



GOVERNMENT OF ROMANIA



SERBIAN GOVERNMENT

Structural Funds

2007 - 2013



EUROPEAN UNION



Contract title: “Technical assistance for multi-annual programming of future cross border cooperation programme in the Romania-Serbia cooperation area”

Reference: 1277/STC/2013

Programme: IPA

Contracting Authority: Regional Office for Cross Border Cooperation Timișoara

Romania-Serbia IPA II CBC Programme 2014 - 2020

First Draft

May 2014

Contents

[SECTION 1 Strategy for the cooperation programme’s contribution to the selected thematic priorities and the relevant Partnership Agreement and Country Strategic Paper(s) 5](#_Toc389547274)

[**1.1** **Strategy for the cooperation programme’s contribution to the selected thematic priorities and the relevant Partnership Agreement and Country Strategic Paper(s)** 5](#_Toc389547275)

[**1.1.1** **Description of the cooperation programme’s strategy for contributing to the selected thematic priorities and the relevant Partnership Agreement and** **Country Strategic Paper(s)** 5](#_Toc389547276)

[Strategic Policy context 5](#_Toc389547277)

[Role of the Cross Border Cooperation in the European strategy 6](#_Toc389547278)

[The Danube Region Strategy. EUSDR 7](#_Toc389547279)

[The Romania-Serbia Cross Border Cooperation area 14](#_Toc389547280)

[Identification of the main challenges and untapped potentials 5](#_Toc389547281)

[Establishment of a Ranking of the identified challenges and potentials 10](#_Toc389547282)

[**1.1.2** **Justification for the selection of thematic priorities** 12](#_Toc389547283)

[**1.2** **Justification for the financial allocation** 17](#_Toc389547284)

[SECTION 2. PRIORITY AXES 22](#_Toc389547285)

[**(**Reference: points (b) and (c) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013) 22](#_Toc389547286)

[***2.1.5.1. A description of the type and examples of actions to be supported and their expected contribution to the specific objectives, including, where appropriate, identification of the main target groups, specific territories targeted and types of beneficiaries*** 25](#_Toc389547287)

[***2.1.5.2. Guiding principles for the selection of operations*** 28](#_Toc389547288)

[***2.1.6.2. Priority axis output indicators (common or programme specific)*** 32](#_Toc389547289)

[***2.2.5.1. A description of the type and examples of actions to be supported and their expected contribution to the specific objectives, including, where appropriate, identification of the main target groups, specific territories targeted and types of beneficiaries*** 39](#_Toc389547290)

[***2.2.5.2. Guiding principles for the selection of operations*** 41](#_Toc389547291)

[***2.2.6.2. Priority axis output indicators (common or programme specific)*** 45](#_Toc389547292)

[***2.3.5.1. A description of the type and examples of actions to be supported and their expected contribution to the specific objectives, including, where appropriate, identification of the main target groups, specific territories targeted and types of beneficiaries*** 53](#_Toc389547293)

[***2.3.5.2. Guiding principles for the selection of operations*** 55](#_Toc389547294)

[***2.3.6.2. Priority axis output indicators (common or programme specific)*** 58](#_Toc389547295)

[***2.4.5.1. A description of the type and examples of actions to be supported and their expected contribution to the specific objectives, including, where appropriate, identification of the main target groups, specific territories targeted and types of beneficiaries*** 66](#_Toc389547296)

[***2.4.5.2. Guiding principles for the selection of operations*** 68](#_Toc389547297)

[***2.4.6.2. Priority axis output indicators (common or programme specific)*** 72](#_Toc389547298)

[**SECTION 3 FINANCING PLAN** 86](#_Toc389547299)

[**Section 5 IMPLEMENTING PROVISIONS FOR THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME** 94](#_Toc389547300)

[**SECTION 6** **HORIZONTAL PRINCIPLES** 100](#_Toc389547301)

Programme draft[[1]](#footnote-1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CCI | *<0.1 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘15’ input=‘S’>*[[2]](#footnote-2) |
| Title | *<0.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’>* |
| Version | *<0.3 type=‘N’ input=‘G’>* |
| First year | *<0.4 type=‘N’ maxlength=‘4’ input=‘M’>* |
| Last year | *<0.5 type=‘N’ maxlength=‘4’ input=‘M’>>* |
| Eligible from | *<0.6 type=‘D’ input=‘G’>* |
| Eligible until | *<0.7 type=‘D’ input=‘G’>>* |
| EC decision number | *<0.8 type=‘S’ input=‘G’>>* |
| EC decision date | *<0.9 type=‘D’ input=‘G’>>* |
| MS amending decision number | *<0.10 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘20’ input=‘M’>>* |
| MS amending decision date | *<0.11 type=‘D’ input=‘M’>>* |
| MS amending decision entry into force date | *<0.12 type=‘D’ input=‘M’>>* |
| NUTS level III regions (or equivalent regions in the non-MS) covered by the cross-border cooperation programme | *<0.13 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>>* |

SECTION 1 Strategy for the cooperation programme’s contribution to the selected thematic priorities and the relevant Partnership Agreement and Country Strategic Paper(s)

[Reference: Article 32, Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No…../…of XXXX on the specific rules for implementing Regulation (EU) XXXX/2014 of dd.mm.2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing an Instrument for Pre-Accession assistance (IPA II)]

* 1. Strategy for the cooperation programme’s contribution to the selected thematic priorities and the relevant Partnership Agreement and Country Strategic Paper(s)
     1. Description of the cooperation programme’s strategy for contributing to the selected thematic priorities and the relevant Partnership Agreement and Country Strategic Paper(s)

|  |
| --- |
| *<1.1.1 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘70000’ input=‘M’>* |

Strategic Policy context

The CBC programme Romania Serbia is designed in the framework of the European strategy for a smart inclusive and sustainable growth. Below are summarized the main policy frameworks at European, National and regional level.

**The Europe 2020 strategy**

Europe 2020 strategy puts forward three mutually reinforcing priorities:

* Smart growth: developing an economy based on knowledge and innovation.
* Sustainable growth: promoting a more resource efficient, greener and more competitive economy and
* Inclusive growth: fostering a high-employment economy delivering social and territorial cohesion.

It also sets focus on five overarching headline targets that have to be reached by 2020.

These targets require a mixture of national and EU action, utilising the full range of policies and instruments available. The same principle applies for the seven underpinning flagship initiatives.

In the context of the IPA Cross Border Cooperation synergies with the aforementioned national and EU actions are to be sought. Two European Commission (EC) communications were released in 2010 and 2011 on smart and sustainable growth respectively, outlining the relevance of CBC programmes.

The European Territorial Agenda 2020 is paramount in defining the importance of CBC claiming that “territorial integration....is a key factor in global competition facilitating better utilisation of development potentials and the protection of natural environment” aiming at integrating the territorial dimension within different policies at all levels of governance.

Additionally the European Territorial Agenda 2020 identifies some key challenges and potentials for territorial development. These include increased exposure to globalisation, demographic changes, social and economic exclusion, climate change, and loss of biodiversity, all relevant to the Programme area.

Role of the Cross Border Cooperation in the European strategy

The European Territorial Agenda describes the European Territorial Cooperation (ETC) and CBC Programmes, as “.... a key factor in global competition... facilitating better utilisation of development potentials and the protection of natural environment”[[3]](#footnote-3).

A typology of results of ETC programmes, which reveals some crucial aspects of the ETC approach, is the following[[4]](#footnote-4):

* Integration related results, i.e. the establishment and implementation of joint territorial governance mechanisms for common assets;
* Investment related results, i.e. delivering socio-economic benefits similar to mainstream programmes either by direct investments or by preparing such investments and
* Performance related results, i.e. inducing improvements on organisational and individual performance.

While these three categories provide a starting point, the Commission working document “Elements for a Common Strategic Framework 2014 to 2020” suggests in Annex II a number of other characteristics of cross-border cooperation:

* Support the joint management and promotion of the shared major geographic features;
* Achieving a critical mass fur success, especially in the field of innovation and ICT;
* Achieving economies of scale for more efficient investments in services and infrastructure;
* Providing support for the coherent planning of transport infrastructure (including TEN-T) and the development of environmentally friendly and interoperable transport modes in larger geographical areas.

The present Programme is characterised by some additional features, which can be summarised as:

* Coverage of a large area with a high diversity of regions and often conflicting interests;
* Full Integration into a Macro area framework, the Danube Macro Region, that generates substantial challenges and opportunities of coordination and synergies.

## The Danube Region Strategy. EUSDR

The Romania Serbia CBC Programme contributes to and interacts with, the Macro Regional strategy that the EU has devised for the countries and regions that share common needs and objectives in the Danube Region.

The **newly elaborated EU Strategy for the Danube Region (DRS)** provides an overall framework for parts of Central and South East Europe area aiming at fostering integration and integrative development. The Danube Region covers 12 countries (Austria, the Slovak Republic, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovenia, Romania and Bulgaria as Member States of the EU as well as Croatia, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and the Republic of Moldova) plus the ‘Danubian’ regions of Germany and the Ukraine.

Thus, the Danube Region **encompasses the entire RO-SR CBC** programme area.

The open-ended EU Strategy for the Danube Region was adopted in December 2010. The strategy includes four pillars

(1) Connecting the Danube Region,

(2) Protecting the environment in the Danube Region,

(3) Building prosperity in the Danube Region and

(4) Strengthening the Danube Region.

It is accompanied by a “rolling” Action Plan breaking down eleven Priority Areas into actions and project examples. The proposed list of the strategic actions were taken into account in the RO-SR CBC programme strategy.

**The Romania EU Partnership Agreement**

EU strategic Frameworks: Romania Partnership Agreement

The last draft of the Romanian Partnership Agreement submitted to the EC in April 2014, highlights the central role of the CBC programmes participated by Romania, for the contribution to the EU development strategy,.

The Partnership Agreement emphasizes the importance of promoting the EUSDR, as macroeconomic strategies offer a new, more substantial and consistent cooperation platform that can be financed not only from dedicated funds.

The planned EUSDR Romania interventions include five different areas, namely transport (e.g.: development of bridges and port infrastructure), settlements network (e.g.: connecting Bucharest and the Danube river), environment (e.g.: protection of the Danube Delta), society (e.g.: improvement of social infrastructure) and economy (e.g.: exploiting the agricultural, energy and tourism potential of the Danube area).

According to the RO PA, . CBC programs should also emphasize the importance of promoting employment, improving tourism and promoting cultural heritage while enhancing the connection between the communities of the border areas. Improvement of the transport and environmental system is also promoted. Romania is committed to remove the existing bottlenecks concerning the cross-border transport flows and to strengthen cooperation especially in the energy sector –in order to raise energy efficiency, decrease pollution and to widen the production, distribution and consumption of renewable energy sources.

**The National Plan for the Adoption of the acquis communitaire (2103-2016) of the Republic of Serbia.**

According to the National plan, the Republic of Serbia is highly motivated to develop relations with immediate neighbors and countries in the region of South-East Europe, thus affirming one of the priorities of its foreign policy – improvement of regional cooperation. In the strategy of Serbia, regional cooperation, especially through regional fora and initiatives, although not replacing the process of integration to the EU, represents a central contribution to strengthening of bilateral relations with the neighbors and the states from the South- East Europe region.

Republic of Serbia is actively contributing specially to the Danube Macro Region Strategy, thus assigning a special role to the CBC Programme RO–SR, for the contribution to the wider strategy, and the creation of an integrated framework for the achievement of the EUSDR objectives.

Regional Development Strategy Republic of Serbia

The last regional development strategy of Serbia, designed in 2006 for the period 2007-2012, identified some key objectives that are still relevant and coherent to the strategy of the RO SR CBC:

* Sustainable Development
* Enhancing regional competitiveness
* Alleviation of regional disparities and poverty
* Curbing negative population trends
* Continuing decentralization and approximation of the European NUTS system

The results of the Territorial Analysis prove that several of these objectives are still relevant and applicable in the eligible area, especially: sustainable development, alleviation of regional disparities, curbing negative population trends.

**CBC and Interregional Programmes accessible in the programme area**

The Programme Area partially overlaps (e.g. CBC HU-RS) or is contained (e.g. South East Europe or the future Danube Programme) to a number of other Territorial Cooperation Programmes. Many of these Programmes follow similar objectives and have relevant thematic orientations. The evaluation of the current programme signalled the need to improve coordination and to exploit synergies. In all cases, they contribute to the development of capacity and know-how among the administration and stakeholders of the region about the modus operandi of Territorial Cooperation. The table below gives an overview of the current programmes 2007-2013, the perspective asset for the next 2014-2020 programming period, and the common eligible territories.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Programme**  **Strategic Objectives in the current programme period**  **Budget** | **Priority Axes[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Shared Eligible Area in RO-SR** | **Planned 2014-2020**  **programme** | **Relevance and potential interaction with CBC- RO –SE**  **Programme** |
| INTERREG- IV  Improve, by means of interregional cooperation, the effectiveness of regional development policies in the areas of innovation, the knowledge economy, the environment and risk prevention as well as to contribute to economic modernisation and increased competitiveness of Europe.  Budget 420 MEuro | PA1: Innovation and knowledge economy  PA2: Environment and risk prevention | Serbia Non eligible  Romania whole area | Confirmed INTERREG EUROPE | Low Transnational European cooperation, not specifically targeting the regional needs and challenges.  Potential synergies from the cooperation between local bodies and European most advanced regions, leading to possible transfer of good practices, innovation in development policies. |
| SEE  Improvement of the territorial, economic and social integration process and contribution to cohesion, stability and competitiveness through the development of transnational partnerships and joint action on matters of strategic importance.  Budget 246 Meuro | PA1:Facilitation of innovation and entrepreneurship  PA2: environment  PA3: accessibility  PA4: transnational synergies for sustainable growth areas | Whole area | Split in two programmes **Danube Region**  RO-SR area eligible  **Adriatic**  SR overlapping | Medium  Strong interaction with Danube region programme for the implementation of the EUSDR. Strong need of coordination of investments and actions, to avoid duplications and maximize synergies  Lower relevance for the Adriatic Ionian programme. |
| IPA CBC Hungary Serbia  Facilitation of a harmonic and cooperating region with a sustainable and safe environment.  Budget 21,7 MEuro | PA1: Infrastructure and Environment  PA2: Economy, Education and Culture | **Serbia** North and Central Banat | Confirmed | Medium –High  Strong interaction for the implementation of the Danube strategy, same eligible partners can lead to competition for projects and or / duplication. Coordination needed. Current experience proves that the strong links with Hungarian communities can attract beneficiaries in this programme, reducing interest for RO-SR CBC |
| IPA CBC Bulgaria Serbia  Strengthen territorial cohesion of the Bulgarian–Serbian cross-border region, its competitiveness and sustainability of its development through co-operation in the economic, social and environmental area over the administrative borders.  Budget 13,5 Meuro | PA1: Development of small-scale infrastructure  PA2: Enhancing capacity for joint planning, problem solving and development | Serbia Borski | Confirmed | Medium  Strong interaction for the implementation of the Danube strategy, same eligible partners can lead to competition for projects and or / duplication. Coordination needed. Potential synergies in the actions for cross border integration |
| ERDF CBC Hungary Romania  Bring the people, communities and economic actors of the border area closer to each other in order to facilitate the joint development of the co-operation area, building upon the key strengths of the border region.  Budget 275 MEuro | PA1: Improvement of the key conditions of joint, sustainable development in the co-operation area  PA2: Strengthen social and economic cohesion of the border area | Romania Timis | Confirmed | Medium to high  Strong interaction for the implementation of the Danube strategy, same eligible partners can lead to competition for projects and or / duplication. Coordination needed. Potential synergies in the actions for cross border integration |
| ERDF CBC Bulgaria Romania  Bring together the people, communities and economies of the Romania-Bulgaria border area to participate in the joint development of a cooperative area, using its human, natural and environmental resources and advantages.  Budget 262 Meuro | PA1: Improved mobility information and communication  PA2: Sustainable use and protection of natural , risk management  PA3: Economic development and social cohesion | Romania Mehedinți | Confirmed | Medium to high  Strong interaction for the implementation of the Danube strategy, same eligible partners can lead to competition for projects and or / duplication. Coordination needed. Potential synergies in the actions for cross border integration |

Apart from those programmes, various international, bilateral and European programmes have supported interventions for a range of topics, ranging from environmental infrastructure and urban rehabilitation up to economic development and civil society environment. Romania after accession to the EU in 2007 has been able to use Structural Funds to its avail, building on the rich experience accumulated through PHARE. In Serbia CARDS and IPA efforts have been accompanied by numerous projects e.g. through GTZ, World Bank and other donors. While the multitude and magnitude of these programmes and single projects is too long to list here, it would be a prerequisite for every project financed under the CBC-OP to demonstrate how it builds on past experiences and projects of different frameworks.

