

MED PROGRAMME 2007-2013
EUROPEAN TERRITORIAL COOPERATION

ANNUAL
IMPLEMENTATION
REPORT

2014



Programme cofinancé par le Fonds Européen
de Développement Régional

Programme cofinanced by the European Regional
Development Fund

INDEX

1. SUMMARY DETAILS	3
2. OVERVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME.....	4
2.1. Achievements and analysis of progress	4
2.2. Significant problems encountered and measures taken to overcome them:	16
2.3. Complementarity with other instruments.....	17
2.4. Monitoring and evaluation	19
3. IMPLEMENTATION BY PRIORITY	26
3.1. Priority 1: Strengthening innovation capacities.....	29
3.2. Priority 2: Environmental protection and promotion of a sustainable territorial development	33
3.3. Priority 3: Improvement of mobility and of territorial accessibility.....	36
3.4. Priority 4: Promotion of a polycentric and integrated development of the MED area	38
3.5. Priority 5: Technical assistance	41
4. ESF PROGRAMMES: COMPLIANCE AND CONCENTRATION	42
5. ERDF/COHESION FUND PROGRAMMES: MAJOR PROJECTS (IF RELEVANT)	42
6. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.....	42
7. INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY	45

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 2014
	Date of approval of the Annual Report by the Monitoring Committee:

➤ List of eligible ERDF regions:

- The whole territory of Cyprus, Greece, Malta, Slovenia and Croatia (since the 1st July 2013)
- The regions of Abruzzo, Apulia, Basilicata, Calabria, Campania, Emilia-Romagna, Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Lazio, Liguria, Lombardy, Marche, Molise, Umbria, Piemonte, Sardinia, Sicily, Tuscany, Veneto (Italy)
- The regions of Algarve , Alentejo (Portugal);
- Gibraltar (United Kingdom);
- Ceuta, Melilla, Andalusia, Murcia, Valencia, Catalonia, Aragon, Balearic Islands (Spain)
- Corsica, Languedoc-Roussillon, Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, Rhône-Alpes (France).

➤ List of eligible IPA regions:

- The whole territory of Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina 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 2014 (Monitoring Committees, Selection Committees, NCP meetings) (No. 1)
- Complete list of programme activities in the participating countries (No. 2)
- Annual reports of the programme's Liaison Offices (No. 3)

2 - OVERVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME

2.1. Achievements and analysis of progress

Introduction

The MED 2007-13 programme has reached its maturity even though it is still fully on-going during the reporting year. The focus has shifted from the massive bottom-up calls for projects in the beginning of programming, towards specific profiles of projects such as strategic, targeted and capitalization projects. As the bottom-up projects have all ended before the end of 2013, the second phase of the programme implementing is focused on compiling and analysing data on project results, and on developing more dynamic tools and measures to accompany specific projects. This programme-level capitalization work is necessary at the intermediary stage between the current programming and the next period, as there is a clear challenge to improve the impact of cooperation projects, and to simplify rules and modalities.

In parallel, a small-scale experimental call for proposals for maritime topics has been carried out for short (one year) projects that could provide relevant input to the development of future calls for projects, via state of the art analysis and data compilation. 13 'Maritime' projects and one 'horizontal project' (MarinaMed) were selected as a result of this call. The role of MarinaMed is to create synergies between the other 13 individual projects, and analyse and summarize their work and their outcomes.

During the first half of 2014, the JTS and the programme authorities have also been involved in the Task Force in charge of drafting the new Cooperation Programme MED (CP MED) 2014-2020. The CP draft was validated by the Task Force and submitted to the Commission on the 26 of September.

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. In short, by the end of 2009, the MED Programme was fully operational with fifty one on-going projects.

In 2010, another 51 ‘standard’ projects were selected as the result of the 2nd call for proposals. 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 elaborated with the help of an external expert. 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. Starting from 4th year of programme implementation, there were no longer open calls for all Priority Axis of the OP, but specific methodologies and procedures for strategic, targeted, and capitalization projects were implemented.

During the year 2012, the programme developed the 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. Two Targeted calls were opened; one for Transport projects and another, for Renewable energy and energy efficiency topics.

With the 2012 calls, the MED programme not only had committed its whole original budget but also engaged with the call for Capitalization projects, most of the ERDF returning from 1st call projects that did not spend their whole budget by the end of the operations.

During 2012 and 2013, the projects from the first two calls (102 projects) ended, while the implementation of strategic, targeted and capitalization projects continued.

The last call for thematic Maritime projects was launched in 2013, and the projects selected in early 2014. In the end of 2014, the first three Strategic projects reached the end of their operational activity. Furthermore the duration of the all capitalization operations (13 projects) was extended through a common written procedure from December 2014 to April 2015 in order to allow the organisation of a common final event in Brussels on March 2015.

The programming strategy has evolved, from the simple bottom-up calls experienced in the beginning of programming, and which were a direct continuity of the types of calls that were launched in 2000-2006 programmes. The current programming period has allowed us to realize that the programme needs a more targeted approach towards the needs of the cooperation area: it has to recall for certain types of partners or projects in order to address key problems. The bottom-up responses to calls opened on the basis of the OP only, are too divided and do not provide a grouped answer to the key needs. The development of Terms of Reference for more targeted calls, and the direct involvement of key stakeholders in developing calls for strategic projects, have allowed the emergence of more focused projects. These new types of projects are yet on-going, but they are already giving evidence of their capacity to impact regional and local policies in a more efficient way.

Main milestones in 2014:

The programme implementing was composed of following main features in the reporting year:

On-going work with Capitalization projects and Targeted projects

The capitalization experience (based on the implementation of the 13 projects having been selected in 2013) was finalized at the end of the reporting year: all implementation activities finished in December but a common main event is foreseen on the 24th and 25th March 2015 in Brussels. An exchange between projects, the MED programme and other ETC programmes (Interreg IVC, Interact, Central, 2 Seas) with EU representatives (from the Parliament and the Commission) is foreseen in this event. A focus will be on delivering the recommendations, tools and best practices developed by the capitalization projects, with analysis and comments from EU representatives.

During 2014 the capitalization projects progressed with quite satisfactory results. Perhaps, the most important objective obtained finally was a general understanding of the process and its external application with stakeholders, decision makers, SMEs...

In fact, during the call preparation the most common difficulty that was identified relates to the weak definition of the concepts (be it in terms of the concrete objectives of the programme or in terms of specificity of the call). Participants had trouble to change the mindset: understand from the beginning that this kind of project is not exactly the same as a traditional project, and face the consequences : a good knowledge of previous results used as starting point, the possibilities to further develop them, the different timing for implementation, etc. This basic weakness entailed subsequent complications in developing synergies with other projects. Finding time to collaborate with other capitalization projects was very difficult because of the complexity of each individual capitalization project. Interactions were basically found only in cases where the same project partner participated in two distinct capitalization projects.

These aspects in particular draw the attention to the need for a stronger background preparation for capitalization projects and raise the question of the real time required for the preparation and implementation phases of these projects.

Regarding concrete outputs, local exchanges, peer reviews, data base, evaluation and monitoring tools, studies and analysis were realized. The two major milestones reached from the Programme point of view were the organization of two thematic events that were held in Spring 2014, preparing and testing the concept of the final event under the Programme coordination. The first seminar on social and economic innovation, gathering 5 CAP projects was held in April in Marseilles and the second seminar about rural development (circular economy) with the contribution of 4 CAP projects was held in May (2014) in Bologna.

It was really interesting to assist to these first spontaneous tests (the events were initiated and coordinated by the projects) for both thematics: in fact projects managed agendas, participants, contents themselves, trying to create or carry out important synergies in a real transnational capitalization process; The main outcomes of both events are showed on the MED Programme website at the following address > <http://www.programmemed.eu/en/the-programme/programme-capitalisation/capitalization-events.html>.

Finally, a specific event on the capitalization of the MED Programme IPA participation was organized in March 2014 in Budva (Montenegro).

As general comment, we can note that a set of goals are identified and successfully reached:

- Deepened understanding of the concept of capitalization and its potential;
- Strengthening of existing partnerships;
- Creation of new partnerships;
- Improving the impact of previously released deliverables;
- Actualization and adaptation of previous results to different fields.
- Continuity of activities started with previous projects. Continuity is fundamental in order to become a reliable point of reference for the stakeholders (public and private) involved in the project activities.
- Knowledge of new projects and possible partners;
- Project partners engaged in a policy learning process together with local and regional stakeholders thereby contributing to awareness raising and the dissemination of results of capitalized projects and their adoption in local and regional context;
- Emergence of the MED capitalization projects' network has allowed the organization of joint events

Regarding the targeted projects, the most important observation we make is a general lack of time to concretize their work! Unfortunately they started almost at the end of the Programme period (late 2012) being really ambitious, and cumulating also administrative difficulties. (These projects contain many new inexperienced partners who previously did not know the MED programme)

The formula to focus objectives and expected results was proved as correct in order to improve the quality and the added value of each operation, especially in the energy field (less in transport) but this same capacity to be / to do better cause another frustration. The fact that the Programme will not continue to promote in 2014-2020 all previous priorities represents a major challenge (and major difficulties) for some projects, in order to capture a solid feed-back of their pilot experiences and have some capacity to transfer results outside the MED Programme before the project ending. On the contrary, in other cases like the “Emilie” project for instance, links and continuity with strategic projects are so strong and natural that such kind of effort is not necessary because they can take advantage of the strategic proposals/results platforms. The “Emilie” project has organised a series of five oriented capitalisation events dealing with results provided by other strategic and targeted MED projects. These events were particularly focused on the following issues: financing, regulatory frameworks, technological challenges, social acceptance and investment coordination applied to the renewable energy and energy efficiency sectors, with a particular focus on SMEs. Another positive outcome of Emilie is the fact of being selected by the European Commission Environmental Compliance Assistance as one of the 99 best practices existing in Europe aiming at assisting SMEs in issues related to environment.

In general, the experience of Targeted projects seems to be valuable, especially having specific terms of references for a more precise framework has improved the focus of the projects.

End of the first Strategic projects, how did these projects answer to the expectations of the programme?

