**Interreg Europe Programming - Survey among partner states**

*16/03/2020*

***General questions***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions** | **Answer options** |
| 1. Which Partner State do you represent? | Drop-down list of Partner States |
| 1. Did you consult programme stakeholders in your country to prepare your response to this survey? If yes, please specify which (categories of) stakeholders you involved. | Yes [please specify]  No |

***PART 1 - Programme scope and focus***

***Introduction:***

*Based on the discussions during the Programming Committee Meeting on 5 March 2020, the programme drafting consultants have developed three scenarios for the possible structure of the cooperation programme. In this first part of the survey you are asked to indicate which of these three scenarios is your preferred option. You also have the opportunity to propose modifications to your preferred scenario.*

*In case none of the proposed scenarios is in line with (or can be adapted to) your preference, you may present an alternative scenario.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questions** | **Answer options** |
| 1. Which of the three proposed scenarios for the overall structure of the future Interreg Europe 2021-2027 cooperation programme do you prefer? | * + 1. Scenario A: programme based on thematic priorities.     2. Scenario B: programme based on Interreg specific objective “Better cooperation governance” with thematic focus     3. Scenario C: programme based on Interreg specific objective “Better cooperation governance” with open thematic scope.     4. None of them |
| 1. In your selected scenario, which modifications or complementary element(s) would you propose (if any)? | * On the overall description [insert text] * On the thematic scope [insert text] * On the cooperation programme features [insert text] |
| ***NB: Conditional: this question does not appear if scenario A/B/C is selected***   1. In case you have selected none of the three proposed scenarios, please describe briefly your proposal for an alternative scenario on the key aspects: overall description, thematic scope and programme features? | * On the overall description [insert text] * On the thematic scope [insert text] * On the cooperation programme features [insert text] |
| 1. Please indicate which of the Policy Objectives and Specific Objectives (as presented in the draft ERDF Regulation, Article 2) should be addressed by the Interreg Europe programme in your opinion.   (You are invited to answer this question regardless of the preferred scenario you have selected, to get a complete overview of the thematic preferences of all Partner States) | *[One drop-down list that expands with the corresponding Specific Objectives as soon as respondents select one Policy Objective – see Annex for the full list]*   * Policy Objective 1: Smarter Europe * Policy Objective 2: Greener Europe * Policy Objective 3: More connected Europe * Policy Objective 4: More social Europe * Policy Objective 5: Europe closer to citizens |
| 1. Beyond your initial selection, how would you rank in order of preference the three proposed scenarios (see question 3) plus the alternative scenario (D, if applicable)? | Rank the scenarios A, B, C and D from 1 (most preferred option) to 4 (less preferred option) |
| 1. Please add any comments or explanations related to your choice of programme focus (see question 3) | [insert text] |
| ***NB: Conditional: this question only appears if PO1 is selected***  The draft ERDF regulation (Article 10bis) states that *“… the Interregional Innovation Investments Instrument shall support the commercialisation and scaling up of interregional innovation projects having the potential to encourage the development of European value chains, through financial and advisory support.*  *Its governance model shall include the set-up of a dedicated expert group composed of representatives from Member States, regional authorities and cities, etc. It shall also ensure appropriate coordination and complementarities with ERDF programmes under the Investment for jobs and growth goal, as well as with Interreg programmes, in particular under strand 'Interreg C'…”*  (see also the related supporting document of the first PC meeting in Lille)     1. In your opinion, how should operations supported by Interreg Europe under Policy Objective 1 support the capacity building pillar of the future Interregional Innovation Investment Instrument? Which specific coordination mechanism could be envisaged? | [insert text] |

