluation/Strategic environmental assessment of the new OP. The MA set out a timetable for this expertise, and the MC gave its agreement to finance it from the Technical assistance budget of the actual MED programme.

The Task Force had yet two other meetings, in September and in December. Meanwhile the Moderator was selected via a public tender procedure, and the Terms of Reference of all other expertise elaborated and mostly also validated. The tenders were to be launched in 2013. The TF agreed on the procedure for the designation of the MA of the programme for the period 2014-2010. Despite this efficient organization and mandating of national representatives to the TF, the progress in 2012 was somewhat hindered by the lack of framework elements from the Commission. The programme space was not yet known, neither the foreseen budget nor the national Partnership Agreements. The final Regulations would not come out before summer 2013.

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

By the end of 2012, 124 projects had been financed and 71 of them already finished their activities. 12 projects were closed (final payment carried out) by the end of the year. The three strategic projects programmed in January had all started their activities, although the transport projects had to undergo modifications that delayed their effective launching, and were on-going.

Two calls for Targeted projects (Axis 3 and Axis 1-2) were launched and altogether 16 projects were selected before the end of the year. However, only four of these projects came from Axis 3, as the overall quality of applications within this priority was not deemed sufficient. After several exchanges and debates over this complex situation, the Monitoring Committee decided to submit a demand of modification of the original budget allocation of the OP: 10M€ euros were proposed to be transferred from the Axis 3 towards the Axis 1 and 2, allowing more resources to the programming of projects from these priorities. As this envelope would only become available after the validation of the requested modification, the Selection Committee decided to establish a ‘reserve list’ of programmable Targeted projects. 7 projects from Priorities 1 and 2 were placed on this list, and could start their activities if and when the modification was validated by the EC.

The programme had reached by the end of the year practically 100% commitment of its ERDF and IPA budget (excluding the Technical Assistance).

The 71 standard projects that had so far ended their activities, reached an average level of ERDF absorption of 86%. Taking into account the difficulties of public sector structures in the middle of an economic crisis, the programme management considers this as a very good score for the standard projects.

By the end of 2012, all standard, strategic, and targeted calls for projects had been carried out. The call for capitalization projects was closed in October, and the proposals were under evaluation by the JTS. The available budget for programming these projects is composed of ERDF returning from the closed 1<sup>st</sup> call projects.

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

	Expenditure paid out by the beneficiaries included in payment claims sent to	Corresponding public contribution	Expenditure paid by the body responsible for making	Total payments received from the Commission
--	--	-----------------------------------	---	---

	the managing authority		payments to the beneficiaries	
Priority axis 1 State the fund concerned ERDF	27 168 395,42	27 168 395,42	12 315 910,3	9 263 816,29
Priority axis 2 State the fund concerned ERDF	21 355 572,21	21 355 572,21	10 956 139,32	6 891 425,31
Priority axis 3 State the fund concerned ERDF	4 810 044,58	4 810 044,58	2 882 362,01	1 860 606,33
Priority axis 4 State the fund concerned ERDF	11 593 886,19	11 593 886,19	3 393 746,45	3 532 799,73
Priority axis 5 (TA) State the fund concerned ERDF	3 820 527,63	3 820 527,63	503 803,66	911 813,68
<b>total amount</b>	68 748 426,03	68 748 426,03	30 051 961,74	22 460 461,34
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. The programming of targeted projects has not brought any significant change in the situation. 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 is only one project 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).

***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. Allowing project extensions has helped many partnerships to carry out most of their foreseen activities. (Although this measure will become more and more contradictory during the years 2013-14 when the programme is facing a higher decommitment risk)

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. All First call projects have ended their activities, and some 2<sup>nd</sup> call projects have also finished before the end of the year.

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 clear that they face the same risks and constraints as standard projects, potentially subject to budget cuts, political constraints and delays in certifying expenses. Their incapacity of absorbing funds

more rapidly than standard projects has also been observed and analysed in the In Itinere final report (in annexes). 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.

In a more global approach towards the results and outcome of MED projects, the JTS has an on-going internal discussion on the development of quality criteria, and how to apply this quality approach in the day-to-day monitoring of projects. We realise that the application form and the evaluation tools have to be improved, using our actual experience to redefine them, so that the exact information needed to monitor the quality of project results, can be better obtained. This work is on-going and should mainly have impact on the preparation of next period selection and monitoring tools.

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 2012 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 transport projects in particular, the programme evaluation team has carried out a specific analysis on them, and exposed the main arguments to explain why the priority was not more successful. Contrary to other domains such as innovation and support to SME's, the domain of transport has been completely focused on maritime transport and more so, the question of multimodality. The quantity of potential project operators thus remains limited, and many of them are already taking part to MED projects.

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 (over 60 altogether) work directly with enterprises, it should be considered logical that the number of enterprises involved in project activities is approaching 2000.

## **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) The difficulties within the JTS staff, resulting partly from understaffing, had been resolved by a restructuring and enlargement carried out during 2011. The reporting year has passed without major difficulties and the JTS staff has been on more adequate level, of competency and of number, to face the number of calls and on-going/finishing projects. This has protected the programme from additional delays in evaluation, programming, and monitoring procedures, and certainly contributed to the final spending capacity of the projects and to the low error rate.

However, we realise that the horizontal issues of communication, capitalization and quality improvement are still difficult to address in a satisfactory way. In 2012 we still only had one communication officer, and two project officers allocating a small part of their working time for the contents of our communication tools and for social media. Taking into account the size of the programme (eligible area and number of projects), it is impossible to address both the communication of the programme, and provide support to the communication of projects, with only one person responsible of the communication. More resources would be needed for these aspects in the near future.

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 and discussion are now on-going with the Presage technical team, to achieve a more substantial improvement of the tool for the next period of programming.

Internal difficulties have been observed equally with some of the public tenders that the MA is contracting for the programme. 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. They now perform the programme audit with what could be qualified as coherent with a minimum level of requirements.

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 part of the 1<sup>st</sup> call projects that had ended their

activities in 2011 and during the first half of 2012, were closed with final payment carried out. 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 have not yet been really 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.

The difficulties to obtain quality projects for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Priority Axis continued with the Targeted call. Whereas we could observe that this type of one-step call, with a specific Terms of Reference, was successful to other Priority Axis (1 and 2), and brought in both quality projects and new structures (almost half of partner structures in these priorities were newcomers in MED programme).

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

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

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

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

The activities developed by the Liaison Office during 2012 showed a slight difference from the previous years, as both programmes are fully running, in this regard the activities developed by the LO for 2012 were mostly related to Communication and Capitalisation, besides carrying out administrative tasks and participating in JTS meetings, project seminars, ENPI CBC MED and MED Committees, Task Force meetings for Future MED and ENI .

In the **Communication field**, the Liaison Officer took part in several MED Project Final and Capitalisation Conferences and Committees. Regarding the new calls of the MED Programme, it informed the beneficiaries through bilateral meetings and organised the Spanish National **seminars for the target calls** related to finding **innovative solutions in the energy field** (axe 1 and 2 of the MED Operational Programme) and **transport** (axe 3) (Valencia, 28 February 2012) and the **Capitalisation Call seminar** (Valencia, 18<sup>th</sup> of September).

The L.O. also actively participated in the organisation of the **Joint event between MED and ENPI CBC MED “Spotlight on the Mediterranean area: Uniting our efforts for the future”** held under the Cypriot Presidency, in 24-25 October in Nicosia.

The **Liaison Office MED- ENPI web space** was updated with interviews to partners belonging to MED and ENPI CBC MED projects, latest news on ENPI, facts and figures and capitalisation events between both programmes. <http://www.programmemed.eu/en/liaison-offices/liaison-med-enpi.html>.

As regards to MED’s **Capitalisation process** the L.O. up dated the common **EuroMediterranean Data base** with the latest MED and ENPI CBC MED approved projects, to detect clusters and information to foster capitalisation in the Mediterranean area, based on this data base it presented **8 possible common topics**: Agrofood, Tourism, Energy, Water for 2020, Waste management,



Protection Maritime zones, Territorial Governance and cultural dialogue and heritage. It was decided to follow up the common clustering process in water related to climate change and energy efficiency. By these means, the Joint **Capitalisation Pilot Action between MED LO and Interact Med lab Group is analysing projects, in the field of energy efficiency in the building sector in the Mediterranean area**, including the whole geographic area (10 ETC and neighbouring programmes). It has also supported the peer reviews organised by CESPI for the MED Clustering Process.