Last December, the three first strategic projects (“Elih-Med”, “Marie” and “Proforbiomed”) launched in 2011 on energy efficiency and renewable sources ended their activities.

The current assessment (waiting for final reports) is really positive. All projects were successful in and with their partnerships / territories / institutions ensuring a concrete transfer of their main outputs and going further than the first technical circle, reaching in many cases also the political level and integrating the mainstream. Indeed, all three projects were able to involve external partners (associated) and integrate or propose new solutions (methodologies, action plans and regulations, mainly at regional level) directly based on their MED activities promoting a direct application in their territories and influencing in some cases even the national policies.

These projects have also implemented an important joint capitalization activity, leading to a common policy paper officially presented during the Elia Med final conference at the EU Parliament headquarter.

Last but not least, as already introduced by the target projects description, “energy” strategic projects have been able to impulse new local and transnational initiatives experimenting, testing and elaborating synthesis and conclusions on previous works upon, for instance, ESCO, PPP (public private partnerships) or Public procurements...

For more information about the three “energy” strategic projects, please see the following websites: <http://www.elia-med.eu/html>; <http://www.marie-medstrategic.eu/en.html>; <http://proforbiomed.eu/>.

Programming of short-term “Integrated Maritime” projects and the first ‘horizontal’ support project

On spring 2014, 14 projects were approved in the context of the integrated maritime call. This call comes as result of the MED historical process and maturity, from a classic vision to a strategic one, then targeted and finally going to an integrated and holistic approach, knowing that topics are not isolated and specially in the sea basin space. The 13 integrated projects, are dealing with diverse maritime and marine topics while 1 project COM CAP performs as a sole communication and capitalisation project for the rest. The aim of these projects is to give some inputs for the future MED programming period. This last effort has also as a backbone, the new Adriatic Ionian Strategy, and new directives in maritime and marine issues. The 13 integrated projects had only a few months of life and no final results have been shown yet. Nevertheless, the COM CAP project already started to organise workshops among the projects in order to find synergies and common interests from the beginning. All these 14 projects will continue until the end of May –June 2015, with a 12 months total duration.

Finalizing and submitting to the EC the new Interreg VB MEDITERRANEAN programme for 2014-2020

The work of the MED 2014-2020 Task Force continued all through the first half of the year 2014. Although most of the drafting was already finalized for the new Cooperation Programme, the financial plan of the programme, especially from the point of view of the use of the Technical Assistance, needed further discussions between the MA and the Member States.

Equally, the drafting of more detailed contents for the Axis 4 of the new programme, foreseen to improve governance mechanisms in the Mediterranean, needed more input from the Task Force, before the CP could be submitted to the Commission.

During the spring and early summer, the consultations on the Strategic environmental assessment were carried out. Most environmental authorities that were consulted (from all programme States) answered to the consultation and gave their opinions, but did not request modifications to the CP content. In parallel, the public was also consulted on the environmental impact of the future programme.

The CP was finalized during the summer and validated by the Task Force in the end of July. Due to the need of a final discussion of the Task Force on Technical assistance and on the Axis 4, which took place in mid-September, the programme was finally submitted to the EC on the 26 of September 2014.

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

- a) Management and monitoring;
- b) Strategic, Targeted, capitalization, and Maritime projects
- c) Integrated management of ERDF and IPA funding
- d) Programme library
- f) Task Force 2014-2020

A) Management and monitoring:

Controls carried out:

As each year, the programme audit (**2nd level control**) was carried out during the first half of the year. 11 operations + Technical assistance (23 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 Certifying Authority performed 2 **certification quality checks** on projects CITEK and HOMER and finalised the one which was in progress by the end of 2013: LIMIT4WEDA.

No on-the spot visits were carried out by the Managing Authority in 2014; however, many specific coordination activities were implemented with the MED National Authorities in order to find common solutions aiming at avoiding the decommitment.

Monitoring on-going projects:

Almost all 1st and 2nd 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 was also clearly visible that many structures were in financial difficulty, with budget cuts, and either had to proceed more slowly in their activities, or even retire from partnership, following the economic crisis.

The slow launching of operations, delays in execution, and in consequence prolongation of project operational time, were much less frequently encountered in our Targeted, Capitalization, and thematic projects. Due to the end of the current programme, these specific projects were aware from the start, that in general no prolongations could be accepted. What seem to help also in executing the project activities timely, was the better focus and harmonisation of the type of activities foreseen for projects within each specific call. Working on more precise elements for each call, better defining the objectives and thematic sectors of projects, as well as improved resources for accompanying on-going projects by the JTS (less projects on-going simultaneously), seem to make a positive impact on the performance of the projects. This can be noted both from financial progress, implementing foreseen tasks timely, but equally from the relevance of results provided by the projects.

The experimenting on the type of projects, specific Terms of references for different types of calls, and close monitoring of activities by JTS Project Officers, are to be taken as positive steps towards

improving the performance and impact of the programme via its projects. The very first ‘horizontal’ project seems to be able to draw out better synergies between individual projects and to break their isolation. It is contributing in a clear way to build a community and a network of projects and operators, thus multiplying the impact of each project’s individual results.

B) Strategic, Targeted, Capitalization and Maritime projects:

Seven strategic projects were on-going throughout the year.

The most advanced strategic projects, (3 on energy efficiency and renewable resources), MARIE, ELIH-MED and PROFORBIOMED, continued their activities until the end of the year while the other 4 strategic projects (MEDESS4-MS, MEDNET, FUTUREMED and HOMER) still implementing, will finish in 2015. First results when approaching the closing of their activities, show that strategic projects are really time consuming and assistance demanding: they are not necessarily the only “strategic” projects experimented by MED in terms of contents but they have been built applying different rules, size, budgets and their management needed a bigger effort from the Programme and from the LP. Projects called “strategic” in MED programme mixed top-down and bottom-up approaches, experimenting real difficulties to find a correct balance between both targets.

On the other hand, the so called “strategic” projects have been in capacity to be in touch with organisms and institutions not usually present in an ETC programme or not usually informed about its activities. That positive return was probably the most important and direct consequence of the “MED strategic” project architecture allowing a concrete transfer but not yet enough durability. Thus, in the future, the new challenge should be on simpler management and stronger durability.

For the Targeted projects, 23 projects were selected in 2012 (19 in the innovation priorities, axis 1 and 2; and 4 in transport priority, axis 3). Their launching took place in early 2013 and they will be on-going until 2015. These projects have a high rate of structures that have never before participated to MED projects. This opening towards new structures is a success to the programme, but contains also a certain risk. Inexperimented partners need more assistance than experimented ones as they are not familiar with programme procedures, and clearly have also more difficulty in advancing with foreseen timetables.

The 13 new capitalization projects were all on-going during the reporting year. The majority of our project partners, especially in these projects but also in other types of projects, welcome 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 exchange topics for the project clusters.

In the framework of a Maritime Integrated call, 14 new projects were programmed on spring 2014 aiming to give some inputs for the future MED programming period. This last effort has as a backbone, the new Adriatic Ionian Strategy, and new directives in maritime and marine issues but also the maturity of the programme which goes to a more holistic approach, knowing that topics are not isolated and especially in the sea basin space. These integrated projects, are dealing with tourism, fisheries, Integrated Coastal management, blue energy, maritime protected areas and maritime transport and accessibility while 1 project COM CAP performs as a sole communication and capitalisation project for the rest. They all started in late spring 2014. While the 13 integrated projects had only a few months of life and no final results have yet been shown; the COMCAP project organised a Joint Kick Off meeting in June, established working groups and started

designing the Capitalisation Workshops. Two of them organised before the end of 2014: *What Future for Fisheries in the Adriatic-Ionian Basin?*” which took place in October 29-30, 2014 in Termoli (Italy) and *Med cooperation Days* in November taking place on 10, 11 and 12 in Rome where integrated coastal management and possible macroregional strategies were discussed. All these 14 projects will continue until the end of May –June 2015, with a 12 months total duration.

C) Integrated management of ERDF and IPA funding:

The integrated management has only been operational from 2012, due to delays in signatures of the financial agreements. Despite this late start, all IPA budget was programmed with the strategic, targeted and capitalization projects by the end of 2012.

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 2012 to allocate instead an ERDF budget to a Croatian partner taking part in a transport Targeted project. However, this budget only became eligible with the accession of Croatia to the EU, in July 2013.

The MC decided to allow an advance payment of 10% for IPA partners to ease their participation in the start-up phase. Approximately two thirds of the IPA partners financed in MED projects have asked for the prefinancing. It seems however, that they still encounter treasury problems and that implementing work is regularly hindered by lack of financing. During the reporting year we have been more conscious about how the IPA partners are working in MED projects and what their difficulties are. It seems clear that the difficulties are mainly financial, and that their spending capacity is low in a system that operates with reimbursements, due to a weak treasury capacity. This information is indicative when determining budget thresholds for IPA partners in the future. IPA partners are in general in lower consumption rate than ERDF partners, but there are some exceptions, cases where the IPA partner is matching the level of financial progress of the ERDF partners. These cases are very probably due to the good steering skills of the Lead Partner, and/or previous experience of the IPA partner in participating to cooperation projects.

D) 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. The pooling of results, establishing a network or community of projects, is necessary for the visibility and the impact of individual projects' results. In regard to the cooperation area, the financing is small scale, and its impact can be visible only if the projects are clustering their work. This is now on-going and the adequate mecanisms will be in place from the start of the new programming period.

The 'library' is constantly updated with new project results and it will progressively include the results of all projects financed within the programme. The library is accessible online in the address: www.programmed.eu/library

E) 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), with the objective of elaborating the new MED CP 2014-2020. The Task Force met regularly throughout the year 2013 and the first part of 2014. Finally the validated CP was submitted to the EC in September, containing the following Priority Axis:

- Innovation and support to SME's
- Low carbon economy
- Environment and cultural heritage protection
- Mediterranean governance

The Task Force also accepted the request of new regions to be joining the eligible area: Lisbon (PT), Midi-pyrénées (FR), and the provinces of Bolzano and Trento (IT).

During the first half of the year, the JS and the external experts provided to the Task Force proposals for the performance framework, the output and result indicators, and the method to calculate the baselines and Target values for each result indicator. The values were only calculated after the submission of the CP to the Commission, towards the end of the year. The feedback from the EC was yet to be received, in order to validate and launch the new programme in the summer 2015.