Every project financed under the CBC Programme will have to demonstrate how it builds on past experiences and projects.

Last but not least, a number of euro regions are active in the area, the most important being the “Danube-Kris-Mureș-Tisa Regional Cooperation” (DKMT) established in 1997 with the aim to develop and broaden relationships among local communities and local governments in the field of economy, education, culture, science and sports – and help the region to maintain the process of the European integration.

The Euroregion maintains a number of workgroups in the domains:

* + Economy, infrastructure and tourism workgroup
  + Urbanism, nature and environmental protection workgroup
  + Culture, sports, non-governmental organisations and social issues workgroup
  + International relations, information and mass communication workgroup
  + Catastrophe prevention workgroup
  + National health workgroup
  + Healthcare workgroup
  + Industrial park workgroup
  + Tourism workgroup
  + Agricultural workgroup


The DKMT demonstrates an example of bottom up engagement and also a platform for sustainable project results, acting as a show case of cross border governance and integration and as a cadre to refer to.

The Romania-Serbia Cross Border Cooperation area

The eligible area for the programming period 2014-2020 under the IPA CBC programme Serbia Romania will include three counties of Romania, and the six districts of the Republic of Serbia[[6]](#footnote-6).

The programme area is at the centre of the European Danube Macro Region. The two partner countries include a large share of the river basin, their total surface representing 10% of the basin in Serbia and 29% in Romania[[7]](#footnote-7).

The total area is 40.596 sqkm (53,1 % in Romania/ 46,9% in Serbia), including the Romanian counties Timiş, Caraş-Severin and Mehedinţi, and the Serbian districts (Severno Banatski, Srednje Banatski, Južno Banatski, Braničevski, Borski, Podunavska).



Map 1 The eligible area of the Romania Serbia IPA CBC Programme

The eligible area is split in two NUTS2 regions in Romania, and two NUTS2 regions in Serbia.

In Serbia, the three Banat districts belong to the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina, an administrative entity classified as NUTS2 statistical region according to the law 46/2010, which has revised the territorial statistical units in Serbia according to the EU criteria. The Braničevski, Borski and Podunavska districts belong to the NUTS2 statistical region of Southern and Eastern Serbia.

In Romania, Mehedinti County belongs to the Development Region South West. The two counties of Caraș-Severin and Timiș belong to the development Region West.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Country | NUTS 3 units: | Administrative status | Capital city / Seats of districts |
| Romania | Timiş | County (Judeţ) (NUTS2 West) | Timișoara |
| Caraş-Severin | County (Judeţ) (NUTS2 West) | Reșița |
| Mehedinţi | County (Judeţ) (NUTS2 South West) | Drobeta Turnu-Severin |
| Republic of Serbia | Severno-Banatski | Severno Banatski (part of Vojvodina Autonomous Province, NUTS2[[8]](#footnote-8)) | Kikinda |
| Srednje-Banatski | Srednje Banatski (part of Vojvodina Autonomous Province NUTS2) | Zrenjanin |
| Južno-Banatski | Južno Banatski (part of Vojvodina Autonomous Province NUTS2) | Pančevo |
| Braničevski | District (part of South East Serbia Region NUTS2) | Požarevac |
| Borski | District(part of South East Serbia Region NUTS2) | Bor |
| Podunavska | District(part of South East Serbia Region NUTS2) | Smederevo |

Table 1 Eligible areas

The eligible territory in Republic of Serbia represents 24% of the total, a larger share than in Romania, were the three eligible counties represent just 9% of the national territory.

The length of the border in the eligible territories between Romania and Republic of Serbia is 546 km, out of which 290 km (53,1 %) on the Danube river. The length of the border in the programme area represents 26% of the external borders of Republic of Serbia, and 17% of the external borders of Romania.

Along this common border there are 5 constantly operating road border crossings and 2 constantly operating railroad crossings. Also, there are 6 fluvial ports in Serbia, and 3 on the Romanian shore.

According to the 2011 census[[9]](#footnote-9), a population of roughly 2,4 million live in the eligible area, that represents roughly 9% of the total combined national populations of Romania and Republic of Serbia. Based on the most recent estimations, in the eligible area it is produced roughly 7% of the GDP of the combined national GDP of the two countries.

The geography of the region is complex and heterogeneous.

The Banat Plains extend in the North in the Serbian Districts and Timiș County. Moving to South East, transition hills between the plans and Mountains lead to the centre occupied by the Southern Carpathians range, with Banat Mountains, Țarcu-Godeanu Mountains and Cernei Mountains and elevations between 600 and 2100 meters in Caraș Severin district. The Danube flows in the South Banat plains, at the border with the Braničevski district, and it reaches the border between Romania and Serbia in the vicinity of Baziaș in Romania. In Romania, Timiș, Cerna, Caraș and Nera rivers cross the counties, some of them through spectacular valleys and gorges. Also worth to mention the Bega channel, connected to the Rhine – Danube network.

Between the southern Carpathian Mountains and the north-western foothills of the Balkan Mountains, the Danube flows through the Iron Gates gorges (Iron Gates is another name of Đerdapska klisura and it is from Golubac to Simska klusura, 98 km. The Đerdap water gate is half on Romanian and half on Serbian side.). The Romanian side of the gorge constitutes the Iron Gates natural park, whereas the Serbian part constitutes the Đerdap national park. In the South East is the Western end of the Southern Carpathians. In the Borski district are Veliki Krš, [Mali Krš](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mali_Kr%C5%A1) and [Stol](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stol_(Serbia)) mountains, dominated by [karst](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karst) formations, and are collectively known as "Gornjanski kras”. In Romania are the Mehedinţi Mountains with heights of up to 1500 m. The heights decrease towards the South East, passing through the hills to a high plain to the Western end of the Romanian Plain.

The relations between the eligible area and the Danube Region can be analysed in the following main fields: socioeconomic development, mobility, energy, natural and cultural resources, risks of environmental catastrophes.

In all these fields of interaction challenges and opportunities can be identified, according to the scale of the phenomena, local, regional or international, and according to the main driving factors, like the global environmental changes, the international tourism markets. We can consider fields of interdependency, or synergy, or competition.

In some areas a strong interdependency between the eligible area and the larger Danube region can be identified. These areas are dominated by international and interregional factors, with impacts that largely overcome the regional dimension. Some examples: reduction and prevention of pollution of land, water and air by industrial and urban sources, control and mitigation of environmental risks, development of the integration of the European Transport Networks. In these areas the action of the CBC programme partners should be focused on the integration of the local with the global strategies at the level of Danube region.

In other areas there is always strong interaction, but the main driving factors depend at list in part on local factors, therefore the local stakeholders can benefit of some autonomy, planning interventions that do not entirely depend, but can benefit, from cooperation at the larger Danube regional level.

Among these areas can be mentioned the preservation of environmental resources, biodiversity, landscape; development of renewable energy sources, increase of accessibility and connectivity, reduction of localized pollution sources, promotion of smart innovation initiatives.

Last, there are areas of – competitive interaction, where the single territories in the Danube regions are at least in part “in competition” among them, because the local actors aim to the same markets niches or to the same global partners.

Two examples of this type of interaction can be those of: the attraction of thematic tourism (cultural tourism, natural tourism), the attraction of foreign direct investments.

In the eligible area the main potentials of action can be identified in the fields of environment protection, SMART innovation, accessibility, renewable energy. Most of these areas can aim to a synergic interaction with the Danube Regions.

In some other areas, especially the promotion of tourism along the Danube River, the development of transport services, multimodal hubs the promotion of innovation and research clusters, a cooperative action should be established, in order to maximize synergy and avoid negative impact of competition.

The main results of the TA (full text available in annex) are summarized below:

**Social and demographic structure and Dynamics**

* Similar number of inhabitants on the two sides of the border;
* Population unequally distributed, with low density in rural areas and in the mountains, higher density in planes in the North and West Banat Planes;
* Decline of population main structural process in the whole eligible area, all Serbian territories and most of Romanian loosing population, often more than 10% in a decade;
* Serious aging of the population as a consequence of emigration and natural decline, specially in the rural areas, and in the South East.
* Just one large urban pole, Timișoara, inside the area. Two urban poles in Serbia very close to the edge of the eligible area (Novi Sad and and Belgrade);
* Most of the regions predominantly rural, in the South East remote rural, especially considering the limited access to large urban poles;
* Numerous ethnic minorities in the area, large communities of Hungarians in the North, Roma communities present in all areas. Romanian, communities especially in the Centre and South of eligible area in Serbia, and Serbian communities in Timiș and Caras Severin.
* Natural demographic trend is negative in most areas, limited positive trends in Timiș county;
* Most of the migration flows are directed outside of the eligible area, limited share of migration is directed to metropolitan areas in the eligible in Romania.

**Economic structure and dynamic**

* The economic development of the whole area, measured with the GDP per capita, is close to the national levels, but the average is the result of strong dualism, especially between North and South East, on both sides of the border;
* In Romania, in Timiș the GDP/pc is almost double than the national average, in Caraș Severin and Mehedinți GDP /pc is 30% lower;
* In Serbia, in the Vojvodina autonomous province the level of GDP is almost at the level of Serbia average, while in Braničevski and Borski 40% lower. Among the Banat districts in Voivodina, the North lags behind the others in terms of GDP per capita;
* In the North, the growth pole of Timiș county generates an impact that extends beyond the borders, producing a potential for cross border interactions;
* In the centre, and south east, the comparable level of GDP and the similar structure more bilateral partnership than unilateral flows.

Regarding the economic sectors:

* Agriculture presents a very dualistic quality and quantity distribution of resources, and levels of productivity, between the planes of Banat and Timiș and Carpathian Mountains area;
* Mining: in metals, oil represents an historical specialization in the area, it experienced a sharp decline in the last decades because of structural factors, quality and quantity of reserves, and international competition of new producers;
* Energy: very large hydro electrical power capacity on the Danube centrals, and some small plants in the other rivers, some potential of development in renewable resources, in particular biomass in the central and south eastern areas.
* Manufactures: traditional productions in large part of the eligible area; Strong growth of innovative sectors in recent years, due also to strong FDI flows both in Serbian and Romanian regions.
* Services: Basic services in health, education, utilities commerce, transport, present in the area. Advanced services strongly concentrated in the urban poles in Timiș County in Romania, smaller centres, often connected to the leading institutions in Serbia

**The labour market**

* Activity rate per sector: Strong dualism between North eligible area (labour concentrated in manufacturing, lower agricultural activity) and the Centre East (labour concentrated in agriculture);
* In the Eligible area lower employment rate then in the national average; lower rate of activity;
* Strong disparities inside the Eligible area, between Timiș County, with very low unemployment and high activity rates, and other counties and districts, with higher unemployment in the south east;
* Strong dualism across the border in the north, with full employment in Romania, and high unemployment in the neighbour district;
* In the labour market limited differences among women and men unemployment rate.

**Social inclusion and poverty:**

* The area is affected by poverty and social exclusion of large shares of the population, concentrated in the rural areas, and in the mountainous districts of Carpathian.
* Main factors of social exclusion and poverty risk seem unemployment, and capacity to access basic services due to remoteness.
* Significant higher unemployment rates among young active population in the rural areas, and among Roma minorities.

**Health care services**

* In the eligible area the availability of health care services is relatively homogenous, with one exception that is that of Timisoara, where the concentration of health care service centres is close to the double in then in the rest of the eligible area.
* University centres of Medicine are located In Timisoara, inside the eligible area, and in Novi Sad, Belgrade, Nis at the edge of the area in Serbia.
* In recent years, according to the information provided by the local stakeholders, an intensive growth of private centres for health care services, including private hospitals, have been developing all over the eligible area, in particular in the main urban centres.
* This process could lead to a larger disparity in the accessibility of health care services among urban and rural population, and active and non active groups (elders, disadvantaged groups).

**Public Transport and ICT infrastructures**

* Eligible area well connected to main European Networks, Central position in the Rine-Danube European core network;
* Disparities in the accessibility of international network among the eligible areas.
* Areas close to Belgrade and to Timiș much better accessible from international networks than the others;
* Areas in the planes are better connected then those peripheral and in the mountain area; density and quality of the local transport network lower than the national average;
* Low speed of public transport services reduces accessibility of rural and remote areas;
* Accessibility of border crossings sufficient, but poor quality of infrastructures;
* Interconnection of eligible area is limited by infrastructure quality and distances;

**Environmental resources and infrastructures**

* Divide of land use and land cover with agriculture dominating in the Northwest and mountain and forested areas dominating in the southeast, with punctual foci of human activity (e.g. mines);
* Rich natural environment and cultural heritage with many small and dispersed attractions which is at pressure either by abandonment in peripheral areas or by overexploitation in the plains;
* Large number of NATURA 2000 and Natural Protected Areas covering a large part of the programme area;
* Rivers and water bodies mostly heavily modified and with weak ecological potential burdened by agricultural, industrial and municipal discharges;
* Relative low level of service of water supply and sewage treatment especially in the rural areas and difficulties to overcome this by conventional approaches;
* Environmental Infrastructure, is often obsolete, underperforming and with limited perspective for financing beyond rudimentary operation and maintenance;
* Municipal waste treatment is nascent and is relying in simple landfills or uncontrolled dumps;
* Air pollution in the urban centres as a consequence of traffic and poor industrial emissions standards;
* Environmental hotspots and risks, especially due to past and present mining and industrial activity, in many cases in remote areas with poor civil protection mechanisms;
* Flood risks (fluvial and flash floods) in different parts of the Programme area;
* Flood Awareness Systems and disaster protection improving and connecting to European networks but still poor at the local level

**Tourism**

* Relevant potential for various types of tourism on both sides of the border, based on natural and historical resources, and on business and cultural activities that attract tourism demand;
* Ecotourism in the protected areas, cultural tourism attracted by historical heritage, business tourism generated by growing international integration of industrial clusters and business poles, present the highest potential;
* Resources are sparse on the territory, producing a potential for integrated tourism networks, more than for spot tourism attractions. All tourism attractors present a potential for integration in cross border networks;
* Accommodation infrastructure is underexploited, signalling the need for soft investments in coordinated actions for increasing attractiveness and national and international demand;
* International connections are adequate for tourism travels to the area, but the quality of local transport infrastructures and services is poor, constraining the development of coordinated offers and cross border initiatives;

**Education, research and innovation**

* The educational system is experiencing intensive structural changes in both countries;
* Basic primary and secondary education quantitatively adequate in the eligible area, limited differences pre-primary education, more developed in Romania.
* The Programme Area presents an unequal distribution of higher education and research poles;
* Private schools are growing in both countries, however limited statistical information is available;
* In the North of the eligible area in Romania counties are located many university poles, with a national and international potential;
* In Serbia there are no large university poles in the PA, but many are located close to the edge in the main urban poles, accessible to the local population;
* Many research centres in the Romanian area, fewer in the Serbian side.
* Common needs of improvement of the effectiveness and quality results of education;
* Common needs of improvement of the access to education for disadvantaged groups;

**Lessons learned in the current programme period**

The specific objectives of the current programme are addressed through 3 thematic Priority Axes:

* PA 1 “Economic and Social Development” is directly linked to Specific Objective 1;
* PA 2 “Environment and Emergency Preparedness” is directly linked to Specific Objective 2;
* PA 3 “Promoting People to People Exchanges”

According to the feedback from the stakeholders, the Programme’s Strategy is still consistent with the socio-economic environment of the cross-border area and both the logic of intervention and needs remain valid. After the assessment considering the structural and economic changes happened in the programme implementation period, the assumptions of the SWOT analysis have largely remained the same, marked by the economic downturn.