### *Liaison Office Thessaloniki*

The Thessaloniki Liaison Office had the following two main objectives for 2012:

1. To maximise the participation of IPA Partners in the MED Projects
2. To contribute at the maximum to the Capitalisation Process by the involvement of the IPA element

In order to reach the goals the LO relied on the networking and cooperation with the JTS, the IPA NCPs and the other important Programmes of the area e.g. SEE and Adriatic. Like this the LO activities can be grouped as follows:

- General Tasks
- Event Organisation
- Communication Activities
- Development of the communication and capitalisation tools

The following tables are showing the content and timing of each activity under the respective group of activities:

#### *General tasks*

<i>Activities</i>	<i>Time frame</i>
Participation in the management tasks related to the IPA participation (awareness raising, contracting and follow up etc.)	All 2012
Providing necessary information for applicants and project partners	All 2012

#### *Events Organisation*

<i>Event</i>	<i>Timing</i>
Information Seminar about the Targeted Call for proposals in Zagreb (Croatia)	21st of February 2012
Transnational IPA Seminar about the Targeted Call for proposals in Podgorica	2nd of March 2012

(Montenegro)	
National IPA Info Day in Tirana (Albania)	12th of March 2012
National IPA Info Day in Tuzla (Bosnia and Herzegovina)	27th of March 2012
IPA Capitalisation Day with the participation of ERDF Lead Partners and projects from other programmes in Budva (Montenegro)	4th of October 2012

### ***Communication Activities***

<b><i>Activities</i></b>	<b><i>Time frame</i></b>
Develop and follow up of the Liaison Office space of the programmes web site	All 2012
Continuous publications in the Programme's newsletter about the IPA issues	All 2012
To participate in MED's Capitalisation Events.	All 2012
Participation in the organization of the MED Annual Event	Second half 2012

### ***Development of the communication and capitalisation tools***

<b><i>Communication tool</i></b>	<b><i>Contribution</i></b>
LO area of the Website	Posting continuously updates regarding the Integration of the IPA funds. Providing online interactive availability
Newsletter	Periodic contribution with the latest updates on the IPA integration issue. Furthermore to propose to have the next issue dedicated fully to the IPA integration (work done so far, future opportunities etc.)
Development of the IPA Partners database	Developing a large scale stakeholders database of IPA partners including data from other programmes in close cooperation with the JTS
Development of the Brochure "Close up on the Western Balkan in the MED"	Identifying and presenting the added value of the IPA partners within the

Programme”	approved an running projects of the first and second call for proposals and in the first call for strategic projects
Thessaloniki LO flyer	A new flyer of the LO presenting its services and 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.

An internal monitoring tool (checkgrid) is being used for the assessment of these documents.

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.

103 operations out of 105 from the first and second call for proposals and from the first call for strategic projects (objectives 2.2 and 2.3) submitted payment claims for which expenditure has been declared in 2012. Regarding the second call for strategic projects (priority 3), operations were to submit their first claims between November 2012 and January 2013.

Assessment of the payment claims, 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 2012. 44 projects from the first and second 'traditional' calls for proposals finished in 2012. Ending projects require special monitoring in order to prevent any significant underspending.

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

In 2012, JTS members attended 46 project Steering Committees in an effort to provide better technical supervision of approved projects:

IP-SME's – Venice (Italy), January 12<sup>th</sup>

ELIH-MED - Athens (Greece), January 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup>

ZERO WASTE – Thessaloniki (Greece), January 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup>

MET3 – Athens (Greece), January 30<sup>th</sup>

MED KED – Barcelona (Spain), January 30<sup>th</sup> and February 1<sup>st</sup>

MEDSTRATEGY – Teruel (Spain), February 8<sup>th</sup>

ENERMED - Thessaloniki (Greece), February 15<sup>th</sup>

MED TECHNOPOLIS – Faro (Portugal), February 15<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>

MEDISS – Forcalquier (France), February 17<sup>th</sup>

RESPONSIBLE MED – Terrassa (Spain), February 22<sup>th</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup>

PACMAN – Avignon (France), February 29<sup>th</sup>

LOSAMECHEM – Genoa (Italy), March 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup>

MEID – Nice / Sophia Antipolis (France), March 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>

KnowInTarget – Marseilles (France), March, 16<sup>th</sup>

MEDIWAT - Aix-en-Provence (France), March 16<sup>th</sup>

WATERLOSS - Aix-en-Provence (France), March 16<sup>th</sup>  
TEMA – Marseilles (France), March 16<sup>th</sup>  
OTREMED – Palermo (Italy), March 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup>  
KnowInTarget – Athens (Greece), April 5<sup>th</sup>  
INFLOWENCE – Malta, April 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>  
MEDESS4MS – Barcelona (Spain), May 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>  
SCORE - Savona (Italy), May 7<sup>th</sup>  
Proforbiomed – Kastoria (Cyprus), May 8<sup>th</sup> -10<sup>th</sup>  
Waterloss – Barcelona (Spain), May 9<sup>th</sup> – 11<sup>th</sup>  
ELIH MED – Alghero (Italy), May 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup>  
MARIE – Turin (Italy), May 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup>  
IKTIMED – Rome (Italy), June 28<sup>th</sup>  
SEATOLAND - La Spezia (Italy), July 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>  
INNONAUTICS - Brussels (Belgium), July 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>  
AGROCHEPACK – Matera (Italy), September 10<sup>th</sup>  
MEDESS4MS – Rome (Italy), September 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup>  
HOMER – Heraklion (Greece), October 2<sup>nd</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup>  
ELIH-MED – Malaga (Spain), October 8<sup>th</sup> – 10<sup>th</sup>  
PACMAN – Valence (Spain), October 9<sup>th</sup>  
PROFORBIOMED – Faro (Portugal), October 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>  
MED KED – Milan (Italy), November 7<sup>th</sup>  
MEDEEA - Attard (Malta), November 8<sup>th</sup>  
ENERSCAPES – Rome (Italy), November 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup>  
MARIE - Brussels (Belgium), November 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup>  
FREIGHT4ALL – Paris (France), November 27<sup>th</sup>  
ECOMARK – Brussels (Belgium), November 29<sup>th</sup>  
ELIH-MED – Rome (Italy), December 6<sup>th</sup>  
LIMIT4WEDA – Rome (Italy), December 6<sup>th</sup>

IPSMES – Thessaloniki (Greece), December, 7<sup>th</sup>

HIDDEN – Thessaloniki (Greece), December 14<sup>th</sup>

FUTUREMED - Thessaloniki (Greece), December 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>

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

MEDESS4MS – Limassol (Cyprus), February 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup>

HOMER – Turin (Italy), April 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup>

MEDNET – Rome (Italy), July 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup>

FUTUREMED – Rome (Italy), July 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>

Equally, the JTS has participated to the Final Conferences of the projects ending in 2012:

SOSTENUTO – Valencia (Spain), January, 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>

FORET MODELE – Salamanca (Spain), February 27<sup>th</sup>

Agro-environmed – Valencia (Spain), February, 29<sup>th</sup>

CLIMEPORT – Valencia (Spain), March 1<sup>st</sup>

MEDISS – Paris (France), March 2<sup>nd</sup>

PHILOXENIA – Thessaloniki (Greece), March 10<sup>th</sup>

SECUR MED PLUS – Genoa (Italy), March 14<sup>th</sup>

SMILIES – Rethymno (Greece), March 19<sup>th</sup>

MEMO – Athens (Greece), March 27<sup>th</sup>

AGRISLES – Bastia (France), April 18<sup>th</sup>

WASMAN – Perugia (Italy), April 19<sup>th</sup>

TERCONMED – Valencia (Spain), April 19<sup>th</sup>

CULTURE – Pisa (Italy), April 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>

WINNOVATE – Athens (Greece), April 27<sup>th</sup>

WATERinCORE – Thessaloniki (Greece), May 24<sup>th</sup>

ZERO WASTE – Rome (Italy), June 8<sup>th</sup>

MACC BAM – Athens (Greece), September 18<sup>th</sup>

TEMA – Naples (Italy), October 5<sup>th</sup>

PROTECT – Brussels (Belgium), October 10th

APICE – Venice (Italy), November 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>

RESPONSIBLE MED - Firenze/Lucca (Italy), November 7<sup>th</sup> -9<sup>th</sup>

MEDPAN NORTH - Antalya (Turkey), November 24<sup>th</sup>-26<sup>th</sup>

### **On-the-spot checks performed by the MA/JTS**

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.

Despite the very low irregularity rate observed by other levels of control, the following visits were performed in 2012:

#### **1. University of Maribor (Slovenia): Maribor, 4<sup>th</sup> April 2012**

Projects concerned by the check:

ENERSCAPES

IKTIMED

LOSAMEDCHEM

R&D INDUSTRY

#### **2. Temi Zammit Foundation (Malta): Msida, 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> April 2012**

Projects concerned by the check:

I.C.E.

RIMED

TRANSit

CreaMED

IKTIMED

In.FLOW.ence

MEID

SEATOLAND

#### **3. University of Algarve (Portugal): Faro, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

Projects concerned by the check:

INS MED

PROTECT

ICS

IKTIMED

KnowInG

MED TECHNOPOLIS

TEMA

#### **4. Sicily Region (Italy): Palermo, 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

Projects concerned by the check:

BACKGROUNDS

QUBIC

CypFire

MEDIWAT

AGRISLES

MedLab

SECUR MED PLUS

TERCONMED

IRH-Med

KNOWING

OTREMED

As mentioned before, these 4 partners were selected according to the methodology approved by the Monitoring Committee. In 2012, the following criteria were taken into account:

- Partners for which the documentation submitted did not provide reasonable assurance during the administrative verifications
- Partners with a significant delay and a low implementation rate
- Partners involved in many MED projects

As a result, no findings involving financial corrections were made, but some general qualitative recommendations were transmitted to the structures concerned:



- Audit trail to be improved
- Mechanisms in place to avoid double funding to be better developed
- Role of the staff allocated to the project to be better explained
- Delays due to the turn-over within structures to be avoided
- Communication between partners to be enriched
- Articulation/capitalisation of the activities between the different services of the same structure participating in different MED projects to be set up

The on-the-spot verifications were performed in coordination with the national delegations.