Information on the physical progress of the operational programme:

By the end of 2014, 158 projects had been financed and 104 of them already finished their activities. 101 projects were already closed (final payment carried out) by the end of the year.

The programme had reached by the end of 2012, practically 100% commitment of its ERDF and IPA budget (excluding the Technical Assistance). During 2014, ERDF returning from the 1st and 2nd calls projects was re-programmed within the call for "maritime" projects.

The 101 standard projects that had so far closed, reached an average level of ERDF absorption of 87%. Taking into account the difficulties of public sector structures in the middle of an economic crisis, the programme management considers this as a very good score for the standard projects. All these projects were programmed with two massive calls in the beginning of the programme, and the staff resources in the JTS were not sufficient to give them as intensive accompanying as has since been practised with the strategic and targeted projects.

In 2014, fourteen new Maritime projects were selected, thus the number of on-going projects in the end of the year was 54.

Financial information (all figures are in euros)¹

	Expenditure paid out by the beneficiaries included in payment claims sent to the managing authority	Corresponding public contribution	Expenditure paid by the body responsible for making payments to the beneficiaries	Total payments received from the Commission
Priority axis 1 State the fund concerned ERDF	63 974 602,54	63 974 602,54	45 633 882,07	44 664 321,88
Priority axis 2 State the fund concerned ERDF	69 923 735,74	69 923 735,74	46 719 203,12	45 912 312,13
Priority axis 3 State the fund concerned ERDF	20 447 209,77	20 447 209,77	13 084 068,22	12 520 921,75
Priority axis 4 State the fund concerned ERDF	22 882 492,07	22 882 492,07	17 340 396,74	16 786 080,46
Priority axis 5 (TA) State the fund concerned ERDF	11 522 492,19	11 522 492,19	8 941 742,90	6 344 725,46
total amount	188 750 532,31	188 750 532,31	131 719 293,05	126 228 361,69
Total in transitional regions in the grand total				
Total in non-transitional regions in the grand total				

¹ Cumulative

Total of the expenses which are part of the ESF where the operational programmed is co-financed by the ERDF ² 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

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 territorial dimension. 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.

The categorisation reinforces the same message that we are receiving from data compiled in the project database: some categories foreseen in the OP have not received so many eligible/programmable proposals, and there are very few operations in these categories. The programming of targeted projects has not brought significant change in the situation. By Priority, the main categories that only have financed a small number of 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, not an objective.

In Transport, in general there are few projects and multi-modality is not treated 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 originally foreseen.

Finally, there are no projects dealing with cultural infrastructure (59).

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 only individual partners have retrieved for financial reasons. It is visible though, that most public structures have been confronted to budget cuts and this has made the work in projects more difficult. For the first call projects, this had often been combatted with a demand to allow the project to continue its activities until the 36 months, when the original duration had been shorter. Allowing project extensions helped many partnerships to carry out most of their foreseen activities. However, this measure was no longer possible for most of the 2nd call projects, which had to submit final payment claim during 2013 in order to contribute to combat the decommitment risk.

² 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.

In many countries, especially with centralised first level control system, the delays of certifying expenses are long, and this is creating strain in respect of submission deadlines for payment claims. But in an overall way the projects are steadily advancing and the final execution rate is rather high (approximately 90%). Equally, the FLC of centralized countries have responded well to the coordination and planning efforts of the JTS in previous years, when the decommitment risk has been high. Due to their good cooperation the risk has been avoided in several successive years, including in December 2014.

The biggest challenges, during the current programme implementation, have been the strategic projects. They have important 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 order to follow their progress in real time and to answer rapidly to any risk factors observed, each strategic project has been followed by two persons from the JTS: a project officer and a financial officer. The experience has demonstrated that the programme team is often able to facilitate solutions if problems are discovered rapidly. Now that the first Strategic projects are reaching their end, we can observe that their financial consumption rate is practically as high as that of smaller projects, but reaching this has needed a considerable accompanying effort from the JTS Project Officers as well as much more time for the implementation (one year more).

Targeted projects also present a relatively high risk to the programme. They include a considerable amount of new partners who have never participated to MED programme, and some of them lack altogether any previous experience of Structural funds. While this is indeed a good proof of the capacity of the thematic calls to attract new types of structures to MED projects, towards the end of the programme this also increases risks, and there is no more room for additional delays. Projects cannot ask for extension of their operational time, and should try to avoid successive modifications, as these take time and could slow down the implementing. In short, they should be very efficient and implement activities in minimum time, which is a challenge for all and in particular for inexperienced partners.

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 for the future period, so that the 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 monitoring tools. The MED JTS has also very actively participated to the 'harmonized implementing tools' (HIT) workshops coordinated by Interact.

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 from Presage is compared with the programme database that contains information on all on-going and finished projects (end 2013 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 1st and 2nd call, and the strategic project calls have partly improved 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, on the question of multimodality. The quantity of potential project operators available to work in cooperation projects remains limited.

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 (almost 70 altogether) work directly with enterprises, it sounds logical that the number of enterprises involved in project activities is much higher than the Target Value estimated in the programme drafting phase.

2.2. Significant problems encountered and measures taken to overcome them:

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 with the current staff resources. The JTS still only has one communication officer. 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 have been on-going with the Presage technical team throughout the reporting year, to achieve a more substantial improvement of the tool for the next period of programming, and this contribution starts to bring its results.

The consequence of the economic crisis to public structures continues to be felt in overall project implementation. 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. 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. 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. In the process of closing the 2nd call projects, the MA was even in some cases compelled to close operations where all partners had 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.

Significant underspending in regard to foreseen timetables is a general feature of cooperation projects, and increases the decommitment risk. It seems at this stage that the most risky still on-going projects are the strategic projects due to their size and complexity, and part of the targeted projects, due to the lack of experience of their partners. But the most difficulties in spending capacity of the structures are to be noted amongst the IPA partners. The main means to address these risks are in accompanying and following the projects by the JTS on a day-to day basis, and close cooperation with national authorities in charge of the programme in each participating state.

It is worth mentioning that the situation of the shortage of payment at the European Commission meant that the MED Programme was not paid between the end of June and the end of November 2014. In consequence, beneficiaries were not reimbursed for months and it could have been critical for the decommitment.

Finally, we also observe a rather significant difference between the Target values foreseen for the result Indicators and the values already realized by our projects (which are much higher than estimated regarding most indicators in Priorities 1, 2 and 4).

As the values have been provided in 2006 by a team of external experts, who did not provide any specific guidance for the method of calculating the values, it is possible that the method of counting elaborated within the programme monitoring system is in reality different than the experts had imagined. These indicators are integrated in the monitoring tool of the programme (Présage CTE) and the project partners must fill in their estimated values in the beginning of their project, and then fill in the realized values regularly.

We also note that the estimations of project partners and the final values at the end of their projects correspond on the average rather well.

We believe that the main problem with our result indicators is that each of them is composed of several units of measure, which results into compilation of different values. Examples are given for each concerned Priority further in the Report.

2.3. Complementarity with other instruments

Annual summary of activities of:

Liaison Office Valencia

The Liaison Office located in Valencia, based on the principles of complementarity and cooperation between MED and ENPI CBC MED programmes and projects, is developing the following tasks:

1. To steer their respective potential beneficiaries towards MED or ENPI CBC MED, depending on the programmes' aims and strategies.
2. To support both Managing Authorities, in the dissemination of information on the specific features of both programmes.
3. To contribute to the dissemination of results and good practices in relation to the specific thematic priorities of each programme.
4. To contribute to the evaluation and capitalization of the results achieved by the two programmes and the coordination of existing implementation tools.

In this regard, the activities and outputs of the MED Liaison Office are mostly related to capitalisation and communication, although during the first semester of 2014 the LO has contributed to the information to the stakeholders and assessment in the MED Maritime Call, in order to check double funding and find some complementarities between MED maritime integrated proposals and ENPI CBC MED running projects in the scope of maritime risks, marine biodiversity, ICZM, tourism and fisheries.

Considering the period we are in, the discussion about the future CP is very much linked to the Capitalisation process of the Programmes, for this reason the MED Liaison Office has been involved in the meetings of the MED Task Force (Marseille - on February 16th, 17th and 18th, Aix en Provence – April 9th and Ljubljana – June 4th and 5th). During this semester the MED Liaison Officer could not attend the future ENI CBC MED Task Force due to agenda constraints.

Liaison Office Thessaloniki

The Thessaloniki Liaison Office has the following two global objectives in its work:

1. To facilitate the participation of the IPA countries (Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro) to the MED programme.
2. To facilitate the capitalization and coordination between the other transnational cooperation programmes of the area and the MED programme

The LO on the basis of these two objectives and considering the new circumstances set out the following objectives for 2014:

- 1) To provide the necessary assistance and guidance to the IPA partners (and Lead Partners) during the project implementation regarding the IPA management;
- 2) To provide the necessary assistance to the JTS and the IPA National Coordinations/First Level Control Bodies regarding the IPA management;
- 3) To contribute to the capitalisation efforts of the IPA project partners;
- 4) To contribute to the dissemination and communication of the MED 2007-2013 results.

In accordance with the set objectives the LO served as a “gateway” for the IPA Partners of the approved projects to the programme management.

Concerning the second main objective the LO made efforts to provide the maximum level assistance both to the JTS and to the IPA National Coordinations/First Level Control Bodies regarding the IPA management.

At the end of this programming period, it is essential to have a closer look on projects and partnerships with IPA participation. In line with this the LO contributed to the organization of a seminar which was realised on 20th and 21st of March 2014 in Budva (Montenegro). This event aimed to bring together IPA partners, lead partners, national contact points and MED Programme representatives to discuss and brainstorm in an interactive way on the results of such projects had been carried out.

During the second half of the year the LO concentrated on the communication activities.