***PART 2 - Programme operational aspects***

| **Questions** | **Answer options** |
| --- | --- |
| According to the draft ETC regulation (Article 3), Interreg Europe shall deal with *“… regional development policies including Investment for jobs and growth goal programmes”*.  During the PC meeting in Helsinki (December 2019), discussions among the partner states tended towards “… *unanimity among all groups for not having strict rules when it comes to Structural Funds, there was still an overall agreement for keeping a kind of link to goal 1 programmes”*   1. In your opinion, how would this link to the jobs & growth goal programmes be implemented at programme level? | 1. As part of the eligibility criteria: a minimum number or share of jobs & growth goal policies in each project (e.g. at least 1 policy addressed per project should be a goal 1 programme) 2. As part of the selection criteria: higher scoring for involvement of jobs & growth goal policies 3. no specific criteria or thresholds 4. other suggestions (please specify) …. |
| The ETC regulation [Article 3] states that Interreg Europe shall contribute to *“… the effectiveness of cohesion policy by promoting exchange of experiences, innovative approaches and capacity building…”*   1. In your opinion, does this require any changes to the projects as implemented by the current Interreg Europe programme? | Yes / No |
| 1. As far as projects are concerned, how could the Interreg Europe programme implement these different elements “*exchange of experiences, innovative approaches and capacity building”* | 1. these elements should be features of all Interreg Europe projects 2. these elements should be translated into distinct, separate types of projects  (for instance by introducing different levels of intensity for projects [[1]](#footnote-1)) 3. these elements should be addressed in another way (please describe your suggestions …) [insert text] |
| 1. For each of the following features of the current Interreg Europe “regular” projects please indicate:   a) whether they should also be features of projects in the new programme.  b) whether you would propose any modifications to these features. | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **YES** | **NO** | **Proposed modification** | | 2 phases |  |  |  | | action plans |  |  |  | | stakeholder groups |  |  |  | | pilot actions |  |  |  | |
| 1. What are your suggestions for additional or alternative features of Interreg Europe projects? | [insert text] |
| 1. In addition to ‘regular’ projects, should the new programme continue to provide policy learning services to all EU regions? | Yes / No |
| 1. If YES, please specify which policy learning services should be provided: *(Multiple answers possible)* | 1. Expert support (mainly peer reviews) 2. Community (thematic events and webinars) 3. Knowledge hub (e.g. articles and policy briefs) 4. Good practice database 5. Other (please describe your suggestions) |
| The ETC regulation [Article 3] states that Interreg Europe shall contribute to *“… the effectiveness of cohesion policy by promoting exchange of experiences, innovative approaches and capacity building …”*   1. In your opinion, does this require any changes to the services as provided by the Policy Learning Platform in the current Interreg Europe programme assuming that they would be maintained in the future programme? | Yes / No |
| ***NB: Conditional: this question appears only if ‘yes’ is selected under question 17***   1. What kind of changes would you propose to the current services? | [insert text] |
| 1. More generally and beyond the tasks to be covered by the Technical Assistance, would you have any suggestions for enlarging or modifying the scope of intervention of a possible future Policy Learning Platform (e.g. contribution to project development, project assessment, programme strategy, etc.)? | [insert text] |

***Annex: list of Policy Objectives and corresponding Specific Objectives***

1. **Policy Objective 1: Smarter Europe***'a smarter Europe by promoting innovative and smart economic transformation'*
2. enhancing research and innovation capacities and the uptake of advanced technologies;
3. reaping the benefits of digitisation for citizens, companies and governments;
4. enhancing growth and competitiveness of SMEs;
5. developing skills for smart specialisation, industrial transition and entrepreneurship;
6. **Policy Objective 2: Greener Europe**‘*a greener, low-carbon Europe by promoting clean and fair energy transition, green and blue investment, the circular economy, climate adaptation and risk prevention and management’*
7. promoting energy efficiency measures;
8. promoting renewable energy;
9. developing smart energy systems, grids and storage at local level;
10. promoting climate change adaptation, risk prevention and disaster resilience;
11. promoting sustainable water management;
12. promoting the transition to a circular economy;
13. enhancing biodiversity, green infrastructure in the urban environment, and reducing pollution;
14. **Policy Objective 3: More connected Europe***‘a more connected Europe by enhancing mobility and regional ICT connectivity'*
15. enhancing digital connectivity;
16. developing a sustainable, climate resilient, intelligent, secure and intermodal TEN-T;
17. developing sustainable, climate resilient, intelligent and intermodal national, regional and local mobility, including improved access to TEN-T and cross-border mobility;
18. promoting sustainable multimodal urban mobility;
19. **Policy Objective 4: More social Europe** *‘a more social Europe implementing the European Pillar of Social Rights'*
20. enhancing the effectiveness of labour markets and access to quality employment through developing social innovation and infrastructure;
21. improving access to inclusive and quality services in education, training and life long learning through developing infrastructure;
22. increasing the socioeconomic integration of marginalised communities, migrants and disadvantaged groups, through integrated measures including housing and social services;
23. ensuring equal access to health care through developing infrastructure, including primary care;
24. **Policy Objective 5: Europe closer to citizens***'a Europe closer to citizens by fostering the sustainable and integrated development of urban, rural and coastal areas and local initiatives'*
25. fostering the integrated social, economic and environmental development, cultural heritage and security in urban areas;
26. fostering the integrated social, economic and environmental local development, cultural heritage and security, including for rural and coastal areas also through community-led local development.

1. For example: The programme could introduce different intensities of cooperation for ‘regular’ projects. The basic level could cover the usual ‘exchange of experience’ activities (in line with activities currently financed under the phase 1 of projects). In addition to these activities, a second level of intensity could allow project to propose (from the start) innovative approaches such as pilot actions in order to also ‘learn by doing’ and test what is learned from the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)