### **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 open calls, procedures and financial eligibility rules to follow.

The following events and activities included the participation of the MA/JTS staff and were mainly linked to the launch of the targeted call on innovation for renewable energy and energy efficiency solutions in Mediterranean regions and cities (Objectives 1.1, 1.2 and 2.2), to the publication of the targeted call “Strengthening Mediterranean port activities and EU accessibility with simpler norms and a better use of information technologies” (Objective 3.1) and to the opening of the call for capitalisation:

On 21<sup>st</sup> February 2012, the MED JTS and the MED/IPA Liaison Office participated in the national seminar that was hold in Zagreb (Croatia)

On 28<sup>th</sup> February 2012, the MED JTS and the MED/ENPI Liaison Office participated in the national seminar that was hold in Valencia (Spain)

On 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2012, the MED JTS and the MED/IPA Liaison Office participated in the transnational IPA info day that was hold in Podgorica (Montenegro)

On 12<sup>th</sup> March 2012, the MED/IPA Liaison Office participated in the national info day that was organised in Tirana (Albania)

On 13<sup>th</sup> March 2012, the MED JTS participated in the national information meeting organised by the French delegation in Marseilles (France)

On 15<sup>th</sup> March 2012, the MED JTS participated in the national seminar that was hold in Florence (Italy)

On 27<sup>th</sup> March 2012, the MED/IPA Liaison Office participated in the national info day that was organised in Tuzla (Bosnia and Herzegovina)

On 18<sup>th</sup> September 2012, the MED/ENPI Liaison Office Valencia participated in the capitalisation national info day hold in Valencia (Spain)

On 18<sup>th</sup> September 2012, the MED JTS participated via videoconference in the capitalisation national info day hold in Florence (Italy)

On 4<sup>th</sup> October 2012, the MED/IPA Liaison Office participated in the capitalisation transnational IPA info day that was hold in Budva (Montenegro)

## **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:

**CLIMEPORT** – Reduction and redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on January, 13<sup>th</sup>

**SOSTENUTO** - Redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on January, 10<sup>th</sup>

**ZEROWASTE** – Withdrawal of a partner and redistribution of the ERDF allocation among the partners (ERDF reduction) approved on January 11<sup>th</sup>

**LIMIT4WEDA** – Reduction of the ERDF allocation, extension to the project duration (6 months) approved on January 4<sup>th</sup>

**ZEROWASTE** – Extension to the project duration (2 months – beyond 36 months) approved on February, 15<sup>th</sup>

**ZEROCO2** – Extension to the project duration (8 months) approved on February, 16<sup>th</sup>

**I.C.E.** – Budget modification and redistribution of ERDF allocation approved on February 20<sup>th</sup>

**2BParks** – Change of the project partnership approved on February, 21<sup>st</sup>

**CREPUDMED** – Redistribution of the ERDF allocation among the partners approved on March, 1<sup>st</sup>

**RESPONSIBLE MED** – Budget modification and extension to the project duration (6 months) approved on March, 6<sup>th</sup>

**IP SMEs** – Budget modification, extension to the project duration (6 months), change to the project partnership, redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on February, 24<sup>th</sup>

**MARIE** – Budget modification, extension to the project duration (9 months), change to the project partnership, redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on March, 5<sup>th</sup>

**NOVAGRIMED** – Reduction of the ERDF allocation approved on March, 9<sup>th</sup>

**SusTEn** – Extension to the project duration (6 months – beyond 36 months), redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on March, 9<sup>th</sup>

**CREAMED** – Extension to the project duration (6 months) and redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on March, 19<sup>th</sup>

**Iktimed** – Change of the project partnership approved on March, 20<sup>th</sup>

**Med Emporion** – Extension to the project duration (3 months) and budget change approved on March, 21<sup>st</sup>

**AGRISLES** – Reduction of the ERDF allocation and redistribution of the ERDF allocation among the partners

**Freight4all** – Extension to the project duration (6 months), change of the project partnership and redistribution of the ERDF allocation between the partners

**MACC BAM** - Change of the project partnership approved, extension to the project duration (beyond 36 months) and reduction and redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on March, 30<sup>th</sup>

**APICE** - Redistribution of the ERDF budget among the partners approved on May, 14<sup>th</sup>

**REINPO RETAIL** – Extension to the project duration (6 months) approved on April, 2<sup>nd</sup>

**CAT-Med** – Reduction and redistribution of the ERDF budget among the partners approved on April, 10<sup>th</sup>

**TEMA** - Extension to the project duration (6 months) and redistribution of the ERDF budget approved on April, 19<sup>th</sup>

**INNONAUTICS** – Extension to the project duration (4 months) approved on April, 24<sup>th</sup>

**FORET MODELE** – Redistribution of the ERDF allocation among the partners approved on April 30<sup>th</sup>

**PROTECT** – Extension to the project duration (beyond 36 months) and reduction of the ERDF allocation approved on May, 14<sup>th</sup>

**I.C.E.** – Extension to the project duration (2 months) approved on May, 14<sup>th</sup>

**MET3** - Redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on May, 30<sup>th</sup>

**PROTECT** - Redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on June, 11<sup>th</sup>

**MEDSTRATEGY** – Extension to the project duration (6 months) and redistribution of the ERDF allocation between the partners approved on May, 31<sup>st</sup>

**ICS** – Redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on June 18<sup>th</sup>

**Pays Med Urban** – Redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on June, 15<sup>th</sup>

**Proforbiomed** – Redistribution of the ERDF allocation among the partners approved on June, 20<sup>th</sup>

**MAREMED** – Redistribution of the ERDF allocation between the partners and change of the project partnership approved on November 16<sup>th</sup>

**WOODE3** – Extension to the project duration (5 months) approved on December 26<sup>th</sup>

**ELIH MED** – Change of the project partnership, reduction and redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on July, 17<sup>th</sup>

**EMMA** – Redistribution of the ERDF allocation and extension to the project duration approved on November, 29<sup>th</sup>

**OTREMED** – Budget modification and extension to the project duration (6 months) approved on September, 17<sup>th</sup>

**MEDNET** – Change of the project partnership, reduction and redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on July, 27<sup>th</sup>

**APICE** - Extension to the project duration (3 months) approved on July, 27<sup>th</sup>

**AGROENVIRONMED** – Reduction and redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on July, 30<sup>th</sup>

**COASTANCE** - Reduction and redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on July, 30<sup>th</sup>

**SOSTENUTO** - Reduction and redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on July, 31<sup>st</sup>

**EASY FINANCE** – Change of the project partnership, reduction of the ERDF allocation and extension to the project duration (6 months) approved on July, 31<sup>st</sup>

**MARIE** – Budget modification, redistribution of the ERDF allocation and change of the project partnership approved on September 12<sup>th</sup>

**KNOWINTARGET** – Reduction of the ERDF allocation and change of the project partnership approved on July, 4<sup>th</sup>

**SCORE** – Extension to the project duration (1 month) approved on September, 19<sup>th</sup>

**MED TECHNOPOLIS** – Budget modification approved on September, 26<sup>th</sup>

**REINPO RETAIL** – Budget modification and extension to the project duration approved on October, 16<sup>th</sup>

**ENERSCAPES** – Extension to the project duration (6 months) approved on October, 2<sup>nd</sup>

**2BParks** – Change of the project partnership approved on October, 12<sup>th</sup>

**MED-IPPC-NET** - Reduction and redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on October, 26<sup>th</sup>

**SEATOLAND** – Extension to the project duration approved on October, 16<sup>th</sup>

**LIMIT4WEDA** – Change of the project partnership, reduction and redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on November, 5<sup>th</sup>

**ENERMED** – Budget modification and redistribution of the ERDF budget approved on November, 5<sup>th</sup>

**IP SMEs** – Budget modification and change of the project partnership approved on November, 16<sup>th</sup>

**ICS** – Change of the project partnership, redistribution of the ERDF allocation and extension to the project duration approved on November, 27<sup>th</sup>

**ELIH MED** – Extension to the project duration, change of the project partnership and redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on December, 20<sup>th</sup>

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, since 2011 the JTS has noticed an increase in the modifications to project proposals previously approved by the Selection Committee. During 2012, the 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 modifications approved in 2012 concerned projects from the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.

The projects also requested ERDF reductions after the revision of their spending forecasts (15 cases during 2012). These reductions had an impact in the programming tables thus in the availability of funds.

Finally, the MA/JTS proposed the possibility to transfer the ERDF between the partners at the end of the project's life when there is a surplus of expenditures for some partners and a deficit for others. This proposal was accepted by the Selection Committee on the 24<sup>th</sup> January 2012, which decided to treat this question on individual case basis by the use of a written procedure. This possibility has since been used by 7 closing projects in 2012.

### **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 2012, the following projects were controlled:

#### **IP-SMEs (March 2012)**

- Chamber of Commerce Industry Craft and Agriculture of Venice (Italy)
- Professionals' Chamber of Thessaloniki (Greece)

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

#### **In.FLOW.ence (September 2012)**

- ANCI Lazio - National Association of the Italian Municipalities Lazio (Italy)
- Valencian Federation of Municipalities and Provinces (Spain)

This check was still on-going by the end of 2012.

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

The number of projects having declared expenditure to the European Commission in 2011 (94 in total) constituted the basis for a sampling exercise undertaken by the CICC on 13<sup>th</sup> January 2012 which was then validated by members of the Group of Auditors on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2012.