Besides the activities in relation to the above main objectives the LO carried out several supporting type of activities to the JTS. These activities were the followings: 1) Representing the JTS in project meetings and conferences 2) Representing the MED Programme at ESPON's conference on Blue Growth and Maritime Spatial Planning 3) Supporting the JTS in collecting data from Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro and Slovenia to establish baselines for the 2.1 and 2.2 result indicators 4) Analysing Sustainable Energy Plans of rural areas from Greece, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Slovenia and Croatia for the calculation of the baselines and target values of Priority Axis 2 regarding rural areas.

2.4. 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.

68 operations out of 158 submitted payment claims for which expenditure has been declared to the EC in 2014. 1st and 2nd calls for proposals, 101 operations, were completely closed in 2014 and 13 capitalisation projects submitted their first claims during the first trimester of the year.

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 partner.

In parallel to this type of monitoring, the JTS completed the existing monitoring system with tables which enable to have an overall view of operations progress at both project and partner level from a financial point of view. This allows identifying different problems which can be addressed in a proactive manner, to give precise information to national-level coordination bodies for better follow-up and to prevent any significant underspending.

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.

Participation in project Steering Committees and Final Conferences

In 2014, the JTS members attended 37 project Steering Committees, 7 Final Conferences and 2 project Kick-off Events in an effort to provide better accompanying and monitoring of on-going projects:

Steering Committees

SMARTinMED – on January 14th and 15th in Lyon (France);

EMILIE – on January 21st and 22nd in Rijeka (Croatia);

ACCELMED – on February 4th and 5th in Ljubljana (Slovenia);

GREEN PARTNERSHIPS – on February 5th-7th in Sarajevo (Bosnia and Herzegovina);

GRASP – on February 27th and 28th in Bastia (France);

CO-EFFICIENT – on March 6th in Modena (Italy);

HOMER – on March 11th and 12th in Sliema (Malta);

MARIE – on March 25th - 27th in Sliema (Malta);

FUTUREMED – on March 26th-28th in Valencia (Spain);

MER – on March 31st in Faro (Portugal);

ELIH-MED – on April 3rd and 4th in Rome (Italy);

MEDNET – on April 7th and 8th in Barcelona (Spain);

CREATIVE-MED – on April 10th in Athens (Greece);

iFREIGHT-MED-DC – on April 30th in Barcelona (Spain);

ENCERTICUS – on May 6th and 7th in Sevilla (Spain);
INTE-TRANSIT – on May 12th-14th in Napoli (Italy);
PHILOXENIAPLUS – on March 17th - 19th in Auch (France);
SMART-MED-PARKS – on May 28th in Nice (France);
MAIN – on June 3rd and 4th in Palma of Majorca (Spain);
COASTGAP – on June 12th in Montpellier (France);
ELIH-MED – on June 16th and 17th in Genoa (Italy);
REMIDA – on June 18th in Isle-sur-la-Sorgue (France);
MEDESS4MS – on June 24th and 25th in Valletta (Malta);
SHAPES – on June 30th - July 1st and 2nd in Faro (Portugal);
FUTUREMED – on July 8th in Portoroz (Slovenia);
FISHMPABLUE – on July 9th in Rome (Italy);
HOMER – on July 9th and 10th in Turin (Italy);
HOMER – on September 10th in Limassol (Cyprus);
MEDNET – on September 12th in Limassol (Cyprus);
E2STORMED – on September 29th in Zagreb (Croatia);
ENERGEIA – on October 21st and 22nd in Nice (France);
REMIDA – on October 30th and 31st in Rubi (Spain);
3C4INCUBATORS – on November 5th in Rome (Italy);
FIREMED – on November 17th and 18th in Malaga (Spain);
MERMAID – October 15th & 16th in Barcelona (Spain);
GREENPARTNERSHIPS – on December 3rd & 4th in Podgorica (Montenegro);
EMILIE – on December 5th in Aix-en-Provence (France).

Final Conferences

PROFORBIOMED – on June 20th & 21st in Aix-en-Provence (France);
HOMER – on September 9th in Limassol (Cyprus);
MARIE – on October 28th-30th in Barcelona (Spain);
3C4INCUBATORS – on November 6th in Rome (Italy);

COASTGAP – on November 11th in Rome (Italy);

PHILOXENIAPLUS – on November 12th in Brussels (Belgium);

CREATIVEMED – on December 10th in Prato (Portugal).

Capitalization projects meetings

Capitalization projects workshop: How to advocate project results for more political commitment? –on February 12th and 13th in Brussels (Belgium);

Green development: products, consumption, promotion and territorial marketing (workshop in the framework of the MED Programme Capitalization process) - on May 14th in Bologna (Italy).

Kick-off and other meetings of Maritime projects

MED-IAMER – on June 18th - 20th in Malaga (Spain);

CAIMANS – on July 1st and 2nd in Barcelona (Spain);

1st COM&CAP Marina-MED event: What Future for Fisheries in the Adriatic Ionian Bassin?
- on October 29th and 30th in Termoli (Italy);

2nd COM&CAP Marina-MED event: Mediterranean Cooperation Days - on November 10th - 12th in Rome (Italy).

Participation in the INTERACT Seminars

Meeting on Harmonised Implementation Tools (HIT) with Transnational Programmes and Interreg IVC Programme – on February 19th and 20th in Lille (France);

European Territorial Cooperation 2014-2020: ready, steady, go! How to deal with the final programming phase – on March 26th in Madrid (Spain);

ETC Communication Seminar – on March 26th and 27th in Helsinki (Finland);

e-Monitoring System Observers Group Meeting – on April 9th in Vienna (Austria);

Workshop on State Aid in ETC programmes – on June 24th in Brussels (Belgium);

Workshop on eligibility of expenditure in ETC programmes – on June 25th in Brussels (Belgium);

5th Meeting on Harmonised Implementation Tools (HIT) with Transnational Programmes and Interreg Europe - on September 24th and 25th in Barcelona (Spain);

Designation procedure for ETC programmes – on October 22nd in Brussels (Belgium);

The What, the Why and the How of Inter-programme Capacity and Competence – on November 26th in Brussels (Belgium);

Workshop on Project Reporting and Monitoring - on December 10th Innsbruck (Austria).

Coordination activities with national delegations

Since in 2014 the Programme was facing a high risk of decommitment, these coordination activities with national delegations were primarily focused on establishing a common action plan in order to avoid it.

The following measures were undertaken in coordination with the national delegations to reduce the risk of decommitment:

- A customised letter reminding the importance of respecting the contractual engagements was sent to every project (Strategic, Targeted and Capitalisation)
- National delegations held meetings with partners (Strategic projects)
- National Contact Points communicated to partners the importance of paying all invoices quickly
- Collaboration with the FLC Units to unblock the pending certificates, to prioritise the highest ERDF amounts and to respect the deadlines to issue the certificates
- The reporting periods of some projects were shortened so that payment claims were treated within the Certifying Authority deadline.

Thanks to this set of actions, the efficiency of the mechanisms in place for the certification of expenditure and the treatment of the payment claims by the Programme structures were considerably improved and thus the Programme succeeded in avoiding decommitment.

The following events and activities included the participation of the MA/JTS staff (LO or core staff). The following meetings were organised between the national delegations and the partners participating in Strategic projects:

- Meetings with the Maltese partners of the MED Strategic projects – in May 2014 in Valletta (Malta)
- Meeting with the Portuguese partners of the MED Strategic projects – on 2nd June 2014 in Lisbon (Portugal)
- Meeting with the Spanish partners of the MED Strategic projects – on 9th June 2014 in Madrid (Spain), with the participation of the JTS
- Meeting with the Italian partners of the MED Strategic projects – on 10th June 2014 in Rome (Italy), with the participation of the JTS
- Meeting between the Greek National Contact Point, the Greek First Level Control Unit and the Greek partners of the MED Strategic projects – on 11th June 2014 in Thessaloniki (Greece), with the participation of the Thessaloniki Liaison Office of the MED Programme
- Meetings with the Cypriot partners of the MED Strategic projects – in June 2014 in Nicosia (Cyprus)

In addition to these meetings with the partners of the MED Strategic projects, two further meetings took place in Greece in coordination with the national delegations:

- Meeting between the JTS and the Greek First Level Control unit – on 16th June 2014 in Athens (Greece)
- Meeting between the JTS and the Greek Lead partners of three targeted projects - on 16th June 2014 in Athens (Greece)

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:

PROFORBIOMED – Redistribution of the ERDF allocation among the partners and extension to the project's duration (9 months) approved on January 15th;

FIREMED – Withdrawal of a partner and redistribution of the IPA allocation among the partners approved on February 6th;

EMILIE – Redistribution of the ERDF allocation approved on March 27th;

MEDESS-4MS – Redistribution of the ERDF allocation among the Spanish partners approved on May 13th;

MARIE – Budget shift between lines and components above 10% and redistribution of the ERDF allocation among the partners approved on June 16th;

ELIH MED – Reduction and redistribution of the ERDF allocation among the partners approved on June 2nd;

TOURMEDASSETS – Extension to the project's duration (2 months) approved on June 24th ;

FUTUREMED – Change of the project's partnership, redistribution of the ERDF allocation between the Cypriot partners and modification of the project's activities and deliverables approved on July 2nd;

GRASP – Redistribution of the ERDF allocation among the partners and budget change approved on July 21st;

MEDNET – Project's budget change and reduction approved on July 25th;

ECOFUNDING – Extension to the project's duration (3 months) approved on July 31st;

MEDESS-4MS – Reduction and redistribution of the ERDF allocation among the partners approved on August 1st;

iFreightMED-DC – Change of the project's partnership approved on September 11th ;

COASTGAP – Change of the project's partnership and extension to the project's duration approved on September 24th;

PHILOXENIAPLUS – Extension to the project's duration approved on September 24th;

SINERGIA – Withdrawal of a partner approved on September 29th;

URBAN_EMPATHY – Redistribution of the ERDF allocation among the partners and extension to the project's duration approved on November 6th;

SHAPES – Redistribution of the ERDF allocation among the partners approved on November 28th;

OPTIMIZEMED – Redistribution of the ERDF allocation among the partners approved on December 1st;

MEDESS-4MS – Extension to the project’s duration (2 months) approved on December 15th;

MAIN – Change of the project’s partnership and redistribution of the ERDF allocation among the partners approved on December 19th.

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.