However, according to the survey carried out during the Programme Evaluation exercise, the programme Stakeholders consider the strategy too broadly defined, lacking of focus on specific development priorities for the area.

Programme Stakeholders also pointed out the need of stronger coordination with the central administrative level in each country and with the MAs of other IPA Programmes covering overlapping eligible regions (Romania – Serbia, Hungary – Serbia and Bulgaria – Serbia) and with the European macro-regional strategies relevant to the cross-border area[[10]](#footnote-10).

The territorial distribution of projects shows that all counties and districts have been involved, in both countries at least one application was submitted from most of the municipalities.

A concentration of project applications in Timiș County and in Centre and South Banat, can be observed, both in terms of number of applications and in terms of total cost of projects. However, the relative distribution of project applications, compared to the population, proves that the Caraș Severin and Mehedinți counties have been even more active than the Timiș County, and the Borski province, has been more active than the two Banat counties

The results of the two calls for projects carried out during the programme implementation proved that the target groups generated a large number of projects addressing all priorities.

A slightly lower performance has been observed for the priority 2, for Environment and Emergency Preparedness. According to the stakeholders, the main reason is due to the difficulty for NGOs to access to this priority.

The second call, dedicated to the priority 2 coordinated to the strategy of the Danube Region, led to the approval of 4 projects on environmental protection and emergency management. However, the implementation of these projects is experiencing some difficulties, due to the administrative complexity associated to the large budget and the technical content.

On the basis of the lessons learned in the current period, the partners expect a confirmation of most of the objectives of the current period and an effective generation of joint projects. Most stakeholders do expect a stronger focus on concrete results, and the identification of actions capable to generate a permanent impact in the eligible area.

The main tool that has been identified for the achievement of these objectives is that of strategic projects, involving key stakeholders on some of the most relevant specific objectives, in particular in the areas of accessibility and transport infrastructure and in environment.

The common aim for the simplification of management procedures also emerged, in particular for shortening the time length of the selection and contracting procedures.

More detailed notes on the current programming experience are discussed below, in the framework of the identification of strategic options.

**The swot analysis**

Based on the Territorial Analysis (TA) (May 2014, provided herein Annex) and the consultation among potential beneficiaries and stakeholders, a SWOT analysis of the area has been developed. The SWOT focuses on those issues that are relevant for the identification of the development challenges that can be addressed by the CBC programme. It is clustered in 6 main areas in accordance to the Territorial Analysis.

| **Sector** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Opportunities** | **Threats** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Social and demographic structure** | Presence of urban poles accessible to a significant part of the population.  Equal number of population on the two sides of the border in the PA, facilitating balanced partnership.  Long history of Romanian-Serbian cooperation  Tradition of respect and coexistence among ethnic groups | Large part of population living in small settlements scattered in remote rural areas, which not being able to compete with the larger urban poles, lose population  High share of population at risk of poverty | EU support for social inclusive growth  Growing social and cultural ties between RO and SR  Integration in the macro regional framework EU Danube region. | Continuing Aging of population.  Relative attractiveness of metropolitan areas, also due to EU integration, pulling out emigration and accelerating marginalization of rural areas  Declining population, especially of young active people. |
| **Economy,**  **SMEs development,**  **Labor Market** | Presence of dynamic economic poles in the area.  Traditional industrial presence with local “ecosystems” operating.  Attractiveness and capacity for FDIs, continuing after global crisis.  Large availability of local resources, in agricultural land, mineral reserves, renewable energy fonts. | Strong dualism in economic development , between more advanced districts (Timiș, Banat ) and others, in industrial sectors, SMEs development, services,  Low access to basic services in rural and remote areas  High level of unemployment in lagging behind districts and counties | Growth of industrial and business clusters inside the PA and at the edge, promoting business and facilitating access to services and jobs of resident population.  Investments supported by IPA II strategy in Serbia and Cohesion Policy in Romania offering potential synergies with cross border initiatives | Uncertainties in the global and national economic scenario leading to decline of investments (national and FDI)  Persistence of high unemployment rates, due to weak economic growth at national level |
| **Transport infrastructures, Accessibility, CBC connection** | Strategic location in the European Corridors Network  Good accessibility from larger centers to national and international destinations, due to adjacent national road, rail and airport connections  Good availability of Border crossings   * Multimodal transport infrastructures easily accessible to most of the programme area | Poor quality of local and intraregional transport infrastructures for moving within the Programme Area  Severe limitations to accessibility in rural and mountainous areas.  Heterogeneous Service level of Border Crossing points.  Poor efficiency of local transport services.  Poor development of common transport monitoring systems on the Danube; | Easing of visa procedures facilitating cross border mobility and interaction.  New infrastructures and services developed in the EU corridors network  Soft technologies for the development, operating and monitoring of more efficient transport services  Advanced transport monitoring infrastructure on the Danube on the Romanian side. | Financial crisis limiting capacity of local administration to maintain local transport infrastructures.  Risks for security from increasing illegal traffic flows (illegal migration, smuggling, especially along the fluvial routes.). |
| **Environment,**  **Natural and cultural resources,**  **Tourism** | Low levels of pollution in peripheral areas of scenic beauty  Major natural resources for tourism development: national and natural parks, thermal springs, forests and areas of outstanding natural beauty.  Striking cultural, ethnic and natural diversity, generating attractiveness for business and tourism.  Low population density and low pressure in naturally attractive and remote areas | Environmental hotspots and risks, especially due to past and present mining and industrial activity  Obsolete environmental infrastructure  Disaster protection and preparedness systems improving but are still weak especially at the local level.  Flood risks (fluvial and flash floods) in various parts of the Programme Area  Dispersion of tourism attractors in small poles in a large territory, limiting the capacity to attract international demand  Insufficient exploitation of existing tourism infrastructures, leading to low productivity and non sustainability of private investments | European strategies for environmental protection in macro regions, offering additional support to local strategies (Danube region)  International proofed models of voluntary local disaster response and preparedness systems with low overall costs available Europe-wide  Growth of new models of tourisms attracted by local resources. (Eco tourism, rural tourism, business tourism).  International networks promoting integrated offers (e.g. Green ways along Danube) | Demographic decline of marginal areas increasing risk of environmental degradation due to abandonment of settlements and industrial areas.  Climate change leading to increased extreme events: floods, rainfall etc forest fires, droughts etc..  Risks emerging outside of the Programme Area, e.g. pollution upstream in Danube, which can have severe impacts in the area;  Shrinkage of public budgets and lack of funds for environmental infrastructure renewal and reclamation of brown-fields  Increasing competition by National and European touristic destinations. |
| **Education, R&D, Innovation** | Poles of advanced research institutes and Universities in the PA and at the edge of the eligible area(e.g. Timis, Belgrade)  Existence of poles of excellence and success stories, (e.g.Timiş,Vršac) in area of RTD | Low rates of university education attainments among adult population in some districts.  Weak performance of primary and secondary educational systems which impacts on the quality of education.  Unequal access to ICT, digital divide in remote rural areas  Poor availability of educational services, especially in remote areas | Involvement of Vojvodina and Timiș in European strategies for smart specialization  Danube region strategy generating opportunities of partnerships for innovation | Declining student population due to negative demographic trends, reducing availability of educational services, especially in remote areas.  Financial crisis leading to reduction of investments in public education in remote areas which are not attractive for private entities |
| **Local institutions and civil society** | Strong involvement of civil society groups in Cross border Partnerships.  Existing private and public networks, offering the possibility of cooperation in several thematic areas, education and culture, etc.)  Tradition of cross border exchanges in the past | Administrative burdens and limited capacities in public institutions limiting cross border interactions  Difficulties and delays in implementation of projects under the current programming period, creating obstacles for new partnerships and project generation. | Official start of accession negotiations for Serbia promoting participation to CBC  Improving economic ties between Romania and Republic of Serbia | Low level of support from the national authorities or no national policies to support the creation of cross-border partnerships. |

The Elements of Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats were identified per each of the sections of the Territorial Analysis on the basis of the most relevant outcomes of the analysis of the structure and recent dynamic of the social and economic system in the eligible area.

SWOT items on Social and demographic system are supported by qualitative and quantitative indicators in chapter 3 and 5 of the TA. The indicators in chapter 3 about outbound migration, ageing of the population and natural balance, support the identification of the main weakness and the relevance of the threat of declining population. The indicators on rurality, and remoteness discussed in the chapter 3 and the qualitative information provided in paragraph 5.3 on poverty and social exclusion, support the identification of the risk of poverty as one of the most important weaknesses of the eligible area.

Considering Economy, SMEs development, Labour Market, the indicators on FDI inflows, the SWOT items are supported by quantitative and qualitative indicators provided in the chapters, 3,4,5. Among the others, the indicator of SMEs density, supports the ranking of strengths, while the indicators on level of GDP per capita, especially the disparities of this indicator among the eligible areas, and the indicators on unemployment rate, support the identification of weaknesses, in particular the dualism in economic development.

The analysis of Transport infrastructure, Accessibility, CBC connection, based on statistical indicators provided by National authorities and those at EU level, led to the identification of the main strengths in the location of the eligible area in key point of the European transport network, as defined by the recent regulation on European transport strategy. The main weaknesses and threats are supported by the analysis of density and quality of transport infrastructures in the eligible area. A detailed analysis of border crossing points, and on the traffic in the main points, has led to the identification of some weaknesses in this area.

Considering Environment, Natural and Cultural resources and Tourism the SWOT is based on the qualitative description and quantitative indicators provided in the chapters 8 and 9 of the TA. These topics are presented in a single SWOT heading, since they are closely interrelated, environmental quality being an essential intermediate input to tourism. Essential sources have been the datasets compiled by the European Environmental Agency, which have been processes in GIS creating visualizations of the quantitative information, especially regarding land use and land cover, position of main sources of pollution and protected and sensible area. Also the findings of the SWOT have been supported by the River Basin Management Plans based on the Water Framework Directive (compiled by International Conference on the Protection of the Danube River) and by the European Flood Awareness System. Further details have been collected from the records of the sectoral or spatial relevant authorities and by anecdotal information provided by local experts (e.g. the experts of the Regional Development Agencies and Serbian N.A.).

Concerning Education, R&D, Innovation, the main issues discussed in the Territorial Analysis using quantitative and qualitative indicators are those of the presence of poles of university research in the area or in close proximity, the educational attainment among the active population, the new opportunities created by the involvement in the SMART innovation strategy of the EU, the threats generated by the marginalization of rural areas

Local institutions and civil society issues were particularly discussed by stakeholders and potential beneficiaries in the consultation held in the eligible area.

Identification of the main challenges and untapped potentials

Based on the findings of the SWOT several strategic responses were formulated using the “forward linkages” method. This method identifies four types of responses as outlined below:

* **growth accelerating/expansionary responses**, combining strengths and opportunities and aiming e.g. at socio-economic growth acceleration and the exploitation of comparative advantages;
* **structures adjustment responses**, combining weaknesses and opportunities, aiming at the engagement of structural deficits and the sustainability of socio-economic growth;
* **stabilization responses**, combining strengths and threats, aiming at neutralizing or compensating negative trends and processes beyond the control of the region;
* **preventive responses,** combining threats and weaknesses, aiming at the precaution and mitigation of negative developments which affect economic growth.

**Table 2 Basic policy formulation based on the SWOT findings**

|  | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Opportunities** | Growth accelerating/ expansionary responses | Adjustment responses |
| **Threats** | Stabilization responses | Preventive responses |

Source: own illustration

CBC programmes, being territorial and integrative, usually embraces a combination of responses. However the method described above has been used for the systemic definition and delimitation of main challenges and untapped potentials used as a basis for the strategy to be defined.

After an accurate process of consultation, based on various instruments and methodologies, (described below in the specific section) the programme partners came to a final selection of thematic objectives. The table below gives an overview of the consultation results. Based on Article 34 of the IPA-II Regulation, each thematic priority will correspond to a Programme Priority Axis. The Regulation notes that “where appropriate and in order to increase its impact and effectiveness through a coherent integrated approach, elements of other thematic priorities may be added”. This notion is also addressed in the table below:

* + 1. **Justification for the selection of thematic priorities**

Table 1 Justification for the selection of thematic priorities

| **Selected thematic priority** | **Justification for selection** |
| --- | --- |
| a. Promoting Employment, labour mobility and social and cultural inclusion across the border | The Thematic Priority is highly relevant since it combines important conditions for the stabilisation of the population and the realisation of sustainable development by addressing attractive employment opportunities, provision of health and social services and inclusive society. Cross-border activity in these fields has been increasing in the last years and this trend is expected to accelerate. |
| b. Protecting the environment, promoting climate change adaptation and mitigation, risk prevention and management | The Thematic Priority is highly relevant since the protection of the environment and the elimination and mitigation of existing environmental hotspots and hazards and the adaptation for new risks is considered an absolute prerequisite for any development plan.  Environmental protection and risk management are by definition cross-border. |
| c. Promoting sustainable transport and improving public infrastructures | The Thematic Priority is highly relevant since functioning, efficient and environmental friendly mobility and transport infrastructure as well as public utility infrastructures are absolute prerequisites for an inclusive, attractive and balanced programme area. The CBC dimension is underlined by the need for improved cross-border concentricity and by the need to adjust infrastructure to performance standards, available funds and demographic change. |
| d. Encouraging tourism and cultural and natural heritage | The Thematic Priority is highly relevant since the natural and cultural potential of the area is a significant comparative advantage of the area and an important development asset stretching across the border. CBC projects can help achieve critical mass and demonstrate immediate effects. |
| e. Investing in youth, education and skills | The Thematic Priority is relevant to the area; however the scope of possible actions is very large to be effectively tackled.  Education and skills development are integrated in all Priority Axes as indicative actions with a clear thematic focus on the topic of each Priority Axis.  These aspects can be treated as a horizontal issue. |
| f. Promoting local and regional governance and enhancing the planning and administrative capacity of local and regional authorities. | The Thematic Priority is in general relevant; however capacity development of local and regional authorities is inherent in various Priority Axes. There is little potential to address governance as a “stand alone” due to the administrative structure of the area.  Where relevant, especially under the Thematic Priorities b) and c) capacity development in planning is explicitly addressed. |
| g. Enhancing competitiveness, business and SME development, trade and | The Thematic Priority is in general relevant; however promotion and direct support to SMEs is not among the priorities that can be best addressed by the IPA CBC programme, because of the heterogeneity of the potential demand, the complexity of the procedural and legal implications related to State Aid, which increase the administrative burden to limited effect,.  However, secondary effects on SMEs development are generated by actions implemented under priority a, and d for the tourism sector. |
| h. Strengthening research, technological development, innovation and ICT | The Thematic Priority is in general relevant; however in the programme area the current structure, in terms of human resources, research centres, private entities, dynamics lead to consider the priority not among the highest ranking for actions under the CBC programme. Other European and National programmes can be better used to address needs and challenges in this field, and the actions implemented in thematic priorities *a* and *b* in particular can ensure synergic support. |

**The priorities of the programme:**

According to the results of the analysis and the identified needs and challenges, and based on the lesson learned from the current programme, four priorities have been established, each of one connected to one thematic objective:

1. **Employment promotion and basic services strengthening for an inclusive growth (thematic objective a)**
2. **Environmental protection and risk management (thematic objective b)**
3. **Sustainable mobility and accessibility (thematic objective c)**
4. **Attractiveness for sustainable tourism (thematic objective d)**