8 operations out of 94 were controlled in 2012. This control involved 8 Lead partners and 8 partners, based in 7 countries participating to the MED Programme (Spain, France, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Malta and Slovenia) for an amount of € 1266.287,73, corresponding to 5,73% of the expenditure declared to the Commission in 2011 (€ 2.101.880,65).

The projects selected under the random sample were:

MEDISS

I.C.E.

EASY FINANCE

MEDOSSIC

PROTECT

COASTANCE

Philoxenia

NOVAGRIMED

Taking into account the coverage obtained by the random sample, no complementary sample was selected.

In the random sample, an irregular amount was detected in respect of the MEDISS project (€24.19). The error rate in 2012 was thus 0.0019%.

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 8<sup>th</sup> November 2012, where the results of the auditing exercises undertaken in 2012 were presented and a workplan for audits in 2013 was established.

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

### **3 – Implementation by priority**

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

Qualitative analysis:

Codes for priority theme	Output indicators	Target value OP	Presage realised 2011	Presage realised 2012
01, 03, 04, 05, 09	No of transnational co-operation networks including research centres, economic operators and training centres/universities for facilitating technology transfer and the dissemination of innovative practices and know-how	15	28	61
	No of transnational studies/ plans/ strategies developed for facilitating innovation capitalisation and dissemination among resource, innovation and entrepreneurship centres	15	124	135
	No of SMEs involved in exchanges of experiences and technology transfer	20	1069	2104
	No of transnational structures for disseminating common standards for enhancing regional policies and innovations capacities	2	27	49
	No of projects for supporting innovation processes in the Med sp	18	45	51

During the first half of 2012, the 1<sup>st</sup> call projects treating this priority, ended their activity. Most of 2<sup>nd</sup> call projects were still on-going. 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 was only launched in 2012. In December, new projects were selected under this priority, and some also placed under a Reserve list (subject to OP modification)

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

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. The first call projects having ended within the reporting period (or the previous year), we were able, for the first time, to prodice inclusive data on their performance.

21 projects have been implemented under priority 1. Although all projects have implemented activities resulting in producing data (210 deliverables), building a community (113 deliverables), producing methods (98) and creating directly usable tools for the community (41), 10 projects' main outputs are methods, action plans and guidelines to support agro-food enterprises and markets (4), cultural and creative industries (1), eco-design process in business furniture (1), technology transfer (2), BA investments (1) and social and corporate responsibility. 5 project presented recommendations and policy papers in regards to eco-construction, cultural and creative industries, and ICT and innovation transfer. 4 other projects concentrated their actions on networking and community building (agro-food industries (2), support to innovation, and social and corporate responsibility). 2 online tools are also available thanks to 1 project on textile and clothing and one on legal, logistic and technological solutions for enterprises.

*An example of project:*



Site : <http://www.medtechnopolis.eu/>

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

Objective 1.1: Dissemination of innovative technologies and know-how

L'objectif du projet est de créer des structures d'interface technologique (SITs) de la génération "technopolis" dans les zones de faible développement économique et entrepreneurial et promouvoir l'innovation et l'économie de la connaissance grâce au lancement d'un cycle méditerranéen de Cours de Formation-Action (CFAs) destinés aux cadres et aux entrepreneurs. A terme, le projet vise à mettre en œuvre des Plans d'Action Régionale (PARs), ayant comme élément moteur les partenariats de Recherche & Formation-Action et pour l'Innovation et la Compétitivité, entre les entreprises et les institutions des 6 régions engagées à ce projet.

Ainsi, un ensemble de structures d'interfaces technologiques ont été créés en début de projet (ou renforcées par rapport aux bases posées lors de la période précédente) avec des Antennes

Technopolis, une Zone Technopolis (ville de Faro) et des structures d'interface multipolaires agissant à un niveau local régional, national ou européen et visant toutes à offrir informations et services aux citoyens et entrepreneurs.

Toujours dans la perspective du projet, la promotion de ces espaces et des cycles de formations ont été organisés et ont mobilisé 120 entrepreneurs. Parallèlement à cela 32 candidats (sur 33) ont également obtenu, outre le soutien du projet MEDTECHOPOLIS durant la préparation de son projet personnel, un diplôme niveau BAC+3 (équivalent 60 crédits ECTS).

Enfin, la mise en place des Plans d'Action Régionale (PARs), a permis l'organisation de « rencontres B2B » visant à favoriser l'échange et la création ou renforcement de réseau et ayant déjà réuni plus de 50 entreprises et dont la prochaine édition sera organisée au Portugal courant février, ces activités ont permis ce jour l'organisation de 150 réunions bilatérales et la création de 4 partenariats R &FA et INNOV/COMP.

### ***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. This accompanying work is most 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

Codes for priority themes	Output indicators	Target value OP	Presage realised 2011	Presage realised 2012
39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 48, 49, 51, 53, 54, 56	No of studies/planning guidelines/plans/methods/tools strategies realised/tested concerning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- environmental maritime cooperation and safety</li> <li>- improvement on energy savings</li> </ul> involving Med countries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- non-state actors</li> <li>- public authorities</li> <li>- authorities/bodies project partners but not being beneficiaries</li> </ul>	15	52 <i>-8 for maritime</i> <i>--44 for energy</i>	<b>86</b> <i>-19 for maritime</i> <i>--67 for energy</i>
	No of transnational management plans developed in the space on natural risks	5	7	<b>8</b>
	No of awareness-raising activities/initiatives carried out/promoted in the space on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- natural resources and heritage</li> <li>- energy use</li> <li>- maritime, coastal and island issues</li> <li>- climate change les changements climatiques</li> </ul>	5	241 <i>-145 for heritage,</i> <i>- 53 for energy,</i> <i>-43 for maritime</i>	<b>714</b> <i>-458 for heritage,</i> <i>- 200 for energy,</i> <i>-56 for maritime</i>
	No of transnational <u>projects</u> on integrated coastal management involving Med countries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- non-state actors</li> <li>- public authorities</li> <li>- institutions in charge of coastal protection</li> </ul>	15	7	<b>8</b>
	No of transnational seminars and forums on water management involving Med countries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- non-state actors</li> <li>- national and regional maritime authorities</li> <li>- qualified authorities/agencies (i.e. ports authorities, agencies/institutions for maritime pollution, public/private bodies for ship control)</li> </ul>	15	45	<b>103</b>
	No of transnational partnerships/collaborative networks, organised in the space, aimed to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- protect the landscape, natural resources and heritage system (e.g. water management, cultural heritage)</li> <li>- prevent natural risks</li> <li>- enhance maritime cooperation</li> <li>- exchange information and management methods on renewable energies use and energy consumption reduction</li> <li>- enhance integrated territorial development and sustainable tourism</li> </ul> involving in different countries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- non state actors</li> <li>- public authorities</li> <li>- authorities/bodies project partners but not being beneficiaries</li> </ul>	40	28	<b>41</b>

## 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 2011. This project (MEDESS4MS) is proving to be a very interesting and relevant pilot operation pulling together the risk prevention and management tools in a global Mediterranean approach.

New Targeted projects were selected under this priority, in December. They followed the same proportional share between Objectives already observed in standard calls. The positive fact is that approximately half of the partners in these projects are newcomers in the MED programme. The call was then successful in bringing in new partners.

Concerning the first call projects already ended, the analysis of their results, based on the programme database, is the following:

Among the 13 implemented projects, 9 projects have produced methodological guidelines, action plans and methods. The tackled issues are diverse: water resources management (2), tourism (2), territorial management, ports, industrial areas, forests and energy saving. Two projects delivered online tools to track maritime transport and make decision on waste management. One project on maritime transport aimed at building a community dealing with social and environmental responsibility. At last, one other project set recommendations on integrated management of coastal areas. In the framework of these projects, 143 data collection work, 73 methodological documents, 75 actions of community building and 51 tools were produced.

### An example of project



<http://teenergy.commpla.com/>

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

### Objective 2.2: Promotion of renewable energy and improvement of energy efficiency

The TEENERGY SCHOOLS project has implemented a Multi-Issues Platform as an interactive Network for the gathering of a common data base and the dissemination of best practices regarding energy efficient retrofitting and new building of secondary schools in the Mediterranean climate context.

The Project has operated from 2009 to 2011 in four countries of the Mediterranean ( Italy, Spain, Cyprus and Greece) and has pointed out the lack of energy saving benchmarks targeted to south Europe climatic conditions and the low energy efficiency of existing school buildings taking into account not only heating but also cooling needs.

Based on the experimentation of energy saving techniques, integration of innovative materials and renewable energies, including passive cooling for reducing costs and consumption in the school buildings, a common Action Plan, Guidelines and 12 Pilot Projects have been developed in close collaboration between all territorial and scientific partners, the pupils of the schools throughout direct participation and the involvement of post graduate students during three international Workshops and a one week CAMPUS session.

TEENERGY SCHOOLS has set up a good practice benchmark based on data from an Energy Survey in nearly 100 Secondary Schools in the Mediterranean Area which provides representative values and compares secondary schools' actual energy performance based on a common Energy Audit, specific end user's feedback questionnaires and an ICT based Tool for the benchmarking of the results.