These requests mainly concern withdrawals and replacements from projects and/or the reduction in funding commitments as well as extensions to implementation timetables when these can be allowed. Requests result in written procedures for the attention of the Selection Committee, and involve a consequent administrative procedure to set up these changes.

The projects also requested ERDF reductions after the revision of their spending forecasts. These reductions have had an impact in the programming tables thus in the availability of funds.

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 2014, two “Certification Quality checks” were implemented on HOMER and CITEK projects.

For HOMER an irregularity of 21,20€ was detected for the Lead Partner Regione Piemonte (Italy) and duly corrected. All points were clarified and no irregularity was detected for partner Local Council Association (Malta).

For CITEK, 0,90€ were declared ineligible and recovered from the Lead Partner Regione Marche (Italy). No finding was stated for the partner ZADAR prefecture (Croatia). It was the first time that a certification quality check was performed on an ERDF Croatian partner by the Certifying Authority.

In addition, in 2014, the certification quality check on the project LIMIT4WEDA (in progress by the end of 2013) was closed. An amount of 12,94€ was recovered from the partner CCEIA (Cyprus).

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

The number of projects having declared expenditure to the European Commission in 2013 (116 in total) constituted the basis for a sampling exercise undertaken by the CICC on the 20th January 2014, which was then validated by the members of the Group of Auditors on the 7th of February 2014.

According to what was decided by the GOA members on November 2013, and following the updated guidance on sampling methods (COCOF_08-0021-03_EN 4 April 2013) issued by the Commission, the sample 2014 was determined following the non-statistical method (random sampling) and by combining the following parameters:

- a minimum cut off value of 4% for determining a layer of high-value projects fully controlled in 2014. (Technical assistance for 2014);
- an audit rate of not less than 10% of the reference population for the audit year for the remaining projects.

Thus, 11 operations out of 115 were controlled in 2014. This control involved 11 Lead partners and 11 partners based in 6 countries participating to the MED Programme (Spain, France, Greece, Italy, Malta and Slovenia).

In addition, the Technical assistance (high-value project), led by the French Managing Authority, was also audited.

An amount of € 6 255 972, 76 was audited, corresponding to 8,24% of the expenditure declared to the Commission in 2013 for the random sampling.

The projects selected under the random sample were the following:

BIOLMED; R&D Industry; InnoNauTICs; MAREMED; Enerscapes; ZeroCO2; E2STORMED; FOR CLIMADAPT; SEATOLAND; QUALIGOUV; OTREMED and the Technical Assistance

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

The error rate in 2014 was 0,1873%

As the annual control report indicates, the results of the operation controls led to the conclusion that: *“the results of systems audits and operations audits lead to a high level of reasonable assurance concerning the correctness of the system and the effectiveness of management and control systems implemented”*.

The Group of Auditors met in Marseille on the 26th of November 2014, where the results of the auditing exercises undertaken in 2014 were approved.

3 – IMPLEMENTATION BY PRIORITY

The MED Operational programme has 4 priority axes 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. Hence the importance of a capitalization approach.

In 2012, the programme undertook the creation of a complete database of all the outputs of the projects to deepen the analysis of results, help making decisions on the expectations for the following calls, improve the follow up of projects, and support the capitalisation process of results.

The JTS identified 3 main types of outputs: outputs related to the development of the theme of the project, to the evaluation of the project and to the management of the project. All types of outputs have been compiled as outputs related to the evaluation of the project are valuable to understand what has been set to ensure quality and reliability of results and outputs related to the management of the project are valuable to understand how the projects organise themselves to ensure a successful cooperation among partners. In the future, identified good practices could be shared between projects.

Each output was then sorted according to its use or function. In the development section, the projects realise activities for 4 purposes: 1) To produce data and information on their subject in order to work on methods, recommendations or to inform the target groups, 2) to draft methods for the target groups, 3) to build or strengthen a community of structures around a theme, 4) to create tools to be used with or by target public or to create tools for data collection or joint analysis of a theme.

This database not only contains information on the types of outputs, but each output is related to a project, a theme, a priority, an objective, a call, a description provided by the project enabling the JTS to proceed with different types of enquiries. Additional information is also available for each output (if relevant) such as: delivery status, number of outputs delivered, link to on-line location, format (important to understand how the results could be reused), languages, target public, status of outputs (main or not) and availability. A complete document has been drafted to explain the development and the purpose of the database (this document can be provided on demand).

So far, the database includes information from 4267 outputs from 8 calls. The fill in of the table is on going, as is the verification of each single output and the generation of statistical data, following the implementation of the on-going projects.

The first results crossed with qualitative information enabled to understand where the main contributions of the projects were, where the difficulties were, how these outputs could be promoted and what could be improved in the follow-up of the projects. Some recommendations were also suggested for the automatic accountability of all these information on the outputs, which is so far manual. This work has nourished the discussion regarding the follow-up of project outputs for the next programming period.

In 2014, an analysis of the outputs delivered by all projects closed by the end of 2013 enabled to identify, per axis, objective and main theme tackled, the deliverables produced, sorted by purpose (project management, development or evaluation) and function (methods, tools, data, community building). This analysis has been useful to identify what kind of outputs the projects generally produce, in which topics they focus, what are the fields which need further development, but also where a redundancy might occur. It has been also useful in the definition of the output indicators (and their target values) for the next programming period.

Axis/Objective/ Main thematic	Purpose and function of deliverables			
	Project Management	Project Development	Project Evaluation	Total

	Methods	Tools	Methods	Tools	Data	Community_ building	Methods	Tools	Data	
Axis 1	63	18	70	44	183	247	6	3	12	646
Objective 1	28	11	37	26	85	105	4	2	6	304
Agri-food	4	1	9	9	22	21	1		3	70
Collaborative planning	3	1	1		12	7				24
Cultural and creative industries	5		4	3	10	14			1	37
Eco-construction	2	1	3	1	4	7		1		19
Energy	2	3	2		3	7	1			18
Furniture			5	1	5	7		1		19
Industrial areas	2	3	3	6	10	7				31
Inno-SMEs	5	1	2	3	7	9				27
Multiple	4	1	4		8	18	2		2	39
Textile and clothing	1		4	3	4	8				20
Objective 2	35	7	33	18	98	142	2	1	6	342
Agri-food	1	1	8	3	16	33				62
Collaborative planning	1		1	1	4	6				13
Co-ops										
Energy										
Industrial areas	2	1	2		11	16				32
Inno-SMEs	9	2	4		7	17				39
ITC	4		4	1	13	7				29
Multiple	9	1	8	7	32	40	2	1	5	105
Retail										
Social and corporate responsibility	5	1	6	5	9	15			1	42
Tourism	4	1		1	6	8				20
Axis 2	36	7	73	54	158	229	3	1	10	571
Objective 1	21	3	41	34	102	118	3		7	329
Energy	4	1	1	1	7	4				18
Forest										
Industrial areas	1		4	6	2	6	1		1	21
Integrated management of coastal areas	2		2	2	21	15				42
Ports	2		3	2	8	7				22
Territorial management										
Tourism	6	1	10	9	8	24	1		1	60
Waste management	3	1	5	4	11	21			2	47
Water resources	3		16	10	45	41	1		3	119
Objective 2	7	1	14	4	17	53			1	97
Energy	6		12	3	9	49			1	80
Ports	1	1	2	1	8	4				17
Objective 3	4	2	4	8	16	19			1	54
Maritime transport	4	2	4	8	16	19			1	54
Objective 4	4	1	14	8	23	39		1	1	91
Forest	4	1	8	5	6	21		1	1	47

Code for priority theme	Output indicators				Target value OP	Presage realised 2012	Presage realised 2014			
Integrated management of coastal areas			2	2	14	7				25
Territorial management			4	1	3	11				19
Axis 3	18	5	20	14	56	66	1	1	2	183
Objective 1	18	5	20	14	56	66	1	1	2	183
Logistics	4		1	3	7	6				21
Maritime transport					2	6				8
Ports	11	2	13	9	41	42	1	1	2	122
Urban transport	3	3	6	2	6	12				32
Objective 2										
Logistics										
Urban transport										
Axis 4	20	3	35	13	66	122		3	10	272
Objective 1	12	3	30	7	50	88		3	10	203
Agri-food	1	1	6	1	18	20		1	4	52
Forest		1	6	1	12	16			1	37
Multiple	4	1	8	3	8	22		2	3	51
Territorial management	2		4	1	11	16			1	35
Waste management	5		6	1	1	14			1	28
Objective 2	8		5	6	16	34				69
Cultural heritage	8		2	4	10	22				46
Urban markets			3	2	6	12				23
TOTAL	137	33	198	125	463	664	10	8	34	1672

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:

The priority has been quite popular, with a spontaneous response to the 1st and 2nd call that committed over 85% of the total budget allocated to the Priority 1.

Code for priority theme	Output indicators	Target value OP	Presage realised 2013	
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	78	86
	No of transnational studies/ plans/ strategies developed for facilitating innovation capitalisation and dissemination among resource, innovation and entrepreneurship centres	15	215	234
	No of SMEs involved in exchanges of experiences and technology transfer	20	3012	3654
	No of transnational structures for disseminating common standards for enhancing regional policies and innovations capacities	2	96	97
	No of projects for supporting innovation processes in the Med sp	18	60	66

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 was launched in 2012 and the projects started their activities in early 2013. A small amount of ERDF returning from closed project was yet used to program Maritime projects in 2014 on several priority Axis, including Axis 1.

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 improve 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 transnational 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 plant products...)
- Non-sectorial approach, concentrating on legal, logistic, technological solutions for enterprises
- Framework cooperation between public authorities and the private sector

As we can see from the follow-up of indicators, the values reached are considerably higher than estimated in the original Target values. It is however rather evident, that with a high number of innovation projects financed, and each of them working directly with enterprises, the values of indicators such as ‘No of SMEs involved in exchanges of experiences and technology transfer’ should result relatively high to justify the level of financing. The main problem with the values of indicators for Priority 1 is that they are composed of different measures (exchange of experience AND technology transfer), which makes it difficult to stick to the original Target value. If the indicator was measuring ONLY technological transfer, the Target value would be more realistic, whereas it is obvious that this cannot be the case for number of enterprises involved in exchange of experience, which necessity is higher.