**Expected contribution of the chosen priorities to the objectives of EU 2020 Agenda,**

Appraisal of relation between challenges and needs and objectives for smart, sustainable and integrative growth

| **European targets** | **Current progress in RO** | **Current progress in SR[[11]](#footnote-11)** | **Current status in the RO –RS programme area** | **Contribution by the strategy of the programme** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 75% of the population aged 20‐64 to be employed | 63.8%, (2012) | 45,3[[12]](#footnote-12)  (2012) | Overall the situation is similar to the national levels in the eligible area. At county/district level there are big inequalities between Timis county and Mehedinti in RO and Branicevski and South Banath in RS. | Significant. Priority 1 promotes employment, joint action for the efficiency and access to labor market by disadvantaged groups |
| 3% of GDP to be invested in R&D | 0.48% (2011) | 0,73 %[[13]](#footnote-13) | In the eligible area the situation is similar to the national levels, lower in the districts or provinces lagging behind, stronger inTimis county, with the highest concentration of research centres | Indirect but significant. Priority 2 and 3 environment and mobility promote innovation projects that will catalyze investments in R& D. |
| Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions with 20% (compared to 1990 level)[[14]](#footnote-14) | 51.84% | 22.19% (1990-1998) | Greenhouse gas emissions are reduced on the one side based on the population and economic activities trends. However major contributors such obsolete industrial complexes and intense agriculture are operating. | Indirect but significant priority 3 promotes innovation for sustainable transport systems, in particular water ways in the Danube system, |
| 20% of total energy consumption from renewable energy sources (RES) | 20.79% (2012) | 26.5% (2011) | Large hydro-electric power units exist on the Danube, shared between the two countries and produce a significant share of the total production from renewable sources, and of the total electricity production. The Romanian units produce 35%-40% of Romania’s RES in Serbia 20-25% of total Serbian electricity). | Direct effects due to priority 2 actions, in Energy efficiency, usage of geothermal hot springs, water, sun and wind power for producing electric energy. |
| Reduction of 10 Mtoe  (20%) in the primary energy consumption | 16.6% (2012) | -15% (1990-1998), stabilised trend | Primary energy consumption partially reduced due to population trends and sporadic building and industry energy efficiency measures. However new lifestyles increase the per capita consumption. | Indirect effect due to improvement of energy efficiency generated by projects under priority 2 and 4 |
| Less than 10% of children should leave school at an early age | 17.4% (2012) | According to UN surveys 91% of children attended primary schools in Serbia in 2007, 78% attended secondary schools. | In the eligible area the access to primary schools is similar to what observed at national level, in both countries. A significantly lower percentage could be observed among Roma children[[15]](#footnote-15)Particularly serious the condition among Roma communities. | Direct effects due to the impact on disadvantaged groups and poverty of projects under priority 1. |
| At least 40% of 30‐34–year‐olds should complete third level education.EU average 24.285% in 2008. [[16]](#footnote-16) | 21.8% (2012) | 6.5% of the total population has a third grade, 4.5% have higher schools degree  population 25-64, with tertiary ed.: 12.47% | In the eligible area the situation is relatively worst then the national average, especially in the most lagging behind areas and for Roma minority. | Indirect effects due to the increase of demand of high profile jobs in innovative sectors: environmental technologies, cultural services. |
| 20 Millions (580,000 in RO) less people should be at risk of poverty or exclusion (compared to 2008 levels) | 240,000 (2011) | people at risk ofpoverty 17,9% in 2008 to 24,6% in 2012. Poverty risk rate in 2008 (17,9% vs 23,4%) in 2012 (24,6% vs22,6%).[[17]](#footnote-17) | The problem of poverty and social exclusion intensified in Serbia in the last years influenced by the world economic crisis. The situation in the eligible area is similar to the national. The majority of poor citizens is concentrated in rural areas. A reduction of poverty rates in Central Serbia between 2007 and 2010 can be observed, partially due to revision of meta data definition | Indirect effects due to the improvement of living conditions and job opportunities created for disadvantaged groups in priority 1, 3, 4 |

**1.2 Justification for the financial allocation**

*Justification for the financial allocation (i.e. Union support) to each thematic priority in accordance with the thematic concentration requirements (taking into account the ex-ante evaluation)*

|  |
| --- |
| *<1.2.1 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘7000’ input=‘M’ >*  The financial allocation to each Priority was defined taking in to consideration some basic criteria, and using the information and feedback received with the consultation of the local partners and stakeholders:   * The proportionality to the challenges and needs emerged in the analysis of the eligible area and addressed by each priority; * The project generation potential, estimated on the basis of the lessons learned from the previous programming period; * The expected financial size of the operations proposed, taking in to account of the technical content, the physical size, the territory targeted the number and or the typology of target groups considered; * the project ideas and proposals collected during the consultations for programming with stakeholders and programme partners, especially for strategic projects; * Further, for the estimation of the number of possible projects under each Priority Axis it was assumed that projects will have on average a budget of XXC Million EUR IPA. However, this being an average, the Programme foresees the need for smaller and larger projects in the course of implementation as it seems fit;   The financial allocation per Priority Axis is as follows:   * **Priority Axis 1 (TP a) Employment promotion and services for an inclusive growth -** the planned budget allocation to Priority Axis 1 is € 20.224.687 EUR, corresponding to 27% of the total.   The allocation is larger than the average of the priority, based on three main justifications:   * The local stakeholders proved a strong capacity to generate projects during the previous programming period, in the fields of the cooperation for social inclusion projects, health care services, cultural cooperation, and the experiences will be surely capitalized in the next programming period; * Some of the actions proposed may include investments in small infrastructures and equipment, with costs larger than those for soft actions; * The actions proposed can produce relevant impact in all communities in the eligible areas, and the number of projects proposals is expected very large;   The priority could support strategic projects, but the proposals currently discussed by the stakeholders seem to privilege ordinary projects  The financial allocation to this priority is in line with the emphasis given within the Programme area and also with the demand from the base as expressed during the period 2007-2013 and within the consultations during programming.  -------------------------------------------------------------------------------   * **Priority Axis 2 (TP b ):** **Environmental protection and risk management** the planned budget allocation to Priority Axis 2 is € 20.224.687 Million EUR, corresponding to 27% of the total, with an estimated number of XX projects to be implemented. The financial allocation within this Priority Axis is justified by the actions envisaged in the pursuit of Specific Objective and also by the potentially cost-intensive outputs under Specific Objective.   The allocation is larger than the average of the 4 priorities, based on three main justifications:   * Some of the actions proposed may include investments in infrastructures and equipments, with costs larger than those for soft actions; * The partners have already produced a large portfolio of strategic projects ideas which include investments in infrastructures and technologies; * The Priority can support some strategic actions that will be particularly relevant for the coordination with the EUSDR strategy;   A share of the priority budget could be implemented through strategic projects. Some of them have been already identified and discussed by the programme partnership  -------------------------------------------------------------------------------   * **Priority Axis 3 (TP c):** **Sustainable mobility and accessibility** the planned budget allocation to Priority Axis 3 is € 13.483.125 Million EUR, corresponding to 18% of the total, with an estimated number of XX projects to be implemented. This financial allocation reflects the expected size of actions facing the needs to support   The allocation is lower than the average of the 4 priorities, based on three main justifications, that lead to the expectation for fewer projects, with a larger average cost than in other areas:   * During the previous programming period the number of projects implemented in these fields was relatively lower than in other areas. * However, the partners have produced a large portfolio of strategic projects ideas, that include investments in infrastructures, project designs for large infrastructures, regeneration of existing infrastructures. * The Priority can support some strategic actions that will be particularly relevant for the coordination with the EUSDR strategy.   A substantial share of the priority budget could be implemented through strategic projects. Some of them have been already identified and discussed by the programme partnership  -------------------------------------------------------------------------------   * **Priority Axis 4 (TP d)** **Attractiveness for sustainable tourism:** the planned budget allocation to Priority Axis 4 is € 13.483.125 Million EUR, corresponding to 17% of the total, with an estimated number of XX projects to be implemented. . This financial allocation reflects the expected size of actions facing the needs to support XCCX valorisation of cultural and natural heritage and increase awareness   The allocation is lower than the average of the 4 priorities, based on three main justifications, that lead to the expectation of a large number of projects with a lower average cost than in other areas:   * During the previous programming period a significant number of projects were implemented in these fields, but the average costs of these projects was smaller than in other areas, especially because most of the projects consisted of soft activities. * The Priority can support some actions that will be particularly relevant for the coordination with the EUSDR strategy, but these actions most probably will consist of soft activities, instead of investments in infrastructures. * Some strategic projects could be identified and developed. However, according to the results of the analysis of challenges and needs these projects will probably consist of soft actions, and the strategic impact will depend on the involvement of partners and stakeholders in the whole eligible area, in the creation of permanent networks and marketing tools. * **Priority Axis 5: technical assistance**. The allocation for technical assistance corresponds to the 10% of the total allocation, in compliance to the art 35 of IPA II implementing regulation.   The decision to allocate the maximum admissible budget depends on two main reasons:   * The experience of the current programming period, that proves that programme partners and potential beneficiaries need a strong support for the generation and implementation of projects, due to the limited resources and skills available, especially in the marginal and remote areas. * The strategy for the new programme has identified ambitious objectives, including strategic projects, strong coordination with regional and international strategies (EUSDR). |

The overall Programme budget comprises of **74.906.248** EUR (with an IPA contribution of € 37.453.124,00 Million EUR) as described in section 3.

.

Table 3 Overview of the investment strategy of the cooperation programme

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Union support (in EUR)** | **Proportion (%) of the total Union support for the cooperation programme** | **Thematic priorities** | **Result indicators corresponding to the thematic priority** |
| *<1.2.1 type=‘S’ input=‘G’>* | *<1.2.2 type=‘S’ input=‘G’>* | *<1.2.5 type=‘S’ input=‘G’><1.2.1 0type=‘P’ input=‘G’>* | *<1.2.6 type=‘S’ input=‘G’>* | *<1.2.9 type=‘S’ input=‘G’>* |
| 1 |  | **27** | A |  |
| 2 |  | **27** | B |  |
| 3 |  | **18** | C |  |
| 4 |  | **18** | D |  |
| 5 |  | **10** | TA |  |

SECTION 2. PRIORITY AXES

**(**Reference: points (b) and (c) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

**Section 2.1.**

**Description of the priority axes (other than technical assistance)**

***Each of the points under Section 2.1, from 1 to 8, shall be repeated for each priority axis***

***as follows: PA 1 (2.1.1-2.1.8), as exemplified below, and then continue with PA 2 (2.2.1-2.2.8), PA 3 (2.3.1-2.3.8) etc***

*(Reference: point (b) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)*

**2.1.1 Priority Axis 1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *ID of the priority axis* | *<2.1.1 type=‘N’ input=‘G’> 1*  **1** |
| *Title of the priority axis* | *<2.1.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘500’ input=‘M’>*  **Employment promotion and basic services strengthening for an inclusive growth** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The entire priority axis will be implemented solely through financial instruments | *<2.1.3 type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* |
| The entire priority axis will be implemented solely though financial instruments set up at Union level | *<2.1.4 type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* |
| The entire priority axis will be implemented through community-led local development | *<2.1.5 type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* |

**2.1.2 Fund, calculation basis for Union support and justification of the calculation basis choice**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Fund* | *<2.1.6 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* |
| *Calculation basis (total eligible expenditure or public eligible expenditure)* | *<2.1.7 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* |
| *Justification of the calculation basis choice* | *<2A.8 type=‘S’ input=‘M’>* |

**2.1.3. The specific objectives of the thematic priority and expected results**

(Reference: points (b)(i) and (ii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *ID* | *<2A.1.1 type=‘N’ input=‘G’>*  **1** |
| *Specific objective* | *<2A.1.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘500’ input=‘M’>*   * To enhance the potential of the programme area for an inclusive growth, improving availability of employment opportunities and quality of life to all residents and reducing the impact of constraints due to remoteness and marginalisation of border areas, through three thematic areas: * Promotion of an efficient and inclusive labour market, * Creation of Infrastructures and actions for improved health care and social services. * Creation of infrastructures and actions for social and cultural inclusion |
| *The results that the partner States seek to achieve with Union support* | *<2A.1.3 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘3500’ input=‘M’>*  **The expected results per each of the thematic areas of the specific objective:**  **Thematic area**: Promotion of an efficient and inclusive labour market, with improved ties across the border, ensuring better accessibility and offering better job opportunities to marginal and disadvantaged groups, young population, women.  **Expected results**: The active population will experience better access to the labour market, receiving more information on job opportunities, adult training opportunities and assistance from professional associations. Tailored assistance for the access to job opportunities will be offered to young persons completing educational cycle, young people not employed, not involved in training or educational activities. Disadvantaged groups, isolated communities in marginal areas. Promotion of the access to the labour market among young active population, disadvantaged groups, unemployed, returning migrants. Cooperation across the border established among Public Services, NGOs, local administrations for joint actions in the labour market.  **Thematic area:** Creation of Infrastructures and actions for improved health care and social services, Improvement of quality and accessibility of basic services, exploiting cross-border synergies and removing bottlenecks and constraints generated by remoteness and technological gaps.  **Expected results:** The resident population will have access to improved services, with more efficient structures and more accessible networks of services in the sectors of health care, and social services. Vulnerable communities, due to remoteness or demographic structure will have ensured new services adapted to the specific needs.  Disadvantaged groups will experience improved access to social services with specific actions of information and assistance. Cross border networks and platforms will be established in order to exploit synergies, and to share strategies for common needs of social inclusion. Cross border mobility of active population will be facilitated, with shared benefits to the local economic systems.  Thematic objective: Creation of infrastructures and initiatives for social and cultural inclusion, for the promotion of a lively cultural environment, integrated across the border, ensuring integration of ethnic groups and inclusion of minorities and disadvantaged groups.  **Expected results:** Resident population will have access to cultural and social services integrated in cross border networks, facilitating cultural integration of ethnic groups, and cross border interaction. Disadvantaged groups will have opportunities to experience cultural services, with the support of innovative instruments, like social enterprises, non profit groups. NGOs and local bodies active in cultural services on the two sides of the border will share good practices and innovative solution |

**2.1.4. Elements of other thematic priorities added to the priority axis**

(Reference: Article 35(1) of IPA II Implementing Regulation)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *ID* | *<2A.1.1 type=‘N’ input=‘G’>* |
| *Contribution to the specific objective of the priority axis* | *<2A.1.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘500’ input=‘M’>* |
| *The results that the partner States seek to achieve with Union support* | *<2A.1.3 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘3500’ input=‘M’>* |

**2.1.5. Actions to be supported under the thematic priority** (by thematic priority)

***2.1.5.1. A description of the type and examples of actions to be supported and their expected contribution to the specific objectives, including, where appropriate, identification of the main target groups, specific territories targeted and types of beneficiaries***

(Reference: point (b)(iii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Thematic Priority* | *<2A.2.1.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* |
| *<2A.2.1.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘14000’ input=‘M’>*  Taking in account the strategy defined herein, the available means and potentials, the CBC Programme is mainly delivering:   * Partnership for the elaboration of innovative methodologies, tools, and action plans; * Implementation of Pilot actions; * cooperation agreements for the joint management of structures and systems; * creation of innovative services provided by joint networks, targeting local communities and common needs * Investments in design and analysis of large projects, integrated in international networks and contributing to macro regional strategies. * Small infrastructures for the enhancement of quality and accessibility of basic services   The indicative Actions to be supported under the thematic priority a)  per thematic areas:  TA 1 ”Employment and labor mobility”:   * Set up of joint initiatives and cross border networks for the identification of potentials of employment and the removal of obstacles to the access to the labor market by disadvantaged groups. * Set up of joint initiatives targeting young active people, to promote their access to the labor market * Set up of cross border initiatives for the capitalization of potentials and facilitation of cross border mobility in the local labor markets. * Joint initiatives, cooperation, exchange of information, coordination of activities and services among professional associations for the promotion of employment and entrepreneurial initiatives, especially among young unemployed, women, disadvantaged groups. * Development of cross-border services for adult trainings, assistance to job seekers, assistance to returning emigrants for the re-integration in the local labor market.   TA2: area ”Health and social infrastructures”:   * Set up of cross-border platforms and networks for planning and provision of health and social services, including remote communities and disadvantaged groups. * Joint studies and researches for the identification of innovative technological solutions for the organization of effective networks for basic services provision * Set up of monitoring services for the identification of needs and the quantification of demands for new social and health services generated by demographic and social dynamics, like aging, and migration * Joint planning of investments for equipment and small infrastructures for the provision of health and social services, targeting communities across the borders.   TA 3: ”Social and cultural inclusion”:   * Set up of cross-border frameworks, and networks for the strengthening of the cross-border cultural exchange; * Design cross-border actions for social and cultural inclusion through innovative solutions such as social enterprises, voluntary organisations, special interest groups etc. * Set up models and test pilot actions for a better participation of all social groups, actors and users in the design and delivery of cultural services and services of general interest.   **Target groups and potential beneficiaries**  In the context of the Programme, the target groups are those bodies, economic and social groups and individuals who will use the outputs of the projects or will experience the impact of the programme outcomes on their economic and social activities and interests. The Romania Serbia CBC programme will target the population of the eligible area, including the population located in the marginal areas, the disadvantaged groups, the young active population.  Beneficiaries are those bodies and organisations which will be directly involved in the projects financed by the Programme. Beneficiary bodies will be the entities that will be responsible of the generation of the project, the implementation of the actions aiming to achievement of the programme results. In the context of the Romania-Serbia programme, potential beneficiaries will be identified among local and national public bodies, educational institutions, NGOs active in the relevant sectors    **Target groups of the Priority:**   * Resident population. * Unemployed, especially young and women, * Residents in remote and marginal areas * Disadvantaged groups.   **Indicative types of beneficiaries**   * Local Public Authorities * Regional Public Authorities * Offices – branches of National Public Authorities active on the themes of the priority in the eligible area * Public Bodies active in the fields of actions of the priority. * Adult Education/training centers * Business support organizations * NGOs active in the themes of the priority | |

