

4.6 Responses to further comments of Partner States

N°	Organisation name	Section of the cooperation programme	Comments	Responses
1	Federal Ministry for Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management (AT)	1. Programme Strategy	It is not clear how the 2nd project phase of implementation is financed (there is just the monitoring). How can the implementation be secured?	The key objective of projects is to make sure the lessons learnt from the cooperation are integrated into the relevant policies at local, regional or national levels. They should therefore not rely on INTERREG EUROPE funding to make sure that actions are taking place. However, INTERREG EUROPE will support the costs for monitoring the implementation of the action plan and for implementing possible pilot actions.
2	Federal Ministry for Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management (AT)	Policy Learning Platforms	The field of topics within one platform is rather large - a bit challenge which needs good structures.	The programme plans to have one platform per Thematic Objective. But depending on the needs of the regions, more specific working groups could be created under each platform. If needed, each platform will also have the possibility to hire specific expertise not available at the expert team level.
3	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development of the Republic of Latvia (LV)	5. Implementation provisions for the cooperation programme - Organisation of the assessment, selection of operations and resolution of complaints	<p>Proposed modification (page 60)</p> <p>Project applications can be submitted following calls for proposals whose terms of reference, application pack incl. funding rules, will be published on the programme website and laid down in the programme manual. Details of the selection procedure will also be made available to all applicants through the programme manual. The applications submitted will be made available to the members of the monitoring committee. The joint secretariat organises the impartial assessment of these applications based on the eligibility and quality criteria approved by the monitoring committee, and makes a proposal for a decision to the monitoring committee.</p> <p>The selected/rejected projects of the Monitoring Committee are confirmed by the MA decision to approve or reject the projects. Project lead applicants are informed in writing [eMonitoring system] about the reasons why an application was not eligible or approved. Any questions in relation to the assessments will be examined and answered by the managing authority/joint secretariat. If needed, remaining complaints will be examined and answered jointly by the chair of the monitoring committee and the managing authority/joint secretariat. The chair may decide to refer back a complaint to the monitoring committee, should s/he judge it necessary. An overview of complaints examined and answered by the chair of the monitoring committee and managing authority/joint secretariat will be provided to the monitoring committee in the following meeting. In case the lead partner is unsatisfied with the answers given by the monitoring committee, joint secretariat/managing authority it may also appeal to the Administrative Court of [specify] The same complaint procedure as described will also apply to other stages of the project implementation controlled by programme bodies, such as the progress monitoring.</p>	<p>A. In line with current practice, amended to: application pack, including the terms of reference and programme manual with funding rules.</p> <p>B. amended to: Following the monitoring committee's decision, the managing authority will prepare a subsidy contract between the managing authority and the lead applicant of the approved project.</p> <p>C. see revised proposal introducing a complaint panel, following the work of Interact and the recent court ruling on the Estonia/Latvia case. The access to court remains of course intact and does not need to be specified in the cooperation programme, especially as this section is aimed at complaint procedures (which are in the hands of the programme) rather than the formal appeal procedure (legal process). The relevant court authority can then still be mentioned in the context of the complaint procedure which is to be included in the programme manual.</p>
4	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development of the Republic of Latvia (LV)	5. Implementation provisions for the cooperation programme - The computerised exchange of data	Page 62: Please supplement that the computerised exchange of data will be possible between FLC, SLC and beneficiaries, Managing Authority/Certifying Authority, Audit Authority.	Article 122 (3) refers to intermediate bodies. According to article 23 (4) of the ETC regulation, each MS is responsible for verifications carried out on its territory. In line with CPR regulation article 2 (18), " 'intermediate body' means any public or private body which acts under the responsibility of a managing or certifying authority, or which carries out duties on behalf of such an authority, in relation to beneficiaries implementing operations". Consequently, the FLC would not be regarded as an intermediate body and this is why we propose not to add this reference in the cooperation programme. At the same time the programme will of course (as in the past) aim to achieve a maximum of interoperability going beyond the basic requirements. However, as there are also certain legal constraints which need to be further explored (electronic signatures, etc.) we can at this point not guarantee that there will be this possibility for FLCs.
5	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development of the Republic of Latvia (LV)	5. Implementation provisions for the cooperation programme	Please correct the references to the CPR Articles: - on page 65: Articles 136 to 139 should be Articles 143 to 147 - on page 66: Article 123 should be Article 133.	Remark integrated
6	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development of the Republic of Latvia (LV)	5. Involvement of partners - Role of the relevant partners in the preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the cooperation programme.	Please correct sentence in the subsection 5.2.1. „Role of the relevant partners in the preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the cooperation programme”, as decisions were not taken during the Task Force meetings.	Remark integrated
7	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development of the Republic of Latvia (LV)	6. Coordination between funds	Please supplement Programme's point about coordination with other interregional cooperation programmes and EU instruments. From the text of the Programme it's not clear based on what criteria or on what principle diversion of the project to the best – fit Programme will take a place in case the objectives of other EU Programmes will overlap with Programme's objectives and tasks. For example, how the possible diversion of the project to suitable programme will be ensured in case submitted project simultaneously corresponds to the requirements of the Programme INTERREG EUROPE and the Programme “Intelligent Energy for Europe”?	INTERREG EUROPE is the only programme being dedicated to a better implementation of Structural Funds programmes and in particular programmes under the Investment for Growth and Jobs goal. This is a fundamental difference with any other EU programme.
8	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development of the Republic of Latvia (LV)	6. Coordination between funds	Please make references to the “Investment for growth and jobs goal” instead of Goal 1, as there is no such division during the 2014-2020.	Remark integrated
9	Ministry of Infrastructure and Development (PL)	2. Description of the priority axes	<p>Priority Axis 4, Investment priority 6 (c) Conserving, protecting, promoting and developing natural and cultural heritage, page 41 and 42.</p> <p>Although cultural heritage is included in the title, no examples of possible projects in this field are provided (interregional cooperation projects). Therefore, it is proposed to complement the final draft with the examples of the projects dedicated to the cultural heritage. The examples should show this topic in a wider extent (e.g. contribution to the development of the creative sector, impact on the labour market, linkages between universities and employers, social inclusion, smart specialisation etc.). In addition, the examples of possible actions of the Policy Learning Platforms could also be enriched and consider the manifold character of the cultural heritage.</p>	The theme of cultural heritage is not only mentioned in the title of the investment priority but it is also included in the description of the specific objective 4.1 (title and results, page 39). The examples provided for this objective are just illustrations of possible projects. Due to text limit, only three examples are provided per specific objective. The list is therefore not exhaustive and cannot cover all the thematic scope of a specific objective. Similar remark applies to the comment made on the platforms.