The deliverables and main results of the 2 first call projects are compiled in the programme library and made available for future programming. Significantly new approaches towards innovation within MED projects can be expected to emerge from the capitalization projects during the years 2014 and 15.

An example of project:



<http://www.3c4incubators.eu/>

Priority 1: Strengthening innovation capacities

Objective 1.1: Dissemination of innovative technologies and know-how

3C 4 Incubators (Culture, Creative and Clusters for Incubators) is a capitalisation project aiming at developing territories through culture and creativity. The main objective of the project is to bring together outputs and results developed by previous cultural and creative projects with the purpose of delivering recommendations and new tools that synthetize and improve the existing productions. 3C 4 Incubators developed actions to:

- Promote the cultural and creative sector as a factor of territorial development and an engine of economic and social innovation.
- Support cultural and creative SMEs, Cultural Initiatives and Incubators through networking approaches and newly developed tools.
- Promote the integration of results, experiences, project's proposals and guidelines, contributing to the EU decision- and policy-making.
- Reach and involve governing bodies in discussion while disseminating the results and outputs across the institutional network at various territorial levels.

Some of its deliverables are already available in the MED Library:

http://www.programmemed.eu/library/livrables.html?no_cache=1

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.

What can significantly hinder the results of the Priority 1 projects in particular, are the modalities of the MED financing, making it impossible to associate enterprises as direct partners in any other modality than under De Minimis financing. This is very limitative for their participation, and moreover, due to the lack of adequate national registers in some MED Member states, the verification of already allocated De Minimis financing in each MS is impossible. The partners must submit to the MA a declaration of their situation indicating any previous De Minimis aid, but this is subject to errors and misunderstandings and the enterprises are not always aware of the received aid being granted under De Minimis.

On the other hand, Priority 1 seems to have a sufficient ‘critical mass’ of participating stakeholders, public authorities and intermediary bodies, which work directly with the enterprises. Almost 70 cooperation projects have been financed and over 3 thousand enterprises directly involved in their implementing, even without being direct partners. The potential of creating communities of projects and clusters is particularly high in this priority, and it is important that this on-going network construction continues beyond the actual programme. We can thus expect a certain maturity of project proposals in the next programming period, with more visibility of individual project results.

Cooperation projects regardless of their priority theme, can also suffer from lack of efficient information circulation, being very much dependent on the efficiency and motivation of the Lead Partner. This is not a priority-specific feature but can affect any sector of cooperation projects. 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 transferring implementing responsibility to other more active partners. This accompanying work is mostly 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	Presage realised	Presage realised
		OP	2013	2014
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"> - environmental maritime cooperation and safety - improvement on energy savings involving Med countries - non-state actors - public authorities - authorities/bodies project partners but not being beneficiaries 	15	97 24 for maritime 73 for energy	271 59 for maritime 212 for energy
	No of transnational management plans developed in the space on natural risks	5	8	21
	No of awareness-raising activities/initiatives carried out/promoted in the space on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - natural resources and heritage - energy use - maritime, coastal and island issues - climate change les changements climatiques 	5	1037 623 for heritage 437 for energy 80 for maritime	647 for heritage 759 for energy 153 for maritime
	No of transnational <u>projects</u> on integrated coastal management involving Med countries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - non-state actors - public authorities - institutions in charge of coastal protection 	15	8	11
	No of transnational seminars and forums on water management involving Med countries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - non-state actors - national and regional maritime authorities - qualified authorities/agencies (i.e. ports authorities, agencies/institutions for maritime pollution, public/private bodies for ship control) 	15	117	125
	No of transnational partnerships/collaborative networks, organised in the space, aimed to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - protect the landscape, natural resources and heritage system (e.g. water management, cultural heritage) - prevent natural risks - enhance maritime cooperation - exchange information and management methods on renewable energies use and energy consumption reduction - enhance integrated territorial development and sustainable tourism involving in different countries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - non state actors - public authorities - authorities/bodies project partners but not being beneficiaries 	40	48	53

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 they were 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. 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, the Selection Committee programmed one strategic project in October 2011. This project (MEDESS4MS) has shown to be a very interesting and relevant pilot operation pulling together the risk prevention and management tools in a global Mediterranean approach, and integrating several competent national Ministries in the partnership.

Targeted projects were selected under this priority, in late 2012. 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 (even though this is an efficiency risk at the end stage of the programme).

Several Maritime projects selected in 2014 positioned themselves on the Axis 2 to treat environmental subjects. Their budget was a result of re-programming ERDF returning from already closed operations.

In general the values reached with the Indicators of the Axis 2 are higher than those estimated in the beginning of the programme.

The problem with the indicators provided is that they are composed of different measures, eg. The first indicator of the Axis 2: No of studies/planning guidelines/plans/methods/tools strategies realised/tested. The compilation of all these types of productions that the projects have delivered is naturally higher than the estimated value, which we consider unexplicably low. As we have shown by the statistics of project outcomes (the programme database), it is frequent for cooperation projects to produce studies, guidelines, plans and even strategies. The original target value would not, from our point of view, provide sufficient value for money, to justify the financing of a high number of projects under Priority 2.

An example of project:



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

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

The mission of the MARIE project is to co-construct a strategy for energy efficiency improvement in existing buildings in the Mediterranean region. The MARIE vision is to allow the countries of the Mediterranean basin to develop a common policy in relation to energy renovation of buildings by creating a socioeconomic context and more appropriate technical and financial leverage capacity. Based on an assessment of demand and supply the project aims to identify and supply the points of leverage in such a way which stimulates the market for energy efficiency technologies in connection with buildings, taking into account the climatic, socioeconomic and cultural characteristics of the Mediterranean.

Some of its deliverables are already available in the MED Library:

http://www.programmemed.eu/library/livrables.html?no_cache=1

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

3.3.1. Achievement of targets and analysis of progress

Codes for the priority theme	Output indicators	Target value OP	Presage réalisé 2013	Presage réalisé 2014
11, 12, 13, 14, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32	No of projects on : innovative maritime traffic management systems accessibility of islands	5	16	16
	No of <u>projects</u> promoting transnational initiatives/ strategies for the use of: multimodal platforms intermodality existing networks (sea, road, rail)	5	14	14
	No of projects developing transnational on line services and particularly addressed to develop digital services in isolated territories	5	16 projects	16
	No of databases, electronic archives, monitoring and analysis systems for water management and risk prevention	5	50 online services and database	60
	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	13	13
	No of networks supporting the use of ICTs involving: territorial administrations civil society (association of users) economic actors (companies specialised in ICT services)	10	3	3

Information on the physical and financial progress of the priority

.....

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 for 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 has been more targeted to urban mobility.

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 2012 and validated in early 2013.

Example of project:



<http://www.mednetproject.eu/index.php>

MEDNET aims at simplifying and harmonizing maritime and port procedures within the Mediterranean region by recommending actions and measures for facilitating maritime freight exchange, speeding up logistic procedures, and reducing logistics costs.

The project is currently developing 20 pilot actions, tested in partner ports and at administrative or customs institutions in participating partner countries, which will enable the identification of opportunities for simplifying and harmonizing procedures. In parallel, monitoring and data collection studies feeds information into the database “Observatory of Port Operations in the Mediterranean”, available to partners and all maritime sector stakeholders.

MEDNET, therefore, acts as an information and best practice-sharing platform. As the project progresses, it puts forward an “ideal virtual port” that all players of the sector are encouraged to draw best practices from.

Some of its deliverables are already available in the MED Library:

http://www.programmemed.eu/library/livrables.html?no_cache=1

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 some 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.

Despite the different call types the response has remained weak in quantity and in quality: in September 2012, only four Targeted projects were programmed, and the Capitalization call resulted in only one transport and accessibility project. Unfortunately transport projects also have frequent 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.

3.4. 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 2013	Presage realised 2014
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	29	30
	No of bodies involved in good practices exchange for - planning tools - cultural innovation	10	1982	2025
	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	176	178
	No of protection plans implemented through projects on - historical heritage - cultural resources (material and immaterial)	5	38	41
	No of cooperation initiatives involving: - towns - metropolis - rural areas	15	201	260
	No of isolated areas - involved in project activities - reached by dissemination of good practices - involved in new territorial development strategies	5	92	98

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 1st and the 2nd 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.

Nevertheless, some indicator values are considerably higher than the Target values estimated in 2006.

If we take as an example the 2nd indicator of the Axis 4 which has a high value of realization in regard to the original Target value: “No of bodies involved in good practices exchange for planning tools/ cultural innovation”.

It is evident that if the indicator measured ONLY the No of structures involved in exchange of good practises for *cultural innovation*, the target value could be more realistic (although still a bit low).

But as it is equally measuring the No of structures involved in exchange of good practises for *planning tools*, the number is much higher, as it is quite frequent for cooperation projects to propose this type of exchange, and it often involves also many other structures than direct partners.

The remaining budget of the Priority Axis 4, increased with a small amount of ERDF returning from closed operations, was used to program the first and only 'horizontal' project of the programme. This specific Maritime project was to take in charge synergies, joint work and communication on behalf of the thirteen other (thematic) Maritime projects selected in 2014.

By the end of the reporting year, it had become clear that this type of coordination project could significantly improve synergies between individual projects and raise their awareness of the 'community of MED projects'. This will very likely result in a higher impact of these operations, in regard to a situation where individual projects work isolated from one another.

Example of project:



http://www.catmed.eu/urban_index.php

URBAN EMPATHY capitalisation project aims at consolidating a permanent structure - the existing CAT MED Platform for Sustainable Urban Models - bringing together projects, policy makers & stakeholders to share concrete results to improve the efficiency of sustainable urban policies in the Mediterranean ensuring their consideration in future programming periods.

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 impact on policies by coordinated activity of Regions, but have a high vulnerability risk towards political changes amongst the partner structures, during the project implementation. 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 which is at the same time a good point (for potential policy impact) and a weakness (for vulnerability of political support throughout the duration). In medium term, evaluation and selection criteria sensitive towards different profiles of partner structures can guarantee more stability to the project implementation. Equally, shorter term thematically focused projects (such as MED Maritime projects) seem to be able to better avoid negative impacts of political instability.