***2.1.5.2. Guiding principles for the selection of operations***

(Reference: point (b)(iii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Thematic priority* | *<2A.2.2.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* |
| *<2A.2.2.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘3500’ input=‘M’>*  The selection of projects will be carried out following a standardized assessment procedure using the following sets of criteria:   * **Strategic coherence**: this criterion examines the coherence and contribution of each project proposal to the relevant Specific Objective addressed the contribution to the envisaged results and the overall coherence of planned activities with the indicative types of actions.   Further the cross-border added value of the operation, its territorial dimension and the relevance of the partnership will also be assessed in this context.   * **Operational quality**: this criterion examines the design of the project proposal in relation to clarity and coherence of the operational objectives, activities and means, feasibility, efficiency, communication of the project and its results, potential for uptake and embedment into operative procedures of the partners involved. * **Compliance to horizontal principles:** this criterion examines the consideration from the side of the project of the Programme Horizontal Principles and the demonstration of their integration and advancement within the project proposal intervention logic. The strategic coherence criterion basically examines the relevance of the project proposal, hence it retains primacy over the other two criteria.   The detailed assessment criteria will be laid down and made available to potential applicants in the calls for proposals documentation that will be approved by the programme Authorities. | |

***2.1.5.3. Planned use of financial instruments*** (where appropriate)

(Reference: point (b)(iii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Thematic priority* | *<2A.2.3.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* a |
| *Planned use of financial instruments* | *<2A.2.3.2 type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* NO |
| *<2A.2.3.3 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘7000’ input=‘M’>*  No financial instruments will be used | |

**2.1.6 Common and programme specific indicators**

(Reference: point (b)(ii) and (b)(iv) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013 and Article 2(2) of IPA II Implementing Regulation)

***2.1.6.1 Priority axis result indicators (programme specific)***

Table 4: Programme specific result indicators

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Indicator** | **Measurement unit** | **Baseline value** | **Baseline year** | **Target value (2023)[[18]](#footnote-18)** | **Source of data** | **Frequency of reporting** |
| *<2A.1.4 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘5’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.1.5 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.1.6 type=‘S’ input=‘M’>* | *Quantitative <2A.1.8 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>*  *Qualitative <2A.1.8 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’* | *<2A.1.9 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *Quantitative <2A.1.10 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>*  *Qualitative <2A.1.10 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.1.11 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘200’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.1.12 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’>* |
| PA1  RI1 | Active Population experiencing improved access to the labour market, | % on total active population | tbd | 2015 | Increase | Survey among target groups | 2015  2017 2020,  2023 |
| PA1  RI2 | Population accessing to improved basic services in health care, culture, education. | % on total population | tbd | 2015 | Increase | Survey among target groups | 2015  2017 2020,  2023 |
| PA1  RI3 | Population experiencing a more lively and integrated cultural and social environment | % on total population | tbd | 2015 | Increase | Survey among target groups | 2015  2017 2020,  2023 |

***2.1.6.2. Priority axis output indicators (common or programme specific)***

Table 5 Common and programme specific output indicators

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Indicator *(name of indicator)*** | **Measurement unit** | **Target value (2023)** | **Source of data** | **Frequency of reporting** |
| *<2A.2.5.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* | *<2A.2.5.2 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* | *<2A.2.5.3 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* | *<2A.2.5.6 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.2.5.7 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘200’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.2.5.8 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’>* |
| **PA1.OI1** | Number of residents involved in projects activities | Units | XX[[19]](#footnote-19) | Monitoring system and projects reports | Bi-annual starting 2016 |
| **PA1.OI2** | Number of cross border Networks, partnerships created | Units | XX | Monitoring system and projects reports | Bi-annual starting 2016 |
| **PA1.OI3** | Number of innovative services in health care and social services established/extended with investments | Units | XX | Monitoring system and projects reports | Bi-annual starting 2016 |
| **PA1 OI4** | Number of disadvantaged persons involved in projects activities | Units | XX | Monitoring system and projects reports | Bi-annual starting 2016 |
| **PA1OI5** | Number of studies, surveys, researches produced | units | XX | Monitoring system and projects reports | Bi-annual starting 2016 |

**2.1.7. Categories of intervention**

(Reference: point (b)(vii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

Categories of intervention corresponding to the content of the priority axis, based on a nomenclature adopted by the Commission, and indicative breakdown of Union support

**Tables 8-11: Categories of intervention**

Table 6: Dimension 1 Intervention field

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2A.4.1.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N>* | *<2A.4.1.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2A.4.1.3 type=‘N’ input=‘M’ Decision=N >* |
| 1 | 102 Access to employment |  |
| 1 | 053 Health Infrastructures |  |
| 1 | 109 Active Inclusion |  |
| 1 | 116 Improving ... access to tertiary education |  |
| 1 | 113 Promoting social entrepreneurship |  |

Table 7: Dimension 2 Form of finance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2A.4.1.4 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N>* | *<2A.4.1.5 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2A.4.1.6 type=‘N’ input=‘M’ Decision=N >* |
| 1 | 01 Non Repayable grant |  |
|  |  |  |

Table 8 : Dimension 3 Territory type

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2A.4.1.7 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N>* | *<2A.4.1.8 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2A.4.1.9 type=‘N’ input=‘M’ Decision=N >* |
| 1 | O1 Large urban areas |  |
|  | 02 Small urban areas |  |
|  | 03 Rural areas |  |

Table 9: Dimension 6 Territorial delivery mechanisms

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2A.4.1.10 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N>* | *<2A.4.1.11 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2A.4.1.12 type=‘N’ input=‘M’ Decision=N >* |
|  | 07 Other |  |
|  |  |  |

**2.1.8. A summary of the planned use of technical assistance including, where necessary, actions to reinforce the administrative capacity of authorities involved in the management and control of the programmes and beneficiaries and, where necessary, actions for to enhance the administrative capacity of relevant partners to participate in the implementation of programmes** (where appropriate)

(Reference: point (b)(vi) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Priority axis* | *<3A.5.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* **1** |
| *<2A.5.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘2000’ input=‘M’>*  Capacity building initiatives:   * For project generation, assisting potential beneficiaries for the identification of needs among target groups, coordination of administrative * Procedures for the establishment of cross border networks; * For procurement procedures design and management;   Promotion initiatives:   * to activate participation among local administrations in remote areas, NGOs; * to inform target groups on outputs of the programme;   Surveys and evaluation activities:   * Surveys among target groups to evaluate the impact of priority; | |

**2.2.1 Priority Axis 2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *ID of the priority axis* | *<2.2.1 type=‘N’ input=‘G’> 1*  **2** |
| *Title of the priority axis* | *<2.2.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘500’ input=‘M’>*  **Environmental protection and risk management** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The entire priority axis will be implemented solely through financial instruments | *<2.2.3 type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* |
| The entire priority axis will be implemented solely though financial instruments set up at Union level | *<2.2.4 type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* |
| The entire priority axis will be implemented through community-led local development | *<2.2.5 type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* |

**2.2.2 Fund, calculation basis for Union support and justification of the calculation basis choice**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Fund* | *<2.2.6 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* |
| *Calculation basis (total eligible expenditure or public eligible expenditure)* | *<2.2.7 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* |
| *Justification of the calculation basis choice* | *<2A.8 type=‘S’ input=‘M’>* |

**2.2.3. The specific objectives of the thematic priority and expected results**

(Reference: points (b)(i) and (ii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *ID* | *<2A.1.1 type=‘N’ input=‘G’>*  **2** |
| *Specific objective* | *<2A.1.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘500’ input=‘M’>*  To enhance protection of natural resources and management of environmental risks, promoting **cross-border interoperability and joint actions** for innovative systems of environmental protection, mitigation of environmental risk and management of emergencies in case of environmental disasters.  The Priority Axis is targeting two thematic areas:   1. Environmental protection and sustainable use of natural resources. 2. Environmental risks management and emergency preparedness |
| *The results that the partner States seek to achieve with Union support* | *<2A.1.3 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘3500’ input=‘M’>*  **The expected results per each of the thematic areas of the specific objective:**  **Thematic area:** Environmental protection and sustainable use of natural resources: Improvement of capacity and actions of organisations and bodies involved in environmental protection and sustainable use of natural resources. Promotion of cross border networks for education and studies on environmental resources.  **Expected Results:** Public organizations of the two sides of the border establishing permanent networks and partnerships for the monitoring and management of environmental resources. Inhabitants better informed on natural resources quality and vulnerability. Education on environmental protection actions and methodologies improved with cross border initiatives. Knowledge on environmental resources improved with cross border partnerships.  Managerial and technological innovations for the environmental protection tailored to the local needs and transferred to the local administrations.  Local and national bodies actively integrated in the strategies for the protection and promotion of environmental resources in the Danube Basin Macro Region.  Enhancement of the capacity of local institutions to protect and promote natural resources, through the creation or the rehabilitation of infrastructures and equipment for the provision of innovative services in the field.  **Thematic area:** Environmental risks management and emergency preparedness. Improvement of cross-border interoperability of organisations and bodies involved in disaster resilience and disaster management systems and emergency preparedness.  **Expected result:** Increase of the capacity of local administrations and public bodies competent for early cross-border identification and assessment of the situation in case of environmental accidents and natural disasters, and joint environmental protective actions.  Local and national bodies active in the area better integrated in the Danube Basin International systems and organizations for the management of environmental risks and emergencies.  Improvement of the capacity of local institutions to play and active and efficient role in interventions for environmental emergencies, due to natural events or industrial accidents, through the creation or rehabilitation of infrastructures and equipment. |

**2.2.4. Elements of other thematic priorities added to the priority axis**

(Reference: Article 35(1) of IPA II Implementing Regulation)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *ID* | *<2A.1.1 type=‘N’ input=‘G’>* |
| *Contribution to the specific objective of the priority axis* | *<2A.1.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘500’ input=‘M’>* |
| *The results that the partner States seek to achieve with Union support* | *<2A.1.3 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘3500’ input=‘M’>* |

**2.2.5. Actions to be supported under the thematic priority** (by thematic priority)

***2.2.5.1. A description of the type and examples of actions to be supported and their expected contribution to the specific objectives, including, where appropriate, identification of the main target groups, specific territories targeted and types of beneficiaries***

(Reference: point (b)(iii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Thematic Priority* | *<2A.2.2.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* |
| *<2A.2.2.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘14000’ input=‘M’>*  **PA 2 TA 1 Environmental protection and sustainable use of natural resources.**   * Establishment and enhancement of cross border partnerships and networks of research institutions in the field of energy efficiency, usage of geothermal hot springs, water, sun and wind power for producing electric energy, including investments in infrastructure based on common and tailored technical solutions * Set up of cross-border frameworks, platforms and networks for the exchange of experience and the identification of needs for state authorities, volunteers organizations and individuals involved or interested in environmental protection; * Development of joint training and awareness programmes for relevant organisations and the general public including educational institutions; * Establishment and enhancement of cross border partnerships and networks of research institutions in the field of natural resources, biodiversity, technologies for environmental protection, for the identification and transfer of innovations tailored to the local needs. * Establishment of networks and partnerships for joint training actions for public entities and local communities in the field of environmental protection, enhancement of pollution control strategies and systems; conduction of joint trainings and maintenance of interoperability including the purchase of compatible equipment. * Joint initiatives and investments in small infrastructures and equipment for the implementation of technologies for the control of pollution and rehabilitation of rivers (e.g. Tisa river) and brown fields and industrial areas with common problems on the two sides of the border (e.g. Moldova Nouă Mines, Resița Industrial areas) ; * Restoration of natural areas (e.g. woods and river banks) to prevent floods and land slides.   **PA 2 TA 2 Environmental risks management and emergency preparedness**   * Development of joint structures and partnerships for the integration of the involved state authorities and volunteers organizations on initiatives in relation to the Danube Strategy (Danube River Basin Management, ICPDR initiatives, European Floods Alert System etc.), including the investments in small infrastructures and equipment; * Establishment and enhancement of cross border liaison in the environmental planning of the involved state authorities and volunteers organizations including joint risk mapping of accident risk spots, risk assessment and evaluation exercises; * Development of joint procedures for the establishment and maintenance, and integration in international networks, in particular Danube Region, of databases on environmental resources and environmental risks; * Promotion of data availability and the integration of management approaches (hazard and risk assessment, planning methodologies, management plans, sustainability and adaptation assessments, monitoring and evaluation etc.); * Establishment of networks and partnerships for joint training actions for public entities and local communities in the field of environmental protection, management of environmental emergencies; joint trainings and maintenance of interoperability including the purchase of compatible equipment; * Establishment of joint services for the management and control of risks generated by hot spots of industrial pollution (e.g. ICP Prahovo; industrial poles in Mehedinți County )   **Target groups**   * Resident population * Population living in areas specially exposed to environmental risk. * Population active in sectors of environmental protection, environmental risks monitoring and management.   **Indicative types of beneficiaries**   * Local Public Authorities * Regional Public Authorities * National Public Authorities * Environmental Agencies * Higher education institutions * NGOs representing cultural and social groups | |

***2.2.5.2. Guiding principles for the selection of operations***

(Reference: point (b)(iii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Thematic priority* | *<2A.2.2.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* |
| *<2A.2.2.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘3500’ input=‘M’>*  The selection of projects will be carried out following a standardized assessment procedure using the following sets of criteria:   * **Strategic coherence**: this criterion examines the coherence and contribution of each project proposal to the relevant Specific Objective addressed the contribution to the envisaged results and the overall coherence of planned activities with the indicative types of actions.   Further the cross-border added value of the operation, its territorial dimension and the relevance of the partnership will also be assessed in this context.   * **Operative quality**: this criterion examines the design of the project proposal in relation to clarity and coherence of the operational objectives, activities and means, feasibility, efficiency, communication of the project and its results, potential for uptake and embedment into operative procedures of the partners involved. * **Compliance to horizontal principles:** this criterion examines the consideration from the side of the project of the Programme Horizontal Principles and the demonstration of their integration and advancement within the project proposal intervention logic. The strategic coherence criterion basically examines the relevance of the project proposal, hence it retains primacy over the other two criteria.   The detailed assessment criteria will be laid down and made available to potential applicants in the calls for proposals documentation that will be approved by the programme Authorities | |

***2.2.5.3. Planned use of financial instruments*** (where appropriate)

(Reference: point (b)(iii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Thematic priority* | *<2A.2.3.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* b) |
| *Planned use of financial instruments* | *<2A.2.3.2 type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* NO |
| *<2A.2.3.3 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘7000’ input=‘M’>*  NO financial instruments will be used for the implementation of the priority. | |