### 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

Codes for the priority theme	Output indicators	Target value OP	Presage réalisé 2011	Presage réalisé 2012
11, 12, 13, 14, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32	No of projects on : innovative maritime traffic management systems accessibility of islands	5	11	13
	No of <u>projects</u> promoting transnational initiatives/ strategies for the use of: multimodal platforms intermodality existing networks (sea, road, rail)	5	6	8
	No of projects developing transnational on line services and particularly addressed to develop digital services in isolated territories	5	10 projects	10 projects
	No of databases, electronic archives, monitoring and analysis systems for water management and risk prevention	5	17 online services and database	17 online services and database
	No of <u>projects</u> to promote multimodal transport systems (particularly environmental-friendly ones) involving: local, regional and national authorities institutes and agencies for territorial development	5	8	11
	No of networks supporting the use of ICTs involving: territorial administrations civil society (association of users) economic actors (companies specialised in ICT services)	10	2	3

.....

## Qualitative analysis:

The ERDF allocation for the Priority 3 amounted 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.

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, that submitted a proposal within the call for capitalization projects.

In 2012, a Targeted call was opened for this priority, but the response was again not sufficient. Observing a weak quality of the proposals, the Selection Committee only approved 4 projects in September. As previously the call for Strategic projects had only resulted to programming 2 projects in January, the successive calls did not have the capacity to absorb the original budget allocation. Following the limited number of active stakeholders and a globally weak quality of project applications (regardless of the type of the call), the Committee decided to submit a demand of modification of the OP budget, to the Commission. 10M€ of remaining budget was to be transferred to priorities 1 and 2. The modification request was submitted in October.

Concerning the first call projects already ended, the analysis of their results, based on the programme database, is the following:

4 projects were implemented. One project focused on the development of the establishment of a network model of sea roads and intermodal interconnections with the participating territories, one project drafted an action plan for the development of ports. One other project drafted recommendations compiling solutions for the short distance maritime transport. The last one delivered an online tool to plan maritime transport. 59 data collection works, 23 methodological items and 10 tools were produced while 19 actions towards community building took place.

### Example of project



[www.homerproject.eu](http://www.homerproject.eu)

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

Objective 3.2: Support to the use of information technologies for a better accessibility and territorial cooperation

The strategic project HOMER aims to develop the full potential of public sector data (PSD) in the Mediterranean area by promoting the use and exploitation of open data. HOMER intends to encourage the development of open public sector data in the Mediterranean, particularly in the workingfields of agriculture, tourism, environment, energy and culture.

Recently, the HOMER partners started working on two pilot projects for businesses and citizens: The first pilot project, Hack4MED aims to encourage Mediterranean companies to reuse information provided by HOMER, to develop web and phone applications and to promote the implementation of a collaborative model. The pilot project will be based on the development of a series of hackatons: that is to say meetings between programmers and other IT professionals in various fields such as software development, graphic design, project management and interface design.

The second pilot project focuses on the involvement of citizens in decision-making through access to public information through the development of dedicated applications (to this subject). This project would therefore allow citizens to become involved directly in improving the quality of life in their territory. It will be necessary as a first step to identify the target audience, the type of participation expected and sectors arousing the most interest.

At the last meeting held in Greece from October 2 to 5, the partners clearly defined their capitalization strategy. They agreed to conduct a socio-economic study on the impact of public information policies in the Mediterranean with the objective to obtain the first results by April 2013. For this reason, surveys will be conducted on local, regional and national level on the following topics: agriculture, energy, culture and tourism.

The capitalization strategy is based on the identification of target groups interested in using public data, on the organization and evaluation of experiences, knowledge or results for reuse in the implantation of new innovative projects and on lobbying with politicians and policy makers to initiate concrete political commitments.



### 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 once again, by launching a call for Targeted projects. The Strategic call had only resulted in programming two transport projects in January, and they have had major delays in launching their activities.

Despite the different call types the response has remained weak in quantity and in quality: in September, only four Targeted projects were programmed. Unfortunately part of them also face difficulties in launching their activities. Facing this continuing difficulty, the MC decided to submit a request of OP budget modification, reducing the amount allocated to transport projects.

## 3. Priority 4: Promotion of a polycentric and integrated development of the MED area

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

Information on the physical and financial progress of the priority

Codes for the priority theme	Output indicators	Target value OP	Presage realised 2011	Presage realised 2012
25, 58, 59, 60, 61, 81	No of transnational networks involving different territorial systems (towns, metropolis, etc.) for supporting the management of cultural poles	5	18	18
	No of bodies involved in good practices exchange for - planning tools - cultural innovation	10	1075	1970
	No of projects/ reports/ comparative analysis involving Med large urban areas for building integrated territorial development strategies on - environmental/energy policies - ports and transports - economic development	5	74	93
	No of protection plans implemented through projects on - historical heritage - cultural resources (material and immaterial)	5	12	15
	No of cooperation initiatives involving: - towns - metropolis - rural areas	15	37	176
	No of isolated areas - involved in project activities - reached by dissemination of good practices - involved in new territorial development strategies	5	28	43

## 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.

Concerning the first call projects already ended, the analysis of their results, based on the programme database, is the following:

12 projects were selected after the first call. 3 projects focused on setting policy recommendations (harmonisation of med governance systems and governance of agri-food sector) and drafting a white book on the management of cultural heritage. 6 projects tested and developed methods to support sustainable cultural hubs and Mediterranean agriculture and to support the management of territories (2), forests and reception of activities in rural areas. 3 projects defined models for the Mediterranean forest, the waste management and urban markets.

Under this priority, the projects from the 1<sup>st</sup> call produced 113 works of data collection and analysis, 53 methodological items, and 17 tools. 72 actions of community building took place.

### Example of project



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

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

Objective 4.2: Strengthening of identity and enhancement of cultural resources for a better integration of the Med Space

The Med EMPORION Project supports food markets and market culture, promoting connection and exchange between cities with relevant food markets in the Mediterranean. Research, pilot projects, and open activities like Food Festivals will help the creation of permanent links, awareness raising about their social role as important placemakers and the improvement of their quality and services.

To help to face successfully market places challenges and opportunities, the cities of Torino, Barcelona, Marseille and Genova, together with Conservatoria dell Piemonte and Conservatoire de la Mediterranée launched the Med EMPORION project as a way to meet and share ideas and activities, to create links among them and identify the best solutions and models for the market future. The Med EMPORION project has created a framework and a network of relation among the markets in the mediterranean area to identify and transfer the best practices on managing markets, trading and modernizing them.

The project includes pilot projects, academic studies, gastronomic and food festivals, meetings, activities and events. The main goal is to promote dialogue and interaction between citizens, market customer and market traders, producers and operators. The project has produced documents and policy recommendations addressed to national and European authorities to improve today's markets situation and face the future with the best tools.

### 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)			9 (1 MC + 3 SC + 1 GoA + 3 TF + 1 Annual event)				
	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 2012 was approximately 2.000.000 €

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 accordance with Article 46 of Regulation 1083/2006, the TA funds may finance activities in relation to the preparation, management, monitoring, evaluation, information and control of the operational programme and activities to reinforce the administrative capacity necessary for the implementation of the funds. In this framework, all activities in the daily management of the programme respond to this priority axis of the OP and are detailed in this report. It seems therefore unnecessary to repeat them in this section.

However, the Managing Authority draw attention to the fact that the budget between “transnational” and “national” expenses decided at the beginning of the Programme was not appropriate anymore and that there is a need to adjust national and transnational budgets. On one hand, the “transnational” estimated budget was higher than expected because of increasing demands for global quality programme management (staff to follow increasing number of projects, external expertise etc.) and on the other hand, the level of consumption of the Member States did not reach 20% of the amount allocated for the national envelope (approx. 4M€). Hence the low rate of certification of ‘national expenses’ at that stage, the delay in the submission of payment claims and unprecise forecasts are not satisfying conditions for a sound and responsible budget management.

Finally, you will find below a list of written procedures of the Monitoring Committee and other important communications.

#### **MED Monitoring Committee Written Procedures 2012:**

- Final ToR and call text consultation “Energy targeted call” - 12 January 2012
- Remaining ERDF after programming of Strategic Projects – 25 January 2012

- Approval of 2012 Draft working plan – 07 February 2012
- Validation of the budget for the targeted call for transport – 20 February 2012
- State Aid SGEI – 10 April 2012
- Minutes approval of Ayia Napa - 27 June 2012
- ToR capitalization call - 04 July 201
- OP MED budget modification – 1<sup>st</sup> October 2012

### **Other consultations and notifications from the MA to the Committee in 2012**

- Announcement of Job vacancy Finance & project Officer (Junior) – 02 February 2012
- Transmission of the letter sent to the Director General Dirk Ahner (DG Regio) alerting on the current situation of the financing agreement issue – 14 February 2012
- Communication of the EC (2011 audit of the programme) & transmission of Cespi annual report – 22 March 2012
- Comments for 2011 annual report – 20 April 2012
- Recruitment Junior Finance & Project Officer Med JTS - 25 April 2012
- State aid: Update of Implementation Guide – 14 May 2012

### **National activities delivered:**

*For more information on the MED National Contact Points activities and tasks during 2012,, please refer to the annex 4. Only public events, meetings and seminars organized by national delegations are listed below.*

#### **France**

In 2012, the French National Contact Point carried out the following public activities on the national level:

- Preparation and organization of national committees "strategic projects of the second call" (March 2012), "targeted projects" (September 2012, December 2012);
- Organization and facilitation of an information meeting on targeted calls (March 2012);
- Organization and facilitation of meetings on the eligibility of expenditure (January 2012 to September 2012).