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)	12 (2 MC+1 SC + 5 TF+ 2 kick off conferences+ 1 GOA + 1 annual event)				
	Target	30										
	Baseline											
	Indicator 2:	Achievement	Number of operations									
	proposed		1 st call	2 nd call	1 st strategic call	2 nd and 3 rd strategic calls	Targeted and capitalization calls	Maritime call				
			531	447	12	19	150	115				
	eligible		277	330	6	5	95	81				
	financed		50	51	3	4	36	14			158	
	Target	150										
	Baseline											

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

Qualitative analysis:

See point 6. Technical Assistance

3.5.2. Significant problems encountered and measures taken to overcome them

Not applicable

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.

In 2014, the Managing Authority has simultaneously conducted missions within two different, but connected, frameworks: the current programming period (2007 – 2013) and the future one (2014 – 2020).

On the one hand, the MA draw its attention to the management of the Technical Assistance budget: assisted by the Member States, efforts have been made for optimizing the use of the ERDF credits, keeping the effective implementation of the Programme as a guideline. Likewise, the efforts made to certify the expenses have prevented any decommitment for the Programme in 2014. More generally, the Med Programme did not suffer any credit loss during the 2007-2013 programming period.

On the other hand, the preparatory work for the future Cooperation Programme have been coordinated and consolidated. Within this framework three Task Forces have been organized. The coordination of the missions dedicated to the redaction of the CP, the Ex-ante assesement, the system of indicators, the environmental impact assesement, has enabled the submission of the CP to the European Commission in mid-September 2014.

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

MED Monitoring Committee Written Procedures 2014:

- Written procedure on TA issues 2014-2020 – 23 June 2014
- Written procedure Liaison Offices and TA budget 2015 – 5 November 2014

Other consultations and notifications from the MA to the Committee in 2014:

- Written consultation extension of capitalization projects – 9 September 2014

National activities delivered:

For more information on the MED National Contact Points activities and tasks during 2014, please refer to the annex 2. Only public events, meetings and seminars organized by national delegations are listed below.

France

In 2014, the French National Contact Point carried out the following public activities at the national level:

- Organization and facilitation of the National Joint Committee MED-ENPI in June 2014.

Italy

In 2014, the Italian National Contact Point carried out the following public activities at the national level:

- 10th June 2014 – Meeting with PO MED Strategic Projects' Partners to inform about general rules, respect of deadlines, contract commitment and risks linked to the Programme decommitment.
- Preparation and organization of the Annual Event in Florence “Med on the Move” which took place on October 24th in the Region of Tuscany premises: public procurement procedures, speakers’ contacts, information and coordination with local media, live streaming service and photos.

Malta

In 2014, the Maltese National Contact Point carried out the following public activity:

- Set up a display of MED Programme in a national event entitled ‘Notte Bianca’ at the Ministry for European Affairs and Implementation of the Electoral Manifesto, (Valletta, October 2014), which attracted a considerable amount of visitors.
- Meeting between the MA/JTS staff and the Maltese partners of the MED strategic projects held in May 2014.
- Organised several bilateral meetings with all Maltese partners concerning their projects and disbursement targets (on-going for duration of project).

Portugal

The Portuguese National Coordination carried out the following public activities in 2014:

- A training seminar for projects’ partners was organized on May 21th, with the purpose to raise awareness on the eligibility’s expenditure, on public procurement procedures control and on first level control procedures.
- Dissemination of MED Programme approved projects for the 2007-2013 programming period in an exhibition in the Cohesion and Development Agency’s showcases.

Slovenia

The Slovenian National Coordination carried out the following public activity in 2014:

- Organization of the MED 2007-2013 Final Conference on October 20th in Ljubljana.

Spain

No public event, meeting or seminar organized by the Spanish national delegation.

Greece

The Greek National Coordination carried out the following public activity in 2014:

- Preparation and organization of the meeting with the Greek partners of strategic projects (Thessaloniki, June 11th, 2014);
- Preparation, organization and participation in the programme's common Annual Event (with Cyprus) – “Med on the move” – “Thessaloniki stop” (Thessaloniki, October 16th, 2014)

Cyprus

The Directorate General for European Programmes, Coordination and Development of Cyprus, under its responsibilities as National Coordinator of European Territorial Cooperation Programmes for the period 2007-2013, carried out the following public activities for the year 2014:

- Organised meetings with Cypriot partners concerning their projects implemented in the framework of the MED programme.

Gibraltar

No public event, meeting or seminar organized by the Gibraltar national delegation.

Croatia

The Croatian National Contact Point carried out the following public activities in 2014:

- Organization of the Implementation workshop for project partners in the framework of the Maritime call on June 27th, 2014;
- Involvement in organizational activities of the MED Programme Joint Annual Event (with Slovenia) (inputs concerning the content, communication with and invitation to Croatian project partners to present their projects within the event) – Ljubljana, on October 20th.

Albania

No contribution made.

Montenegro

The Montenegrin National Contact Point carried out the following public activities in 2014:

- Preparation and organization of the IPA MED Capitalisation Seminar for the projects approved within the seven (7) CfPs of the Mediterranean Transnational Cooperation Programme, 20-21 March 2014, Budva, Montenegro;
- Preparation and organization of the Conference for the Transnational Programme South East Europe and Mediterranean programme, 14 April 2014, Budva. The conference aimed to reflect the lessons learnt, to capitalize on the achieved results and to consider the options for possible improvements, paying special attention to the future macro-regional strategies and EU investment priorities.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

No public event, meeting or seminar organized by the Bosnia and Herzegovina national delegation.

7. INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY

7.1 MED Programme events

7.1.1 'MED ON THE MOVE' – a roadtrip to the regions

In October 2014, a roadtrip entitled 'MED ON THE MOVE' was realised serving as one main programme final event (together with the 2015 capitalisation event in Bruxelles). The aim was to bring the programme and project results to the territories. And also, to initiate more active dialogue between the programme and its involved regions to discuss methods to better transfer results to and coordinate with the mainstream programmes.



In total, four events were realised from 14th to 24th of October 2014 by the programme, notably by the Member and Partner States:

- ▶ Valencia – for actors from Spanish and Portuguese regions
- ▶ Thessaloniki – for actors from Greek regions and Cyprus
- ▶ Ljubljana – for actors from Slovenia, Croatia and the IPA countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro
- ▶ Florence – for actors from Italian regions and Malta

Around 350 persons participated to the event on spot. Three of the events were also livestreamed (see recordings below).

[Conclusions](#)

[Livestream recordings](#)

[Picture Gallery](#)

[Presentations, Participants lists etc.](#)

7.1.2 Joint Communication Training

Around 100 representatives from more than 60 projects participated in the Joint Communication Training co-organised by the MED and the SEE Programmes on 2nd and 3rd of June 2014 in Bled (Slovenia). 49 MED partners were present.

The training aimed at supporting project communication managers in the last communication activities to be carried out by their projects in order to best disseminate the results produced, increasing their impact and reaching an appropriate target audience.



During the two days of training, the projects' communication managers learnt

- ▶ How to fine tune their Communication Strategies;
- ▶ How to best use Social Media for the project purposes;
- ▶ How to best organise their Final Events;
- ▶ How to use Story-telling to best disseminate their project results;
- ▶ And how to best advocate the project at EU level.

Apart from the workshop and learning sessions, there was a valuable exchange of knowledge and practices between MED and SEE projects thanks to networking possibilities.

Follow-up communication: [Presentations, Guidance, Conclusions](#)

7.1.3 Training: How to feed MED project results into EU policy-making?

On 12th and 13th February 2014 a workshop for lead and communication partners of MED capitalisation projects was carried out in Brussels. The workshop was organised together with the Brussels regional representation office of the Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur region.

The learning sessions were based on active exchanges with actors on EU level. Thus project partners could directly discuss and learn from those they target in their communication strategy such as the European Commission, European Parliament, National Permanent Representation, but also those that might support their communication as multipliers, such as the Committee of the Regions, intermediary actors such as the CPMR, networks such as NECSTouR or FEDARENE and regional representation offices.

[Training presentations and follow-up](#)

7.2 Website, online publications and social media

7.2.1 Website improvements and management

The online library of final project results, launched in 2012, was further filled with final productions of projects. Up to now, the library contains 856 results from the two first calls projects.

[THE MED LIBRARY](#)

7.2.2 MED Community 2.0

Also in 2014, focus was put to further develop the MED social media: Twitter, Facebook, YouTube and LinkedIn.

Twitter: In summer 2014 (@Medprogramme) 1000 followers were reached from 24 countries and 58 cities. At the end of the year 2014, an increase to 1500 followers (writing 1283 tweets) was reached.

Facebook: From summer 2012 up to now, the MED Facebook page increased from 237 likes to 968 likes.

LinkedIn: At the end of 2014, 2500 contacts were reached (against 506 in September 2012).

YouTube: Our YouTube Channel got a new look with the development of thematic playlists. 44 subscribers follow us.