**2.2.6 Common and programme specific indicators**

(Reference: point (b)(ii) and (b)(iv) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013 and Article 2(2) of IPA II Implementing Regulation)

***2.2.6.1 Priority axis result indicators (programme specific)***

Table 10: Programme specific result indicators

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Indicator** | **Measurement unit** | **Baseline value** | **Baseline year** | **Target value (2023)[[20]](#footnote-20)** | **Source of data** | **Frequency of reporting** |
| *<2A.1.4 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘5’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.1.5 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.1.6 type=‘S’ input=‘M’>* | *Quantitative <2A.1.8 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>*  *Qualitative <2A.1.8 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’* | *<2A.1.9 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *Quantitative <2A.1.10 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>*  *Qualitative <2A.1.10 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.1.11 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘200’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.1.12 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’>* |
| PA2-RI 1 | Inhabitants awareness on environmental resources and protection actions | Qualitative indicator on Ordinal scale value | TBD | 2015 | Increase | Survey among inhabitants | 2017 2020  2023 |
| PA2.RI1 | Increase of the capacity for emergency identification and management | Qualitative indicator Ordinal scale value (1-10) | tbd | 2015 | Increase | Survey among stakeholders | 2017 2020,  2023 |
| PA2.RI2 | Increase of the potential for cross-border interoperability | Qualitative indicator Ordinal scale value (1-10) | tbd | 2015 | Increase | Survey among stakeholders | 2017 2020,  2023 |

***2.2.6.2. Priority axis output indicators (common or programme specific)***

Table 11: Common and programme specific output indicators

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Indicator *(name of indicator)*** | **Measurement unit** | **Target value (2023)** | **Source of data** | **Frequency of reporting** |
| *<2A.2.5.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* | *<2A.2.5.2 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* | *<2A.2.5.3 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* | *<2A.2.5.6 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.2.5.7 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘200’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.2.5.8 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’>* |
| **PA2.OI1** | Number of cross border cooperation partnerships, and networks established | Units (No) | XX[[21]](#footnote-21) | Monitoring | Bi-annual, starting 2016 |
| **PA2.OI2** | Participants to project initiatives and events for information and awareness rising | Units (No | XX | Monitoring | Bi-annual, starting 2016 |
| **PA1OI5** | Number of studies, surveys, researches produced | units | XX | Monitoring | Bi-annual, starting 2016 |
| **PA2.OI3** | Participants to capacity building initiatives in | units (No) | XX | Monitoring | Bi-annual, starting 2016 |
| **PA2.OI4** | Data bases and monitoring systems established /extended in the eligible area | Units | XX | Monitoring | Bi-annual, starting 2016 |

**2.2.7. Categories of intervention**

(Reference: point (b)(vii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

Categories of intervention corresponding to the content of the priority axis, based on a nomenclature adopted by the Commission, and indicative breakdown of Union support

**Tables 14-17: Categories of intervention**

Table 12: Dimension 1 Intervention field

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2A.4.1.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N>* | *<2A.4.1.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2A.4.1.3 type=‘N’ input=‘M’ Decision=N >* |
| 2 | 085 protection and enhancement. | 30% |
| 2 | 087 Adaptation to climate change... management of climate related risks | 40% |
| 2 | 088 Risk prevention and management of non climate related risks | 30% |

Table 13: Dimension 2 Form of finance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2A.4.1.4 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N>* | *<2A.4.1.5 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2A.4.1.6 type=‘N’ input=‘M’ Decision=N >* |
| 1 | 01 Non Repayable grant |  |
|  |  |  |

Table 14: Dimension 3 Territory type

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2A.4.1.7 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N>* | *<2A.4.1.8 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2A.4.1.9 type=‘N’ input=‘M’ Decision=N >* |
| 1 | O1 Large urban areas | 20% |
|  | 02 Small urban areas | 40% |
|  | 03 Rural areas | 40% |

Table 15: Dimension 6 Territorial delivery mechanisms

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2A.4.1.10 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N>* | *<2A.4.1.11 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2A.4.1.12 type=‘N’ input=‘M’ Decision=N >* |
|  | 07 |  |
|  |  |  |

**2.2.8. A summary of the planned use of technical assistance including, where necessary, actions to reinforce the administrative capacity of authorities involved in the management and control of the programmes and beneficiaries and, where necessary, actions for to enhance the administrative capacity of relevant partners to participate in the implementation of programmes** (where appropriate)

(Reference: point (b)(vi) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Priority axis* | *<3A.5.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* **2** |
| *<2A.5.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘2000’ input=‘M’>*  Capacity building initiatives:   * for project generation, assisting potential beneficiaries for the identification of needs among target groups, coordination of administrative; * procedures for the establishment of cross border networks; * For procurement procedures design and management;   Promotion initiatives:   * to activate participation among local administrations in remote areas, NGOs; * to inform target groups on outputs of the programme;   Surveys and evaluation activities:   * Surveys among target groups to evaluate programme impact; | |

**2.3.1 Priority Axis 3**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *ID of the priority axis* | *<2.3.1 type=‘N’ input=‘G’> 1*  **3** |
| *Title of the priority axis* | *<2.3.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘500’ input=‘M’>*  **Sustainable Mobility and Accessibility:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The entire priority axis will be implemented solely through financial instruments | *<2.3.3 type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* |
| The entire priority axis will be implemented solely though financial instruments set up at Union level | *<2.3.4 type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* |
| The entire priority axis will be implemented through community-led local development | *<2.3.5 type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* |

**2.3.2 Fund, calculation basis for Union support and justification of the calculation basis choice**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Fund* | *<2.3.6 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* |
| *Calculation basis (total eligible expenditure or public eligible expenditure)* | *<2.3.7 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* |
| *Justification of the calculation basis choice* | *<2A.8 type=‘S’ input=‘M’>* |

**2.3.3. The specific objectives of the thematic priority and expected results**

(Reference: points (b)(i) and (ii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *ID* | *<2A.1.1 type=‘N’ input=‘G’>* **3** |
| *Specific objective* | *<2A.1.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘500’ input=‘M’>*   * To support the achievement of improved and homogenous quality standard in public infrastructures for mobility and access to services, especially in remote areas and ; * To improve efficiency of secondary transport networks and basic utilities. * To promote innovation and the preparation of feasibility studies for investments to be implemented in coordination with other EU and National programmes   The Priority Axis is targeting two thematic areas:   * Mobility and transport infrastructures and services, * ICT and public utilities infrastructures and networks, |
| *The results that the partner States seek to achieve with Union support* | *<2A.1.3 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘3500’ input=‘M’>*  **The expected results per each of the thematic areas of the specific objective:**  **PA3. Thematic area - Mobility and transport infrastructures and services, Expected Results**   * Promotion of efficient and environmental friendly mobility and transport in the programme area; * Improvement of cross border mobility and integration; * Improvement of accessibility of remote marginal areas; * Enhancement of integration of local transport infrastructures and services in the main European transport corridors, especially the water ways connected to the Danube corridor; The population resident in the area experiencing improved accessibility to local and external destinations, through improved services and or improved infrastructures, with lower environmental impact; * The regional and national authorities acquiring feasibility analysis on key transport infrastructures, improving regional national and international connection to transport networks; * Population commuting across the border for economic and social, cultural activities experiencing improved services for border crossing, due to improved technologies and infrastructures; * Tourist mobility improved and extended in the area, based on new services, and infrastructure;   **PA3 Thematic area ICT and Public utilities infrastructures and networks**,   * Creation of the improved accessibility to state-of-the-art and efficient public utilities (access to internet, utilities: waste, water, energy) in the light of technological options, economic constraints, environmental requirements and demographic change; * Establishment of cross border partnerships for the implementation of innovative solutions for the access to public services, especially for remote areas and marginalized communities; * Population experiencing improved access to public utilities and services, based on innovative solutions shared across the border; * Remote areas receiving tailored assistance to facilitate removal of obstacles to the access to IT services and public utilities; * Disadvantaged groups enabled to easier access to utility and services, with targeted information and awareness rising actions; |

**2.3.4. Elements of other thematic priorities added to the priority axis**

(Reference: Article 35(1) of IPA II Implementing Regulation)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *ID* | *<2A.1.1 type=‘N’ input=‘G’>* |
| *Contribution to the specific objective of the priority axis* | *<2A.1.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘500’ input=‘M’>* |
| *The results that the partner States seek to achieve with Union support* | *<2A.1.3 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘3500’ input=‘M’>* |

**2.3.5. Actions to be supported under the thematic priority** (by thematic priority)

***2.3.5.1. A description of the type and examples of actions to be supported and their expected contribution to the specific objectives, including, where appropriate, identification of the main target groups, specific territories targeted and types of beneficiaries***

(Reference: point (b)(iii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Thematic Priority* | *<2A.2.3.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* ***C)*** |
| *<2A.2.3.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘14000’ input=‘M’>*  **PA3. Thematic area Mobility and transport infrastructures and services**   * Establishment and enhancement of cross border partnerships of the involved state authorities for the planning f physical infrastructures; * Joint studies for the preparation of cross-border infrastructure investments with emphasis on multimodal solutions; * Set up of cross-border frameworks, platforms and networks for the identification of innovative solutions in the field of cross border mobility, including ICT interventions, alternatives modal and public/private transport networks; * Development and upgrading of the road infrastructure and cross-border crossing points, and improvement/acceleration of procedures linked to mobility of persons and goods; * Support of upgrades of the infrastructures at the border stations, and improvement/acceleration of procedures linked to mobility of persons and goods.   **PA3 TA 2 Public utilities infrastructure,**   * Set up of cross-border frameworks, platforms and networks for the exchange of experience and the identification of needs for service providers involved; * Development of joint information and awareness rising programmes for relevant organisations, local administrations, and the general public for the provision of basic utilities to the local communities, specially in remote areas. * Joint feasibility studies and models design for planning of infrastructure investments with emphasis on locally-adapted solutions (e.g. small-scale water treatment, access to ICT, renewable energy ) for areas facing similar challenges on both side of the border; (e.g. JKP Badnjevo, Ada, water treatment)   **Strategic projects**  Strategic projects could be identified by the programme partners, for the achievement of the programme objectives and the specific objectives of the priority. The basic principles for the eligibility of a strategic project are those listed for priority one.  The areas where strategic projects could be generated are specially those of feasibility studies for transport infrastructures, to improve accessibility and sustainability, small transport infrastructures in the remote areas, rehabilitation and technological upgrade of infrastructures specially relevant for the cross border accessibility, like the rehabilitation and improvement of the cross border points  The share of resources dedicated to strategic projects could correspond to an approximated percentage of 30% on the total financial budget of the programme, with different percentages in each priority axes according to the availability and readiness of these projects.  **Target groups**   * Resident population * Active population commuting in the area and to main urban centers * Tourists and business travelers * Manufacture enterprises located in the area * Local administrations responsible for provision of basic utilities.   **Indicative types of beneficiaries**   * Local Public Authorities * Regional Public Authorities * Local units / branches of National Public Authorities * ICT Agencies * Public service providers * Education/training centers * Business support organisations * NGO and associations representing Interest groups | |

***2.3.5.2. Guiding principles for the selection of operations***

(Reference: point (b)(iii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Thematic priority* | *<2A.2.3.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* |
| *<2A.2.3.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘3500’ input=‘M’>*  The selection of projects will be carried out following a standardized assessment procedure using the following sets of criteria:   * **Strategic coherence**: this criterion examines the coherence and contribution of each project proposal to the relevant Specific Objective addressed the contribution to the envisaged results and the overall coherence of planned activities with the indicative types of actions.   Further the cross-border added value of the operation, its territorial dimension and the relevance of the partnership will also be assessed in this context.   * **Operative quality**: this criterion examines the design of the project proposal in relation to clarity and coherence of the operational objectives, activities and means, feasibility, efficiency, communication of the project and its results, potential for uptake and embedment into operative procedures of the partners involved. * **Compliance to horizontal principles:** this criterion examines the consideration from the side of the project of the Programme Horizontal Principles and the demonstration of their integration and advancement within the project proposal intervention logic. The strategic coherence criterion basically examines the relevance of the project proposal, hence it retains primacy over the other two criteria.   The detailed assessment criteria will be laid down and made available to potential applicants in the calls for proposals documentation that will be approved by the programme Authorities. | |

***2.3.5.3. Planned use of financial instruments*** (where appropriate)

(Reference: point (b)(iii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Thematic priority* | *<2A.2.3.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* b) |
| *Planned use of financial instruments* | *<2A.2.3.2 type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* NO |
| *<2A.2.3.3 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘7000’ input=‘M’>*  NO financial instruments will be used for the implementation of the priority. | |

**2.3.6 Common and programme specific indicators**

(Reference: point (b)(ii) and (b)(iv) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013 and Article 2(2) of IPA II Implementing Regulation)

***2.3.6.1 Priority axis result indicators (programme specific)***

Table 16: Programme specific result indicators

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Indicator** | **Measurement unit** | **Baseline value** | **Baseline year** | **Target value (2023)[[22]](#footnote-22)** | **Source of data** | **Frequency of reporting** |
| *<2A.1.4 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘5’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.1.5 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.1.6 type=‘S’ input=‘M’>* | *Quantitative <2A.1.8 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>*  *Qualitative <2A.1.8 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’* | *<2A.1.9 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *Quantitative <2A.1.10 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>*  *Qualitative <2A.1.10 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.1.11 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘200’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.1.12 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’>* |
| **PA3.RI1** | Increase of options available for efficient and environmental friendly mobility and transport | Ordinal value (1-10) | tbd | 2015 | Increase | Survey among stakeholders | 2017 2020,  2023 |
| **PA3.RI2** | Increase of the awareness of needs and options for efficient public utilities. | Ordinal value (1-10) | tbd | 2015 | Increase | Survey among residents | 2017 2020,  2023 |

***2.3.6.2. Priority axis output indicators (common or programme specific)***

Table 17: Common and programme specific output indicators

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Indicator *(name of indicator)*** | **Measurement unit** | **Target value (2023)** | **Source of data** | **Frequency of reporting** |
| *<2A.2.5.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* | *<2A.2.5.2 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* | *<2A.2.5.3 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* | *<2A.2.5.6 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.2.5.7 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘200’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.2.5.8 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’>* |
| **PA3.OI1** | Cross border cooperation frameworks (frameworks, platforms and networks etc.) | Units (No) | XX | Monitoring | Bi-annual starting 2015 |
| **PA3.OI2** | Feasibility studies, preparatory studies elaborated in the field of transport and mobility infrastructures, | Units n. | XX | Monitoring | Bi-annual starting 2015 |
| **PA3.OI3** | Designs of models and pilot actions for provision of utilities and transport infrastructures | Units (No) | XX | Monitoring | Bi-annual starting 2015 |
| **PA3.OI4** | Participants to information / training / awareness raising initiatives | Units (No) | XX | Monitoring | Bi-annual starting 2015 |

**2.3.7. Categories of intervention**

(Reference: point (b)(vii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

Categories of intervention corresponding to the content of the priority axis, based on a nomenclature adopted by the Commission, and indicative breakdown of Union support

**Tables 20-23: Categories of intervention**

Table 18 Dimension 1 Intervention field

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2A.4.1.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N>* | *<2A.4.1.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2A.4.1.3 type=‘N’ input=‘M’ Decision=N >* |
| 3 | O44 Intelligent transport systems | 20% |
| 3 | 041 Inland waterways and ports | 20% |
|  | 017 household waste management | 20% |
|  | 021 water management--- | 20% |
| 3 | 022 waste water treatment... | 20% |

Table 19: Dimension 2 Form of finance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2A.4.1.4 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N>* | *<2A.4.1.5 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2A.4.1.6 type=‘N’ input=‘M’ Decision=N >* |
| 1 | 01 Non Repayable grant |  |
|  |  |  |

Table 20: Dimension 3 Territory type

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2A.4.1.7 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N>* | *<2A.4.1.8 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2A.4.1.9 type=‘N’ input=‘M’ Decision=N >* |
| 1 | O1 Large urban areas | 20% |
|  | 02 Small urban areas | 40% |
|  | 03 Rural areas | 40% |