#### **Italy**

In 2012, the Italian National Contact Point carried out the following public activities on the national level:

- Preparation and organisation of 5 *National Committees* (January 2012, May 2012, June 2012, September 2012, December 2012) for the coordination of the Italian Regions participating in the Programme.
- Preparation and organisation of two *Information Seminars* in Florence: 15/03/2012 *Information Seminar on Targeted Calls Innovation and Transport*; 25/09/2012 *Information Seminar on Capitalisation Call*.

### **Malta**

### **Portugal**

In 2012 the Portuguese National Coordination carried out the following public activities:

Realization of one training seminar for partners, held in Lisbon on the 11<sup>th</sup> of May, with the purpose to raise awareness on the eligibility's expenditure, on public procurement procedures control and on first level control procedures.

### **Slovenia**

### **Spain**

### **Greece**

### **Cyprus**

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

- Organized a training seminar to project partners and their FLCs, 2 May 2012 in Nicosia;
- Participated to the National Contact Point meeting held in Cyprus, June 2012

### **Gibraltar**

### **Croatia**

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

Info day on the 21st of February 2012 which was aimed at giving all relevant information to potential beneficiaries regarding the targeted calls.

### **Albania**

## **Bosnia and Herzegovina**

### **Monténégro**

- IPA MED Transnational Info Day, 2 March 2012, Podgorica, Montenegro
- IPA MED informative meeting, 28 March 2012, Podgorica
- IPA MED informative meeting, 10 April 2012, Kotor
- IPA MED Transnational Seminar and projects exhibition , First call for capitalization projects, 4 October 2012, Budva
- Training on implementation of ERDF MED grant contracts, 17-19 May 2012, Budva

## **7. Information and publicity**

### **7.1 MED Programme events**

#### ***7.1.1 MED annual event: Uniting our efforts for the future!***

For the first time, the MED Programme organized a joint event with the ENPI CBC MED Programme. The joint conference was organized in the framework of the Cyprus Presidency of the European Council which officially auspiced the conference. The conference took place on 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012 and gathered some 300 people from the Southern and Northern Mediterranean. The event (first day) was also live streamed on the web. Around 300 persons followed the event on their screens at home and submitted questions and comments that were directly passed to the discussion leaders on stage.

The event was divided into two days: The first day followed a political and strategic focus, while the second day was filled with four parallel project visits followed by thematic discussions in a workshop atmosphere focusing on capitalization of current and development of future themes.

[Event post communication: video, proceedings, interviews, pictures etc.](#)

#### ***7.1.2 Communication training***

Another joint activity was organized with the Alpine Space Programme: a joint communication training of project partners. This training took place in April, 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> 2013 and gathered more than 100 partners from the MED and Alpine Space area.

The two days event offered not only possibilities to learn and exchange about communications' best practices, but also to capitalize between project partners of two programmes: a joint dinner was organized and resulted in vivid discussions.

At the occasion of the training, the MED Communication Handbook gathering Factsheets on various strategies, tools and skills was published. This factsheet collection is constantly updated and helps project partners in the development and implementation of their communication activities, mainly to make them more strategic and target group oriented.

[Complete Communication Handbook](#)

#### ***7.1.3 National and transnational applicants' seminars,***

Various applicants' seminars in the framework of the targeted and capitalization call were organized on transnational and national level, namely:

##### ***Capitalisation call***

- Transnational Applicants' Seminar in Marseille, France - 25/09/2012 (organized by the JTS)
- Info day in Valencia, Spain - 18/09/2012 (organized by the Liaison Office Valencia and NCP)
- Info day and IPA transnational seminar in Budva, Montenegro - 04/10/2012 (organized by the Liaison Office Thessaloniki and NCP)
- Info day in Florence, Italy - 18/09/2012 (organized by the NCP)



## Capitalization call seminars - post communication

### ***Targeted calls***

- Transnational Applicants' seminar in Montenegro: March, 2nd (organized by Liaison Office Thessaloniki and NCP)
- Transnational Applicants Seminar in Marseille: March, 6th (organized by the JTS)
- Croatian infoday in Zagreb: February, 21st 2nd (organized by NCP)
- Spanish infoday in Valencia: February, 28th 2nd (organized by Liaison Office Valencia and NCP)
- Slovenian infoday in Litija: March, 7th 2nd (organized by NCP)
- Albanian infoday in Tirana: March 12th (organized by NCP)
- French infoday in Marseille: March, 13th (organized by NCP)
- Italian infoday in Florence: March, 15th (organized by NCP)
- Bosnian infoday in Tuzla: March, 27<sup>th</sup> (organized by NCP)

## Targeted call seminars – post communication

Lead Partner seminars on transnational level for approved strategic projects took place on a bilateral level and were organized in the JTS premises.

### ***7.1.4 Capitalisation events***

Outcomes

- [Peer Review Coastal Management](#)
- [Peer Review Smart Med Regions](#)
- [Peer Review Sustainable Cities](#)
- [Peer Review Transport](#)

### ***7.1.5 ECD: Marseille, Valencia, Thessaloniki***

The MED Programme participated to the European Cooperation Day jointly organized by European Territorial Cooperation programmes and coordinated by INTERACT.

The Liaison Office in Valencia got involved in activities jointly planned and realized with the INTERACT point in Valencia.

The Liaison Office in Thessaloniki contributed to the activities carried out by the Greek Managing Authority of CBC programmes.

The JTS presented the recently produced project stories (see more below) at the occasion of the international Fair of Marseille, in September 2012. This fair attracted some 320.000 people and was targeted to the general public. Events, concerts, cooking presentations, stands from different countries and regions, with this mix of information and entertainment different target groups were attracted. The MED Programme was presented at the stand of the region of PACA.

## **7.2 Website, online publications and social media**

### **7.2.1 Website improvements and management**

The MED website was ‘refurbished’ and newly launched:

Some new design elements were integrated and the division of sections was optimized. Many pages were published as new sections, such as the [capitalization pages](#), [evaluation section](#), [section on the programming 2014-2020](#), dedicated areas for the Liaison Offices ([ENPI](#) and [IPA](#)).

Moreover, the [results’ library](#) (recently published) has been developed.

### **7.2.2 MED goes social media: FB, Twitter, LinkedIN, Youtube**

The MED Programme created and actively updated various social networks. They were already partly developed in 2011, but special focus on their activation took place in 2012. The programme now is present and actively discussing and commenting at:

- [Facebook](#)
- [Twitter](#) (mainly used during events)
- [LinkedIN](#) (more than 800 members)
- [Youtube](#) (channel)

### **7.2.3 Online Newsletter**

Three online newsletters have been sent:

- [Newsflash 5 - May 2012](#): Focus on Transport (related to the targeted call on transport)
- [Newsflash 6 - September 2012](#): Update on the MED Capitalization process (related to the capitalization call)
- [Newsflash 7 - December 2012](#): Christmas Edition to resume on 2011 and allow an outlook on 2013

## **7.3 Publications**

‘[Cooperation stories from the MED Programme](#)’ have been developed: these stories are targeted to a general public which shall be informed about cooperation’s added value and the concrete benefit for EU citizens.

These kinds of stories shall also help project partners to develop their skills in ‘story telling’. One of the main challenges for project partners in their communication is to create the right message and use the right language for a specific target group. In many, the messages are general, overloaded with technical details and process oriented.

Finally, these stories can also be easily translated into the MED languages and thus be used for communication activities on regional and national level. Since they are mostly dealing with concrete outputs or activities in a specific MED territory, they could also be presented to the local and regional media in different areas.

Up to now, five stories have been developed, more examples will be added. The JTS hopes to receive more and more stories also from the projects themselves...

\*\*\*

### **Projects ongoing/Projects closed in 2012:**

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 and closed projects is shown below together with their total budgets.