[Facebook](#) [Twitter](#) [LinkedIN](#) [Youtube](#)

7.2.3 Online Newsletter

Three issues of the MED Newsflash were launched in 2014:

11th issue: [Spring 2014](#)

12th issue: [Summer 2014](#)

13th issue: [Christmas 2014](#)

7.2 Results publications

In the light of the roadtrip, some results were resumed in publications:

- ▶ [Appetiser ENERGY](#)
- ▶ [Appetiser ENVIRONMENT](#)
- ▶ [Appetiser INNOVATION](#)

Projects ongoing/Projects closed in 2014:

All information concerning current projects is available from databases on the programme website at the following addresses:

Detailed statistics and budgets by beneficiary: <http://www.programmemed.eu/en/the-projects/project-calls-statistics.html>

General project database: http://www.programmemed.eu/en/the-projects/project-database/results/view/listing.html?no_cache=1&cHash=1787848ffd63f96284c78c71b30f32b8

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
CLOSED	2	1	2G-MED09-003	2Bparks	1 623 500,00	487 166,66	0	0	0	0	2 110 666,66
CLOSED	1	2	2G-MED09-004	2InS Clusters	1 369 800,00	438 200,00	0	0	0	0	1 808 000,00
CLOSED	2	1	2G-MED09-015	AGROCHEPACK	880 300,00	277 700,00	0	0	0	0	1 158 000,00
CLOSED	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
CLOSED	2	4	2G-MED09-070	CypFire	1 012 000,00	318 000,00	0	0	0	0	1 330 000,00
CLOSED	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
CLOSED	1	1	2G-MED09-093	ecomovel	725 833,49	241 944,51	66 515,90	11 738,10	0	0	1 046 032,00
CLOSED	1	2	2G-MED09-098	EMMA	933 017,48	311 005,85	0	0	0	0	1 244 023,33
CLOSED	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
CLOSED	2	1	2G-MED09-103	enerscapes	1 393 625,00	366 875,00	0	0	0	0	1 760 500,00
CLOSED	2	4	2G-MED09-117	FOR CLIMADAPT	1 300 500,00	433 500,00	0	0	0	0	1 744 500,00
CLOSED	3	2	2G-MED09-119	FREIGHT4ALL	1 287 000,00	413 000,00	0	0	0	0	1 700 000,00
CLOSED	1	2	2G-MED09-139	HIDDEN	1 117 282,52	372 427,50	0	0	0	0	1 489 710,02
CLOSED	1	2	2G-MED09-148	ICS	1 336 382,59	445 460,86	0	0	0	0	1 781 843,45
CLOSED	1	2	2G-MED09-152	IKTIMED	1 419 074,99	432 425,01	0	0	0	0	1 851 500,00
CLOSED	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
CLOSED	1	1	2G-MED09-174	IP-SMEs	779 241,90	259 747,30	0	0	0	0	1 038 989,20
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
CLOSED	1	2	2G-MED09-189	KnowInG	1 362 892,50	454 297,50	0	0	0	0	1 817 190,00
CLOSED	1	1	2G-MED09-190	KnowInTarget	1 274 650,00	406 350,00	0	0	0	0	1 681 000,00
CLOSED	3	2	2G-MED09-196	LiMIT4WeDA	1 004 495,00	281 920,01	0	0	0	0	1 286 415,01
CLOSED	3	1	2G-MED09-199	LOSAMEDCHEM	1 301 053,00	367 127,00	0	0	0	0	1 668 180,00
CLOSED	2	1	2G-MED09-209	MAREMED	1 498 600,00	480 066,66	0	0	0	0	1 978 666,66
CLOSED	1	1	2G-MED09-225	MED TECHNOPOLIS	1 500 000,00	500 000,00	0	0	0	0	2 000 000,00

CLOSED	2	2	2G-MED09-241	MEDEEA	1 142 532,65	314 181,11	0	0	0	0	1 456 713,76
CLOSED	2	1	2G-MED09-262	MEDIWAT	1 139 000,00	341 000,00	0	0	0	0	1 480 000,00
CLOSED	1	2	2G-MED09-263	MED-KED	948 488,22	285 469,64	0	0	0	0	1 233 957,86
CLOSED	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	833 531,00	257 524,00	0	0	0	0	1 091 055,00
CLOSED	1	1	2G-MED09-291	MEID	958 532,00	305 644,00	0	0	59 500,00	10 500,00	1 334 176,00
CLOSED	2	1	2G-MED09-302	MODELAND	1 349 979,38	412 043,79	0	0	0	0	1 762 023,17
CLOSED	2	1	2G-MED09-327	OSDDT-Med	1 028 662,25	326 108,75	0	0	0	0	1 354 771,00
CLOSED	4	1	2G-MED09-328	OTREMED	1 176 258,75	376 206,25	0	0	0	0	1 552 465,00
CLOSED	1	2	2G-MED09-331	PACMA ⁿ	1 191 015,46	373 786,49	0	0	0	0	1 564 801,95
CLOSED	3	1	2G-MED09-348	PORTA	1 111 155,00	345 849,00	0	0	0	0	1 457 004,00
CLOSED	1	1	2G-MED09-353	R&D Industry	1 059 125,00	293 375,00	0	0	0	0	1 352 500,00
CLOSED	1	2	2G-MED09-357	REINPO RETAIL	929 069,76	302 379,96	0	0	0	0	1 231 449,72
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
CLOSED	3	1	2G-MED09-382	SEATOLAND	1 274 850,00	388 150,00	0	0	0	0	1 663 000,00
CLOSED	2	1	2G-MED09-410	SylvaMED	971 911,35	306 214,65	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
CLOSED	2	3	2G-MED09-425	TOSCA	1 669 620,00	556 540,00	0	0	0	0	2 226 160,00
CLOSED	2	1	2G-MED09-445	WATERLOSS	1 436 841,00	409 947,00	0	0	0	0	1 846 788,00
CLOSED	1	2	2G-MED09-447	WIDE	1 172 530,50	390 843,50	0	0	0	0	1 563 374,00
CLOSED	1	2	2G-MED09-451	WOODE3	952 404,00	295 188,00	0	0	0	0	1 247 592,00
CLOSED	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
ENDED	2	2	1S-MED10-002	MARIE	4 511 098,00	1 402 782,00	123 454,00	21 786,00	6 059 120,00
ENDED	2	2	1S-MED10-009	PROFORBIOMED	4 239 550,85	1 347 632,15	0,00	0,00	5 587 183,00
ENDED	2	2	1S-MED10-029	ELIH-Med	6 582 891,25	2 029 763,75	0,00	0,00	8 612 655,00

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	1 294 041,95	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	3 653 451,77	1 085 005,50	947 826,50	167 263,50	5 853 547,27
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	47 017,50	2 200 668,32
ON GOING	2	2	1C-MED12-20	ENCERTICUS	928 690,47	309 563,49	0	0	1 238 253,96
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	1 442 822,99	450 030,53	11 179,20	1 972,80	1 906 005,52
ON GOING	2	2	1C-MED12-33	GRASP	1 474 203,41	458 788,34	256 700,00	45 300,00	2 234 991,75
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	1 479 090,00	493 030,00	0	0	1 972 120,00
ON GOING	2	2	1C-MED12-68	PV-NET	1 015 766,30	263 759,70	0	0	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	1 308 165,17	407 639,02	166 682,92	29 414,63	1 911 901,74
ON GOING	1	2	1C-MED12-83	SMARTinMED	1 002 645,00	334 215,00	76 500,00	13 500,00	1 426 860,00
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-MED12-08	iFreightMED-DC	1 606 700,00	464 712,00	0	0	2 071 412,00
ON GOING	3	1	2C-MED12-05	INTE-TRANSIT	1 395 767,49	438 434,49	0	0	1 834 201,98
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	0	1 901 670,00

CAPITALIZATION 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	1CAP-MED12-01	3C 4 Incubators	961 344,25	300 355,75	0	0	1 261 700,00
ON GOING	1	2	1CAP-MED12-02	ACCELMED	524 236,05	162 745,65	0	0	686 981,70
ON GOING	1	2	1CAP-MED12-07	CITEK	988 250,00	296 750,00	0	0	1 285 000,00
ON GOING	2	4	1CAP-MED12-08	COASTGAP	1 042 000,00	318 000,00	0	0	1 360 000,00
ON GOING	1	2	1CAP-MED12-10	CreativeMED	1 020 250,00	304 750,00	0	0	1 325 000,00
ON GOING	1	1	1CAP-MED12-12	ECO-SCP-MED	804 045,50	250 248,50	0	0	1 054 294,00
ON GOING	2	1	1CAP-MED12-19	MEDLAND2020	788 363,05	244 213,95	42 512,75	7 502,25	1 082 592,00
ON GOING	1	2	1CAP-MED12-21	MER	867 250,00	257 750,00	0	0	1 125 000,00
ON GOING	3	1	1CAP-MED12-26	OPTIMIZEMED	853 500,00	260 500,00	0	0	1 114 000,00
ON GOING	4	1	1CAP-MED12-27	philoxeniaplus	645 250,00	185 750,00	0	0	831 000,00
ON GOING	4	1	1CAP-MED12-29	Sha.p.e.s.	981 310,00	313 890,00	0	0	1 295 200,00
ON GOING	4	1	1CAP-MED12-34	URBAN_EMPATHY	864 500,00	275 500,00	72 250,00	12 750,00	1 225 000,00
ON GOING	2	1	1CAP-MED12-35	ZEROWASTE PRO	656 946,98	194 102,32	35 887,69	6 332,31	893 269,30

MARITIME 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	1M-MED14-10	MITOMED	443 500,00	126 500,00	0,00	0,00	570 000,00
ON GOING	1	1	1M-MED14-11	NEMO	322 062,35	88 218,65	0,00	0,00	410 281,00

ON GOING	1	1	1M-MED14-04	CoRINThos	438 322,50	131 447,50	0,00	0,00	569 770,00
ON GOING	1	2	1M-MED14-14	TOURMEDASSETS	200 500,00	59 500,00	0,00	0,00	260 000,00
ON GOING	1	2	1M-MED14-01	BLUENE	382 800,00	114 400,00	0,00	0,00	497 200,00
ON GOING	1	2	1M-MED14-05	ENERCOAST	289 000,00	78 000,00	0,00	0,00	367 000,00
ON GOING	2	1	1M-MED14-07	Med-IAMER	265 240,00	88 413,50	0,00	0,00	353 653,50
ON GOING	2	1	1M-MED14-12	POSEIDON	269 595,00	89 865,00	0,00	0,00	359 460,00
ON GOING	2	2	1M-MED14-06	FishMPABlue	352 500,00	117 500,00	0,00	0,00	470 000,00
ON GOING	2	3	1M-MED14-02	CAIMANs	533 250,00	177 750,00	0,00	0,00	711 000,00
ON GOING	2	3	1M-MED14-08	MEDTRENDS	436 834,25	141 344,75	0,00	0,00	578 179,00
ON GOING	3	1	1M-MED14-09	MERMAID	469 875,27	156 625,08	0,00	0,00	626 500,35
ON GOING	3	1	1M-MED14-13	SMART-PORT	506 500,00	153 500,00	0,00	0,00	660 000,00
ON GOING	4	2	1M-MED14-03	COM&CAP MarInA-Med	499 500,00	166 500,00	0,00	0,00	666 000,00