Table 21 Dimension 6 Territorial delivery mechanisms

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2A.4.1.10 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N>* | *<2A.4.1.11 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2A.4.1.12 type=‘N’ input=‘M’ Decision=N >* |
|  | 07 |  |
|  |  |  |

**2.3.8. A summary of the planned use of technical assistance including, where necessary, actions to reinforce the administrative capacity of authorities involved in the management and control of the programmes and beneficiaries and, where necessary, actions for to enhance the administrative capacity of relevant partners to participate in the implementation of programmes** (where appropriate)

(Reference: point (b)(vi) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Priority axis* | *<3A.5.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* **2** |
| *<2A.5.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘2000’ input=‘M’>*  Capacity building initiatives:   * for project generation, assisting potential beneficiaries for the identification of needs among target groups, coordination of administrative; * Procedures for the establishment of cross border networks; * For procurement procedures design and management;   Promotion initiatives:   * to activate participation among local administrations in remote areas, NGOs. * to inform target groups on outputs of the programme.   Surveys and evaluation activities:   * Surveys among target groups to evaluate programme impact. | |

**2.4.1 Priority axis 3**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *ID of the priority axis* | *<2.4.1 type=‘N’ input=‘G’> 1*  **4** |
| *Title of the priority axis* | *<2.4.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘500’ input=‘M’>*  **Attractiveness for sustainable tourism** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The entire priority axis will be implemented solely through financial instruments | *<2.4.3 type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* |
| The entire priority axis will be implemented solely though financial instruments set up at Union level | *<2.4.4 type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* |
| The entire priority axis will be implemented through community-led local development | *<2.4.5 type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* |

**2.4.2 Fund, calculation basis for Union support and justification of the calculation basis choice**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Fund* | *<2.4.6 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* |
| *Calculation basis (total eligible expenditure or public eligible expenditure)* | *<2.4.7 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* |
| *Justification of the calculation basis choice* | *<2A.8 type=‘S’ input=‘M’>* |

**2.4.3. The specific objectives of the thematic priority and expected results**

(Reference: points (b)(i) and (ii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *ID* | *<2A.1.1 type=‘N’ input=‘G’>*  **4** |
| *Specific objective* | *<2A.1.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘500’ input=‘M’>*   * Growth of the local tourism economy based on the promotion of a sustainable cultural and recreational use of the natural and cultural heritage.   The specific objective is based on two main thematic areas:   * PA4 TA1 Promotion of innovative tourism activities and networks based on the common natural and cultural resources * PA4 TA2 Enhancement of capacities and skills for the improvement quality and quantity of tourism services and products in common networks and partnerships on the two sided of the border. |
| *The results that the partner States seek to achieve with Union support* | *<2A.1.3 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘3500’ input=‘M’>*  **PA4 Thematic area: Promotion of innovative tourism activities and networks based on the common natural and cultural resources**   * The growth of cross border networks of tourism clusters, attracting visitors from the national and international markets; * Integration of local tourism attractions in the international networks of the Danube Basin. The growth of visitors and tourism services, based on the establishment of a common brand and image for the local touristic offer attracting additional demand; * The increase in the occupancy rate of tourist infrastructures, in all areas and for the diversified typologies of tourism; * The establishment of touristic networks across the border, exploiting synergies and sharing innovative management and technological solutions; * The investment for the creation of small infrastructures for the provision of innovative services in the touristic sector, for specific forms of tourism, like cultural tourism, naturalistic tourism, thematic tourism.,   **PA4 TA2 Enhancement of capacities and skills for the improvement quality and quantity of tourism services and products in common networks and partnerships**   * Enhancement of capacities among entrepreneurs and workers of the tourist sector, for the improvement of the quality of tourists services, and the diversification of tourist products; * Improvement of the information and knowledge on natural and cultural resources, for the implementation of conservation strategies and the promotion of sustainable tourism networks;   Results:   * The improvement of the quality of tourist services offered in joint networks; * The promotion on the tourist market of Natural and historical heritage; * The improvement of conservation and protection strategies, based on researches and studies carried out by partnerships of research institutions and specialized agencies. |

**2.4.4. Elements of other thematic priorities added to the priority axis**

(Reference: Article 35(1) of IPA II Implementing Regulation)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *ID* | *<2A.1.1 type=‘N’ input=‘G’>* |
| *Contribution to the specific objective of the priority axis* | *<2A.1.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘500’ input=‘M’>* |
| *The results that the partner States seek to achieve with Union support* | *<2A.1.3 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘3500’ input=‘M’>* |

**2.4.5. Actions to be supported under the thematic priority** (by thematic priority)

***2.4.5.1. A description of the type and examples of actions to be supported and their expected contribution to the specific objectives, including, where appropriate, identification of the main target groups, specific territories targeted and types of beneficiaries***

(Reference: point (b)(iii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Thematic Priority* | *<2A.2.4.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* ***d)*** |
| *<2A.2.4.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘14000’ input=‘M’>*  PA4 Thematic area: Investments for the growth of the local tourism networks and promotion of innovative tourism activities   * Organise knowledge transfer, exchange of good practice examples, networking and development of innovations for protection of natural and cultural heritage and sustainable tourism; * Development of a cross-border regional image and brand and joint marketing initiatives, * Development of distinct tourism products such as thematic tour ism clusters and routes (e.g. monasteries, Roman heritage, wine routes, etc.) * Joint implementation of actions recording and promoting shared traditional features (music, language, folklore) including joint cultural events (festivals conferences, etc) in relation to the aforementioned indicative actions. * Joint actions for the promotion of Thermal centres as trough the creation of common brand and the improvement of quality standards of the services offered.   **PA4 Thematic area Capacity building initiatives for the improvement of quality and innovation of tourism services and products**   * Development of accreditation systems for the award of quality labels for promoters of cultural and natural heritage and providers of tourism products; * Establishment of partnership for research and studies on natural and cultural heritage in the area, as basis for protection strategies and promotion initiatives. * Investment in joint and cross-border small scale infrastructures for tourism services (welcome centers, info-points, service centers for micro enterprises in the touristic sector) * Establishment of partnership for innovative pilot actions for the promotion, upgrade and rehabilitation of natural and cultural monuments including religious monuments, traditional buildings and settlements, historical and archaeological sites etc. ;   **Strategic projects**  Strategic projects could be identified by the programme partners, for the achievement of the programme objectives. The basic principles for the eligibility of a strategic project are those listed for priority one.  Main potential in this priority can be identified in the establishment of partnerships and networks for the creation of innovative marketing tools based on a common brand for the whole eligible area, the creation of networks of touristic attractors based on common cultural and natural resources.  The share of resources dedicated to strategic projects could correspond to an approximated percentage of 30% on the total financial budget of the programme, with different percentages in each priority axes according to the availability and readiness of these projects.    **Target groups**   * General public. * Tourists and visitors * Micro and small Enterprises in the tourism sectors * Population active in natural and cultural resources protection and touristic sector   **Indicative types of beneficiaries**   * Local Public Authorities * Regional Public Authorities * Local branches/ units of National Public Authorities * Public Agencies * Public service providers * Education/training centres * Business support organisations * Interest groups including NGOs | |

***2.4.5.2. Guiding principles for the selection of operations***

(Reference: point (b)(iii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Thematic priority* | *<2A.2.4.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* |
| *<2A.2.4.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘3500’ input=‘M’>*  The selection of projects will be carried out following a standardized assessment procedure using the following sets of criteria:   * **Strategic coherence**: this criterion examines the coherence and contribution of each project proposal to the relevant Specific Objective addressed, the contribution to the envisaged results and the overall coherence of planned activities with the indicative types of actions.   Further the cross-border added value of the operation, its territorial dimension and the relevance of the partnership will also be assessed in this context.   * **Operative quality**: this criterion examines the design of the project proposal in relation to clarity and coherence of the operational objectives, activities and means, feasibility, efficiency, communication of the project and its results, potential for uptake and embedment into operative procedures of the partners involved. * **Compliance to horizontal principles:** this criterion examines the consideration from the side of the project of the Programme Horizontal Principles and the demonstration of their integration and advancement within the project proposal intervention logic. The strategic coherence criterion basically examines the relevance of the project proposal, hence it retains primacy over the other two criteria.   The detailed assessment criteria will be laid down and made available to potential applicants in the calls for proposals documentation that will be approved by the programme Authorities. | |

***2.4.5.3. Planned use of financial instruments*** (where appropriate)

(Reference: point (b)(iii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Thematic priority* | *<2A.2.4.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* **d)** |
| *Planned use of financial instruments* | *<2A.2.4.2 type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* NO |
| *<2A.2.4.3 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘7000’ input=‘M’>*  NO financial instruments will be used for the implementation of the priority. | |

**2.4.6 Common and programme specific indicators**

(Reference: point (b)(ii) and (b)(iv) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013 and Article 2(2) of IPA II Implementing Regulation)

***2.4.6.1 Priority axis result indicators (programme specific)***

Table 22: Programme specific result indicators

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Indicator** | **Measurement unit** | **Baseline value** | **Baseline year** | **Target value (2023)[[23]](#footnote-23)** | **Source of data** | **Frequency of reporting** |
| *<2A.1.4 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘5’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.1.5 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.1.6 type=‘S’ input=‘M’>* | *Quantitative <2A.1.8 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>*  *Qualitative <2A.1.8 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’* | *<2A.1.9 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *Quantitative <2A.1.10 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>*  *Qualitative <2A.1.10 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.1.11 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘200’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.1.12 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’>* |
| PA4.RI1 | Increase of number of tourists arrivals and stays | Units | Tbd | 2014 | Increase 25% | National statistica office | 2017  2020  2023 |
| PA4 RI2 | Occupancy rate of Tourism Infrastructures | Percentage | Tbd | 2014 | Increase 20% | National Statistical office | 2018  2023 |
| PA4 RI 3 | Improvement of the perceived quality of touristic services and natural and cultural resources protection | Ordinal scale value (1-10) | Tbd | 2014 | Increase 25% | Survey among residents and visitors | 2017 2020  2023 |

***2.4.6.2. Priority axis output indicators (common or programme specific)***

Table 23: Common and programme specific output indicators

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Indicator *(name of indicator)*** | **Measurement unit** | **Target value (2023)** | **Source of data** | **Frequency of reporting** |
| *<2A.2.5.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* | *<2A.2.5.2 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* | *<2A.2.5.3 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* | *<2A.2.5.6 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.2.5.7 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘200’ input=‘M’>* | *<2A.2.5.8 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’>* |
| **PA4.OI1** | Number of cross border cooperation frameworks (frameworks, platforms and networks etc.) | Units (No) | XX | Monitoring | Bi-annual, starting 2015 |
| **PA4.OI2** | Number of studies and researches related to natural and cultural resources.... | Units (No) | XX | Monitoring | Bi-annual, starting 2015 |
| **PA4.OI3** | Number partnerships, for the provision of services, established | Units (No) | XX | Monitoring | Bi-annual, starting 2015 |
| **PA4.OI4** | Number of participants attending training initiatives | Units (No) | XX | Monitoring | Bi-annual, starting 2015 |

**2.4.7. Categories of intervention**

(Reference: point (b)(vii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

Categories of intervention corresponding to the content of the priority axis, based on a nomenclature adopted by the Commission, and indicative breakdown of Union support

**Tables 26-30: Categories of intervention**

Table 24: Dimension 1 Intervention field

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2A.4.1.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N>* | *<2A.4.1.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2A.4.1.3 type=‘N’ input=‘M’ Decision=N >* |
| 4 | 091 Development and promotion of tourism potential |  |
| 4 | 092 Development and promotion of public tourism assets |  |
| 4 | 093 Development and promotion of public tourism services |  |
| 4 | 094 Development and promotion of public cultural heritage assets |  |
| 4 | 093 Development and promotion of public cultural heritage services |  |

Table 25: Dimension 2 Form of finance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2A.4.1.4 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N>* | *<2A.4.1.5 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2A.4.1.6 type=‘N’ input=‘M’ Decision=N >* |
| 1 | 01 Non Repayable grant |  |
|  |  |  |

Table 26: Dimension 3 Territory type

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2A.4.1.7 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N>* | *<2A.4.1.8 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2A.4.1.9 type=‘N’ input=‘M’ Decision=N >* |
| 1 | O1 Large urban areas | 10% |
|  | 02 Small urban areas | 40% |
|  | 03 Rural areas | 50% |

Table 27: Dimension 6 Territorial delivery mechanisms

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2A.4.1.10 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N>* | *<2A.4.1.11 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2A.4.1.12 type=‘N’ input=‘M’ Decision=N >* |
|  | 07 |  |
|  |  |  |

**2.4.8. A summary of the planned use of technical assistance including, where necessary, actions to reinforce the administrative capacity of authorities involved in the management and control of the programmes and beneficiaries and, where necessary, actions for to enhance the administrative capacity of relevant partners to participate in the implementation of programmes** (where appropriate)

(Reference: point (b)(vi) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Priority axis* | *<3A.5.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* **4** |
| *<2A.5.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘2000’ input=‘M’>*  Capacity building initiatives:   * for project generation, assisting potential beneficiaries for the identification of needs among target groups, coordination of administrative; * procedures for the establishment of cross border networks; * For procurement procedures design and management;   Promotion initiatives:   * to activate participation among local administrations in remote areas, NGOs; * to inform target groups on outputs of the programme;   Surveys and evaluation activities:   * Surveys among target groups to evaluate programme impact; | |

**Section 2.5 Description of the priority axes for technical assistance**

(Reference: point (c) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

**2.5.1 Priority axis**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *ID* | *<2B.0.1 type=‘N’ maxlength=‘5’ input=‘G’>*  **5** |
| *Title* | *<2B.0.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’>*  Technical assistance |

**2.5.2 Fund and calculation basis for Union support**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Fund* | *<2B.0.3 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* |
| *Calculation Basis (total eligible expenditure or public eligible expenditure)* | *<2B.0.4 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* |
| *Justification of the calculation basis choice (only if total eligible expenditure basis selected)* | *<2B.0.4 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* |

**2.5.3. The specific objectives of the priority axis and the expected results**

(Reference: points (c)(i) and (ii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

**Specific objective**(repeated for each specific objective)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *ID* | *<2B.1.1 type=‘N’ maxlength=‘5’ input=‘G’>* ***5-1*** |
| *Specific objective* | *<2B.1.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘500’ input=‘M’>*  The aim of the priority is the promotion of an effective and efficient implementation of the Programme ensuring the effective functioning of the Programme bodies, and committees  The efficient execution of all stages of the programme cycle and project implementation, starting from the project generation stage, the control and audit activities, the execution of programme monitoring and evaluation activities.  The implementation of actions for the visibility of the programme strategy and results among target groups and stakeholders. |
| *Results that the partner States seek to achieve with Union support* [[24]](#footnote-24) | *<2B.1.3 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘3500’ input=‘M’>*  TA budget is largely below 15 Millions E |

**2.5.4. Actions to be supported and their expected contribution to the programme implementation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Priority axis* | *<2.B.3.1.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’>* **5** |
| *<2.B.3.1.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘7000’ input=‘M’>*  The following actions will be supported:   * Establishment and operation of the Joint Technical Secretariat and National Authorities contact points * Management of the Programme by the Managing Authority with support of the Joint Technical Secretariat; * Establishment and operation of the Programme Monitoring Committee * Execution of the tasks of the Certifying Authority; * Establishment of co-operation and co-ordination networks and contacts among Programme bodies and Partner States, as well as with bodies and representatives of other relevant EU-co-funded programmes by MA, JS and ACP; * Setting up appropriate procedures for the selection and implementation of projects, preparation of guidelines for applicants and for project implementation; * Establishment of a IT system (in computerised form) for monitoring, evaluation, financial management, verification and audit, including data on individual participants in projects; * Design and implementation of an evaluation plan; * Setting-up of a bodies and procedures for first level controls, in cooperation with the NAs. * Setting up and implementation of audit system with regard to the Programme management and control systems.   Actions for the capacity building of applicants and beneficiaries  The following indicative actions will be supported:   * Organisation of workshops and seminars for potential project applicants to strengthen their capacity to elaborate project proposals in line with the Programme Specific Objectives and results, involving programme bodies and active involvement of NAs. * Organisation of trainings and seminars on specific project implementation issues like project management, reporting, information and promotion, control and audits; * Provision of project management tools to the beneficiaries in order to facilitate the internal project planning and controlling; * Intensifying the support for beneficiaries in the project generation phase; * Setting up of information materials (fact sheets, forms and guidance) for applicants and beneficiaries in order to provide instruction with regard to all phases of the project cycle: project preparation, application, implementation and closure.   Actions for Programme activities promotion and visibility of Programme results   * Design and implementation of a communication and visibility strategy; * Execution of studies, analysis and surveys on the programme activities and impact for the promotion and information among the large public * Creation of ICT tools for information and communication, web sites, emailing, etc * Establishment of cooperation and coordination networks and contacts at European level, for the promotion and information of the programme objectives. | |