TRADITIONAL PROJECTS - 1ST CALL											
Statut	Priority	Objective	Internal reference	Acronym	ERDF	National co finance	IPA Croatie	Croatian co finance	IPA Montenegro	Montenegrin co finance	Total eligible budget
CLOSED	1	2	1G-MED08-012	AGRISLES	871 159,49	263 645,68	0	0	0	0	1 134 805,17
CLOSED	1	1	1G-MED08-014	AGRO-ENVIRONMED	940 604,63	303 165,90	0	0	0	0	1 243 770,53
CLOSED	3	1	1G-MED08-034	BACKGROUNDS	1 075 999,00	340 678,00	0	0	0	0	1 416 677,00
CLOSED	1	1	1G-MED08-040	BIOLMED	1 119 382,47	354 747,49	0	0	0	0	1 474 129,96
CLOSED	4	2	1G-MED08-046	C.U.L.T.UR.E	1 078 335,86	359 445,28	0	0	0	0	1 437 781,14
CLOSED	2	4	1G-MED08-048	CAT-Med	1 592 680,08	530 893,36	0	0	0	0	2 123 573,44
CLOSED	4	2	1G-MED08-052	CHORD	987 750,01	329 249,99	0	0	0	0	1 317 000,00
CLOSED	2	2	1G-MED08-060	CLIMEPORT	1 235 228,15	375 225,85	0	0	0	0	1 610 454,00
CLOSED	2	4	1G-MED08-062	COASTANCE	1 320 636,61	417 687,53	48 940,00	8 636,47	0	0	1 795 900,61
CLOSED	4	1	1G-MED08-069	CREPUDMED	1 104 000,00	368 000,00	0	0	0	0	1 472 000,00
CLOSED	3	1	1G-MED08-085	DEVELOP-MED	1 015 698,20	304 673,80	0	0	68 000,00	12 000,00	1 400 372,00
CLOSED	1	2	1G-MED08-117	ETHIC	659 051,61	219 683,87	0	0	0	0	878 735,48
CLOSED	1	2	1G-MED08-129	Flormed	1 400 000,00	466 665,00	0	0	0	0	1 866 665,00
CLOSED	4	1	1G-MED08-133	FORET MODELE	976 500,00	325 500,00	45 900,00	8 100,00	0	0	1 356 000,00
CLOSED	2	1	1G-MED08-134	FREE-MED	940 770,00	313 590,00	0	0	0	0	1 254 360,00
CLOSED	1	1	1G-MED08-161	I.C.E.	1 175 164,99	361 763,70	0	0	0	0	1 536 928,69
CLOSED	1	2	1G-MED08-164	IC-MED	1 424 998,50	474 999,50	0	0	0	0	1 899 998,00
CLOSED	1	2	1G-MED08-182	INNOVATE-MED	822 559,50	274 186,50	0	0	0	0	1 096 746,00
CLOSED	1	1	1G-MED08-185	INS MED	917 317,00	305 773,00	0	0	0	0	1 223 090,00
CLOSED	1	2	1G-MED08-216	MACC BAM	965 513,91	321 837,97	0	0	0	0	1 287 351,88
CLOSED	4	2	1G-MED08-231	MED EMPORION	1 238 949,00	412 983,00	0	0	0	0	1 651 932,00
CLOSED	4	1	1G-MED08-264	Medgovernance	1 208 148,75	402 716,25	0	0	0	0	1 610 865,00
CLOSED	2	1	1G-MED08-273	MED-IPPC-NET	900 826,75	287 845,78	0	0	0	0	1 188 672,53
CLOSED	1	1	1G-MED08-276	MEDISS	1 230 900,00	410 300,00	0	0	0	0	1 641 200,00
CLOSED	1	1	1G-MED08-280	MedLab	1 300 000,00	379 867,00	0	0	0	0	1 679 867,00
CLOSED	1	2	1G-MED08-289	MEDOSSIC	905 579,00	221 002,00	0	0	10 901,25	1 923,75	1 139 406,00
CLOSED	2	3	1G-MED08-307	MEMO	1 008 750,00	318 991,00	0	0	0	0	1 327 741,00
CLOSED	1	1	1G-MED08-309	MET3	1 286 250,00	428 750,00	0	0	0	0	1 715 000,00
CLOSED	4	1	1G-MED08-349	NOVAGRIMED	1 303 620,35	484 543,58	0	0	0	0	1 788 163,93
CLOSED	4	1	1G-MED08-370	PAYS.MED.URBAN	1 224 999,00	408 333,00	0	0	0	0	1 633 332,00
CLOSED	4	1	1G-MED08-376	Philoxenia	1 567 323,00	398 266,00	0	0	0	0	1 965 589,00
CLOSED	1	1	1G-MED08-377	Planet Design	989 437,50	329 812,50	0	0	0	0	1 319 250,00
CLOSED	2	4	1G-MED08-387	PROTECT	1 092 283,68	339 291,90	64 260,00	11 340,00	0	0	1 507 175,58
CLOSED	4	1	1G-MED08-392	QUALIGOUV	1 363 500,00	454 500,00	0	0	0	0	1 818 000,00
CLOSED	1	2	1G-MED08-395	QUBIC	1 273 749,00	424 583,00	0	0	0	0	1 698 332,00
CLOSED	1	2	1G-MED08-419	RIMED	1 061 222,50	306 007,50	0	0	0	0	1 367 230,00
CLOSED	4	1	1G-MED08-425	Rururbal	1 278 334,12	426 111,38	0	0	0	0	1 704 445,50

CLOSED	2	3	1G-MED08-437	SECUR MED PLUS	1 222 500,00	394 167,00	0	0	0	0	1 616 667,00
CLOSED	2	1	1G-MED08-445	SHIFT	898 707,00	299 569,00	0	0	0	0	1 198 276,00
CLOSED	1	2	1G-MED08-454	SMILIES	1 263 500,00	392 300,00	0	0	0	0	1 655 800,00
CLOSED	1	1	1G-MED08-458	SOSTENUTO	1 162 581,22	347 590,66	0	0	112 000,00	19 764,00	1 641 935,88
CLOSED	2	1	1G-MED08-463	SusTEn	1 210 500,00	384 300,00	0	0	0	0	1 594 800,00
CLOSED	2	2	1G-MED08-477	Teenergy schools	999 500,00	306 500,00	0	0	0	0	1 306 000,00
CLOSED	3	1	1G-MED08-478	TERCONMED	1 162 628,00	369 206,00	0	0	0	0	1 531 834,00
CLOSED	1	1	1G-MED08-482	TEXMEDIN	1 426 312,50	475 437,50	0	0	0	0	1 901 750,00
CLOSED	3	1	1G-MED08-495	TRANSit	1 013 152,50	286 840,12	0	0	0	0	1 299 992,62
CLOSED	4	1	1G-MED08-511	WASMAN	1 250 095,00	366 866,00	0	0	0	0	1 616 961,00
CLOSED	2	1	1G-MED08-515	WATERinCORE	773 375,00	235 125,00	0	0	0	0	1 008 500,00
CLOSED	1	2	1G-MED08-525	WiNNOVATE	1 152 950,00	368 670,00	0	0	0	0	1 521 620,00
CLOSED	2	1	1G-MED08-533	ZERO WASTE	999 955,87	304 302,06	0	0	0	0	1 304 257,93

\*\*\*

TRADITIONAL PROJECTS - 2ND CALL											
Statut	Priority	Objective	Internal reference	Acronym	ERDF	National co finance	IPA Croatia	Croatian co finance	IPA Bosnia Herzegovina	Bosnian co finance	Total eligible budget
ON GOING	1	2	2G-MED09-004	2InS Clusters	1 369 800,00	438 200,00	0	0	0	0	1 808 000,00
ON GOING	2	1	2G-MED09-015	AGROCHEPACK	880 300,00	277 700,00	0	0	0	0	1 158 000,00
ON GOING	2	1	2G-MED09-026	APICE	1 711 065,00	570 355,00	0	0	0	0	2 281 420,00
CLOSED	1	2	2G-MED09-062	CreaMED	1 005 000,00	295 000,00	0	0	0	0	1 300 000,00
CLOSED	3	1	2G-MED09-069	CYCLO	696 250,00	208 750,00	0	0	0	0	905 000,00
ON GOING	2	4	2G-MED09-070	CypFire	1 012 000,00	318 000,00	0	0	0	0	1 330 000,00
ON GOING	1	1	2G-MED09-086	EASY FINANCE	654 395,16	203 465,05	0	0	0	0	857 860,21
CLOSED	1	2	2G-MED09-091	ECOMARK	1 260 443,57	401 251,86	0	0	0	0	1 661 695,43
ON GOING	1	1	2G-MED09-093	ecomovel	725 833,49	241 944,51	66 515,9	11 738,1	0	0	1 046 032,00
ON GOING	1	2	2G-MED09-098	EMMA	933 017,48	311 005,85	0	0	0	0	1 244 023,33
ON GOING	2	2	2G-MED09-102	ENERMED	1 165 600,00	368 400,00	22 935,79	4 047,49	0	0	1 560 983,28
ON GOING	2	1	2G-MED09-103	enerscapes	1 393 625,00	366 875,00	0	0	0	0	1 760 500,00
ON GOING	2	4	2G-MED09-117	FOR CLIMADAPT	1 300 500,00	433 500,00	0	0	0	0	1 744 500,00
ON GOING	3	2	2G-MED09-119	FREIGHT4ALL	1 287 000,00	413 000,00	0	0	0	0	1 700 000,00
ON GOING	1	2	2G-MED09-139	HIDDEN	1 117 282,52	372 427,50	0	0	0	0	1 489 710,02
ON GOING	1	2	2G-MED09-148	ICS	1 365 000,00	455 000,00	0	0	0	0	1 820 000,00
ON GOING	1	2	2G-MED09-152	IKTIMED	1 419 074,99	432 425,01	0	0	0	0	1 851 500,00
ON GOING	4	1	2G-MED09-157	In.FLOW.ence	1 483 074,05	443 034,25	0	0	0	0	1 926 108,30
CLOSED	1	2	2G-MED09-164	InnoNauTICs	739 125,00	246 375,00	0	0	0	0	985 500,00
ON GOING	1	1	2G-MED09-174	IP-SMEs	820 275,00	273 425,00	0	0	0	0	1 093 700,00
CLOSED	1	1	2G-MED09-175	IRH-Med	742 620,37	247 540,13	54 730,31	9 658,29	0	0	1 054 549,10
ON GOING	1	2	2G-MED09-189	KnowInG	1 362 892,50	454 297,50	0	0	0	0	1 817 190,00
ON GOING	1	1	2G-MED09-190	KnowInTarget	1 274 650,00	406 350,00	0	0	0	0	1 681 000,00
ON GOING	3	2	2G-MED09-196	LiMIT4WeDA	1 004 495,00	281 920,01	0	0	0	0	1 286 415,01
ON GOING	3	1	2G-MED09-199	LOSAMEDCHEM	1 301 053,00	367 127,00	0	0	0	0	1 668 180,00
ON GOING	2	1	2G-MED09-209	MAREMED	1 498 600,00	480 066,66	0	0	0	0	1 978 666,66
ON GOING	1	1	2G-MED09-225	MED TECHNOPOLIS	1 500 000,00	500 000,00	0	0	0	0	2 000 000,00
ON GOING	2	2	2G-MED09-241	MEDEEA	1 142 532,65	314 181,11	0	0	0	0	1 456 713,76
ON GOING	2	1	2G-MED09-262	MEDIWAT	1 139 000,00	341 000,00	0	0	0	0	1 480 000,00
ON GOING	1	2	2G-MED09-263	MED-KED	948 488,22	285 469,64	0	0	0	0	1 233 957,86
ON GOING	2	1	2G-MED09-270	MEDPAN NORTH	1 814 915,00	565 910,00	0	0	0	0	2 380 825,00
CLOSED	4	1	2G-MED09-282	MedStrategy	833 531,05	257 523,95	0	0	0	0	1 091 055,00
ON GOING	1	1	2G-MED09-291	MEID	958 532,00	305 644,00	0	0	59 500,00	10 500,00	1 334 176,00
ON GOING	2	1	2G-MED09-302	MODELAND	1 349 979,38	412 043,79	0	0	0	0	1 762 023,17
ON GOING	2	1	2G-MED09-327	OSDDT-Med	1 028 662,25	326 108,75	0	0	0	0	1 354 771,00

ON GOING	4	1	2G-MED09-328	OTREMED	1 176 258,75	376 206,25	0	0	0	0	1 552 465,00
ON GOING	1	2	2G-MED09-331	PACMAAn	1 191 015,46	373 786,49	0	0	0	0	1 564 801,95
ON GOING	3	1	2G-MED09-348	PORTA	1 111 155,00	345 849,00	0	0	0	0	1 457 004,00
ON GOING	1	1	2G-MED09-353	R&D Industry	1 059 125,00	293 375,00	0	0	0	0	1 352 500,00
ON GOING	1	2	2G-MED09-357	REINPO RETAIL	979 550,00	312 450,00	0	0	0	0	1 292 000,00
CLOSED	1	2	2G-MED09-362	Responsible MED	1 034 052,50	324 637,50	0	0	0	0	1 358 690,00
CLOSED	2	2	2G-MED09-381	SCORE	1 278 057,75	388 579,25	0	0	0	0	1 666 637,00
ON GOING	3	1	2G-MED09-382	SEATOLAND	1 274 850,00	388 150,00	0	0	0	0	1 663 000,00
ON GOING	2	1	2G-MED09-410	SylvaMED	974 589,50	303 536,50	0	0	0	0	1 278 126,00
CLOSED	1	2	2G-MED09-419	TEMA	840 718,07	280 239,35	0	0	0	0	1 120 957,42
ON GOING	2	3	2G-MED09-425	TOSCA	1 669 620,00	556 540,00	0	0	0	0	2 226 160,00
ON GOING	2	1	2G-MED09-445	WATERLOSS	1 436 841,00	409 947,00	0	0	0	0	1 846 788,00
ON GOING	1	2	2G-MED09-447	WIDE	1 172 530,50	390 843,50	0	0	0	0	1 563 374,00
ON GOING	1	2	2G-MED09-451	WOODE3	952 404,00	295 188,00	0	0	0	0	1 247 592,00
ON GOING	2	2	2G-MED09-452	ZeroCO2	1 403 560,73	467 853,58	0	0	0	0	1 871 414,31

\*\*\*

STRATEGIC PROJECTS - 1ST CALL									
Statut	Priority	Objective	Internal reference	Acronym	ERDF	National co finance	IPA Montenegro	Montenegrin co finance	Total eligible budget
ON GOING	2	2	1S-MED10-002	MARIE	4 511 098,00	1 402 782,00	123 454,00	21 786,00	6 059 120,00
ON GOING	2	2	1S-MED10-009	PROFORBIOMED	4 239 550,85	1 347 632,15	0,00	0,00	5 587 183,00
ON GOING	2	2	1S-MED10-029	ELIH-Med	6 992 797,00	2 154 399,00	0,00	0,00	9 147 196,00

\*\*\*

STRATEGIC PROJECTS - 1ST CALL - RECALL									
Statut	Priority	Objective	Internal reference	Acronym	ERDF	National co finance	IPA Funds	IPA National co finance	Total eligible budget
ON GOING	2	3	2S-MED11-01	MEDESS-4MS	4 716 157,40	1 318 159,60	95 200,00	16 800,00	614 6317,00

\*\*\*

STRATEGIC PROJECTS - 2ND CALL									
Statut	Priority	Objective	Internal reference	Acronym	ERDF	National co finance	IPA Funds	IPA National co finance	Total eligible budget
ON GOING	3	1	2S-MED11-14	MEDNET	3 847 580,00	1 134 820,00	947 826,50	167 263,50	6 097 490,00
ON GOING	3	1	2S-MED11-29	FUTUREMED	4 010 042,50	1 224 007,50	0,00	0,00	5 234 050,00
ON GOING	3	2	2S-MED11-35	HOMER	2 728 711,62	837 725,88	85 000,00	15 000,00	3 666 437,50

\*\*\*



TARGET PROJECTS - 1ST CALL									
Statut	Priority	Objective	Internal reference	Acronym	ERDF	National co finance	IPA Funds	IPA National co finance	Total eligible budget
ON GOING	1	1	1C-MED12-10	CO-EFFICIENT	1 236 575,00	338 925,00	276 250,00	48 750,00	1 900 500,00
ON GOING	2	2	1C-MED12-14	E2STORMED	1 103 853,08	345 903,12	251 183,95	44 326,58	1 745 266,73
ON GOING	1	1	1C-MED12-17	ECOFUNDING	1 135 807,67	342 335,89	118 830,00	20 970,00	1 617 943,56
ON GOING	1	1	1C-MED12-19	EMILIE	1 453 119,10	434 099,19	266 432,53	47 014,50	2 200 665,32
ON GOING	2	2	1C-MED12-20	ENCERTICUS	1 316 145,50	438 715,50	0,00	0,00	1 754 861,00
ON GOING	1	1	1C-MED12-21	ENERGEIA	1 222 946,19	374 008,73	164 560,00	29 040,00	1 790 554,92
ON GOING	1	2	1C-MED12-29	FireMed	1 747 605,00	545 095,00	210 205,00	37 095,00	2 540 000,00
ON GOING	2	2	1C-MED12-33	GRASP	1 568 301,50	496 288,50	306 000,00	54 000,00	2 424 590,00
ON GOING	2	2	1C-MED12-35	GREEN PARTNERSHIPS	1 236 855,00	326 405,00	350 880,00	61 920,00	1 976 060,00
ON GOING	1	1	1C-MED12-37	GREENBERTH	1 063 286,25	328 828,75	190 400,00	33 600,00	1 616 115,00
ON GOING	2	2	1C-MED12-48	MAIN	1 573 500,00	524 500,00	0,00	0,00	2 098 000,00
ON GOING	2	2	1C-MED12-68	PV-NET	1 015 766,30	263 759,70	0,00	0,00	1 279 526,00
ON GOING	2	2	1C-MED12-70	REMIDA	1 083 329,00	339 691,00	147 254,00	25 986,00	1 596 260,00
ON GOING	2	2	1C-MED12-73	REPUBLIC-MED	1 152 210,72	384 070,24	314 484,11	55 497,19	1 906 262,26
ON GOING	1	1	1C-MED12-78	SINERGIA	1 578 530,00	491 870,00	371 535,00	65 565,00	2 507 500,00
ON GOING	1	2	1C-MED12-83	SMARTinMED	1 002 648,50	334 215,00	76 500,00	13 500,00	1 426 863,50
ON GOING	2	2	1C-MED12-85	SMART-MED-PARKS	1 017 266,25	323 988,75	95 871,50	16 918,50	1 454 045,00
ON GOING	2	2	1C-MED12-87	SMILE	1 216 899,75	405 633,25	212 500,00	37 500,00	1 872 533,00
ON GOING	1	1	1C-MED12-94	WIDER	1 750 131,90	542 010,10	198 563,40	35 040,60	2 525 746,00

\*\*\*

TARGET PROJECTS - 2ND CALL									
Statut	Priority	Objective	Internal reference	Acronym	ERDF	National co finance	IPA Funds	IPA National co finance	Total eligible budget
ON GOING	3	1	2C-MED12-05	INTE-TRANSIT	1 395 767,49	438 434,49	0,00	0,00	1 834 201,98
ON GOING	3	1	2C-MED12-08	iFreightMED-DC	1 513 200,00	448 212,00	0,00	0,00	1 961 412,00
ON GOING	3	1	2C-MED12-13	MED.I.T.A.	1 425 000,00	475 000,00	56 451,00	9 962,00	1 966 413,00
ON GOING	3	1	2C-MED12-21	MED-PCS	1 426 252,50	475 417,50	0,00	0,00	1 901 670,00