**2.5.5. Programme specific indicators**[[25]](#footnote-25)

***2.5.5.1 Programme specific result indicators***

**(**Reference: point (c)(ii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

**Table 9: Programme-specific result indicators**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Indicator** | **Measurement unit** | **Baseline value** | **Baseline year** | **Target value**[[26]](#footnote-26) **(2023)** | **Source of data** | **Frequency of reporting** |
| *<2.B.2.1 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘5’ input=‘M’>* | *<2.B.2.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’>* | *<2.B.2.3 type=‘S’ input=‘M’>* | *Quantitative <2.B.2.4 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<2.B.2.5 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *Quantitative <2.B.2.6 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>*  *Qualitative <2A.1.10 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’>* | *<2.B.2.7 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’>* | *<2.B.2.8 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’>* |
| PA5.RI1 | Involvement of all eligible areas in programme strategy and activities  Number of Projects implemented / 10.000 of inhabitants | Numeric Ratio | 0 | 2014 | All districts / counties involved in project partnerships | Monitoring System | 2017 2020,  2023 |
| PA5 RI 2 | Effective absorption of funds .  Certified expenditures on planned allocation by the deadlines established | % | 0 | 2014 | 100% according to the financial plans | Monitoring system | 2017 2020  2023 |
| PA5 RI 3 | Awareness of local population on programme activities and results | Ordinal scale value (1-10) | 0 | 2014 | Increase 25% | Survey among population | 2017 2020  2023 |

***2.5.5.2 Programme specific output indicators expected to contribute to results***

(Reference: point (c)(iv) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

**Table 10: Programme specific output indicators**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Indicator** | **Measurement unit** | **Target value (2023)**  **(optional)** | **Source of data** |
| *<2.B.3.2.1 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘5’ input=‘M’>* | *<2.B.2.2.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’>* | *<2.B.3.2.3 type=‘S’ input=‘M’>* | *<2.B.3.2.4 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<2.B.3.2.5 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘100’ input=‘M’>* |
| **PA5.OI1** | Number of meetings of programme bodies | Units (No) | XX | Monitoring |
| **PA5.OI2** | Number of projects calls implemented | Units (No) | XX | Monitoring |
| **PA5.OI3** | Number projects contracts signed | Units (No) | XX | Monitoring |
| **PA5 OI4** | Number of projects controlled reimbursed | Units (No) | XX | Monitoring |
| **PA5.OI5** | Number of programme evaluation implemented | Units (No) | XX | Mon itoring |
| PA5OI6 | Number of participants attending information and training initiatives | Units (No) | XX | Monitoring |
|  | Number of persons reached by information and promotion initiatives | Units (No) | XX | Monitoring |

**2.5.6. Categories of intervention**

(Reference: point (c)(v) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013**)**

Corresponding categories of intervention based on a nomenclature adopted by the Commission, and an indicative breakdown of Union support.

**Tables 30-33: Categories of intervention**

Table 28: Dimension 1 Intervention field

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2B.4.1.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2B.4.1.2 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2B.4.1.3 type=‘N’ input=‘M Decision=N ‘>* |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Table 29: Dimension 2 Form of finance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2B.4.2.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’ Decision=N >* | *<2B.4.2.2 type=‘S’ input=‘S’* *Decision=N >* | *<2B.4.2.3 type=‘N’ input=‘M’* *Decision=N >* |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Table 30: Dimension 3 Territory type

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Code** | **Amount (EUR)** |
| *<2B.4.3.1 type=‘S’ input=‘S’* *Decision=N >* | *<2B.4.3.2 type=‘S’ input=’* *Decision=N S’>* | *<2B.4.3.3 type=‘N’ input=‘M* *Decision=N ‘>* |
|  | NA |  |
|  |  |  |

**Section 2.6 Overview table of indicators per priority axis and thematic priority**

Table 31: Table of common and programme specific output and result indicators

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Thematic priority** | **Specific objective(s)** | **Selected results indicators** | **Selected**  **output indicators** |
| PA1: | TP a) Promoting employment, labour mobility and social inclusion | Specific objective | Indicator 1: | Indicator 1: |
| Indicator 2: | Indicator 2: |
| PA2: |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |
| PA3 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| PA4 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**SECTION 3 FINANCING PLAN**

(Reference: point (d) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

**3.1** **Financial appropriation from the IPA (in EUR)**

(Reference: point (d)(i) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

**Table 15**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fund**  *<3.1.1 type=‘S’ input=‘G’>* | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **Total** |
| *IPA* | *<3.1.3 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<3.1.4 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<3.1.5 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<3.1.6 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<3.1.7 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<3.1.8 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<3.1.9 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<3.1.10 type=‘N’ input=‘G’>* |

**3.2.1 Total financial appropriation from the IPA and national co-financing (in EUR)**

(Reference: point (d)(ii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |
| --- |
| 1. *The financial table sets out the financial plan of the cooperation programme by priority axis.* 2. *The financial table shall show for information purposes, any contribution from third countries participating in the cooperation programme (other than contributions from IPA and ENI)* 3. *The EIB[[27]](#footnote-27) contribution is presented at the level of the priority axis.* |

**Table 16: Financing plan**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Priority axis | Basis for calculation of Union support  (Total eligible cost or public eligible cost) | Union support (a) | National counterpart  (b) = (c) + (d)) | Indicative breakdown of the national counterpart | | Total funding  (e) = (a) + (b) | Co-financing rate  (f) = (a)/(e) (2) | For information | |
|  |  |  | National Public funding (c) | National private funding (d) (1) |  |  | Contributions from third countries | EIB contributions |
| *<3.2.A.1 type=‘S’ input=‘G’>* | *<3.2.A.3 type=‘S’ input=‘G’>* | *<3.2.A.4 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<3.2.A.5 type=‘N’ input=‘G’>* | *<3.2.A.6 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<3.2.A.7 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<3.2.A.8 type=‘N’ input=‘G’>* | <3.2.A.9 type=‘P’ input=‘G’> | *<3.2.A.10 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<3.2.A.11 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* |
| *Priority axis 1* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Priority axis 2* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Priority axis 3* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Priority axis 4* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Priority axis 5* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

(1)  To be completed only when priority axes are expressed in total costs.

(2)  This rate may be rounded to the nearest whole number in the table. The precise rate used to reimburse payments is the ratio (f).

**3.2.2 Breakdown by priority axis and thematic priority**

(Reference: point (d)(ii) of Article 8(2) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

**Table 17**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Thematic priority** | **Union support** | **National counterpart** | **Total funding** |
| *<3.2.B.1 type=‘S’ input=‘G’>* | *<3.2.B.2 type=‘S’ input=‘G’>* | *<3.2.B.3 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<3.2.B.4 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* | *<3.2.B.5 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |

**SECTION 4 INTEGRATED APPROACH TO TERRITORIAL DEVELOPEMENT**

(Reference: Article 35 (2) of IPA II Implementing Regulation and Article 8(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

Description of the integrated approach to territorial development, taking into account the content and objectives of the cooperation programme and showing how it contributes to the accomplishment of the programme objectives and expected results

|  |
| --- |
| *<4.0 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘3500’ input=‘M’>* |

**4.1 Community-led local development** (where appropriate)

Approach to the use of community-led local development instruments and principles for identifying the areas where they will be implemented

(Reference: Article 35 (2) of IPA II Implementing Regulation and point (a) of Article 8(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |
| --- |
| *<4.1 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘7000’ input=‘M’ >* |

**4.3 Integrated Territorial Investment (ITI)** (where appropriate)

Approach to the use of Integrated Territorial Investments (ITI) (as defined in Article 36 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013) other than in cases covered by 4.2, and their indicative financial allocation from each priority axis

(Reference: Article 35 (2) of IPA II Implementing Regulation and point (c) of Article 8(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |
| --- |
| *<4.3.1 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘5000’ input=‘M ‘>* |

**Table 18: Indicative financial allocation to ITI (aggregate amount)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Priority axis** | **Indicative financial allocation (Union support) (EUR)** |
| *<4.3.2 type=‘S’ input=‘G’ >* | *<4.3.3 type=‘N’ input=‘M’>* |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| TOTAL |  |

**4.4 Contribution of planned interventions towards macro-regional and sea basin strategies, subject to the needs of the programme area as identified by the relevant partner States and taking into account, where applicable, strategically important projects identified in those strategies (where appropriate)**

**(Where partner States and regions participate in macro-regional and/or sea basin strategies**)

(Reference: point (d) of Article 8(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |
| --- |
| *. <4.4.1.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘7000’ input=‘M’ >*  The **EU Strategy for the Danube Region** provides an overall framework for the Danube area aiming both to foster integration and integrative development. The Danube Region covers 12 countries (Austria, the Slovak Republic, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovenia, Romania and Bulgaria as Member States of the EU as well as Croatia, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and the Republic of Moldova) plus the ‘Danubic’[[28]](#footnote-28) regions of Germany and the Ukraine.  The Danube Region Strategy addresses a wide range of issues; these are divided among 4 pillars and 11 priority areas (see Graphic below).  Figure 1 **EU Strategy for the Danube Region Structure**  priorities.jpg  Source: <http://www.danube-region.eu>  The Programme demonstrates a high relevance and coherence to both strategic initiatives. The table below gives an overview over the Programme Priority Axis and thematic areas.  The Priority Axis objective is closely correlated to the **EU Danube Region Strategy**, especially, but not exclusively, to Pillar 3: Building Prosperity in the Danube Region andPriority Areas (PA).  **The priorities of the programme:**   1. **Employment promotion and basic services strengthening for an inclusive growth (thematic objective a)**   Danube strategy priority axes specially relevant:   * PA 9 To invest in people and skills * PA 7 To develop the knowledge society through research, education and IT  1. **Environmental protection and risk management (thematic objective b)**   The Priority Axis objective is closely correlated to the **EU Danube Region Strategy**, especially to Priority Areas (PA):   * PA 4 “ To restore and maintain the quality of waters”, * PA5 “To manage environmental risks” and * PA6 “To preserve biodiversity, landscapes and the quality of air and soils”.   The CBC dimension is extremely relevant, for the integrated and interdependent environmental systems, in the Carpathian Chain, and the Danube Basin, the Banat plains and also for the common challenges generated by industrial pollution, decommissioning of obsolete industial activities, brown fields.   1. **Sustainable mobility and accessibility (thematic objective c)**   The Priority Axis objective is closely correlated to the **EU Danube Region Strategy**, especially to Priority Areas (PA):   * PA 1 To improve mobility and multimodality * PA7 “To develop the knowledge society through research, education and IT   The CBC dimension is present in the sense that the aforementioned weaknesses affect the attractiveness of the entire programme area, while negatively contributing to the intraregional disparities between favoured and less favoured areas.  Due to the financial capacity of the programme the coordination of the projects implemented in the cooperation area with those implemented the Danube Region is particularly relevant.   1. **Attractiveness for sustainable tourism (thematic objective d)**   The priority is coordinated to the Danube region strategy, that identifies actions for the sustainable development based on the natural and cultural resources among the main pillars of the regional strategy:  Pillar 1: connecting the Danube Region.  PA 3 To promote culture and tourism, people to people contacts  The results to be achieved by the programme are the creation of a recognizable identity for the entire area as a destination for sustainable tourism, the promotion of innovative type of tourism, the integration of the area in the touristic networks targeting the diverse environmental systems, of the Danube Basin, the Carpathian Areas, the rural areas of Banat. The increase of the capacity for joint protective actions of the natural resources |

**Section 5 IMPLEMENTING PROVISIONS FOR THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME**

(Reference: Article 8(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

**5.1 Relevant authorities and bodies**

(Reference: Article 8(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

**Table 19: Programme authorities**

(Reference: point (a)(i) of Article 8(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Authority/body** | **Name of authority/body and department or unit** | **Head of authority/body (position or post)** |
| Managing authority | *. <5.1.1 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’ decision=’N’ >* | *. <5.1.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’ decision=’N’ >* |
| Certifying authority, where applicable | *. <5.1.3 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’ decision=’N’ >* | *. <5.1.4 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’ decision=’N’ >* |
| Audit authority | *. <5.1.5 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’* *decision=’N’ >* | *. <5.1.6 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’ decision=’N’ >* |
| **The body to which payments will be made by the Commission is:**  (Reference: point (b) of Article 8(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)   |  |  | | --- | --- | | the managing authority | *<5.1.7 type type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* | | the certifying authority | *<5.1.8 type type=‘C’ input=‘M’>* | | | |

Table 32: Body or bodies carrying out control and audit tasks

(Reference: points (a)(ii) and (iii) of Article 8(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Authority/body** | **Name of authority/body and department or unit** | **Head of authority/body (position or post)** |
| Body or bodies designated to carry out control tasks | *<5.1.9 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’ >* | *<5.1.10 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’ >* |
| Body or bodies designated to be responsible for carrying out audit tasks | *<5.1.11 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’ >* | *<5.1.12 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘255’ input=‘M’ >* |

**5.2 Joint Monitoring Committee**

Table 33: Indicative list of Joint Monitoring Committee members

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of authority/body and department or unit** | **Role in the programme** | **Contact details of the authority/body** |
| EU Commission | Advisory |  |
| NIPAC | Decision |  |
| National Authority | Decision |  |
| Macro-regional strategy representative (where the programme is overlapping a macro-region covered by an EU Strategy) | Consultative |  |
| EIB | Consultative |  |
| Other (as agreed by the partner countries) |  |  |

**5.3 Procedure for setting up the joint secretariat**

(Reference: point (a)(iv) of Article 8(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |
| --- |
| *<5.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘3500’ input=‘M’ >* |

**5.4 Summary description of the management and control arrangements**

(Reference: point (a)(v) of Article 8(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |
| --- |
| *<5.3. type=‘S’ maxlength=‘35000’ input=‘M’ >*  **Strategic projects**  Strategic projects could be identified outside calls for proposals for the achievement of the programme objectives and priority specific objectives. Strategic projects contribute to achievement of a bigger impact through real and strong cross-border impact and long-term results, in respect of the Programme’s objectives.  Strategic Projects must be effective and answer the territory’s needs as envisaged by the Programme and result in a significant and long-lasting change or improvement on the whole or large parts of programme area. The Strategic Projects can cover one or more priority axes, defined in the Programme.  The share of resources dedicated to strategic projects is within 30% of the IPA funds allocated to the programme.  The basic principles for the eligibility of a strategic project could be the following   * To address key specific objectives that can be achieved only through the involvement of large partnerships and /or of key stakeholders on the two sides of the border * To be based on a larger financial size then ordinary projects, proportionate to the relevance of the objectives and results. * to produce lasting effects and catalyze further actions by public and private stakeholders and/or public financing and human resources; * to promote permanent cooperation opportunities in the fields of social and cultural inclusion.   The main areas of actions where strategic projects regarding Environment and Emergency preparedness could be designed for the achievement of the priority objectives are, among the others:   * Establishment of networks and partnerships for joint training actions in the field of environmental protection, management of environmental emergencies, also through the investment in small infrastructures. * Development of joint structures and partnerships for the integration of the involved state authorities and volunteers organizations on initiatives in relation to the Danube Strategy for emergency interventions, like the European Floods Alert System * Establishment of permanent networks and partnerships for the protection and conservation of natural resources.   Strategic projects could be especially relevant in this priority for the coordination of the programme strategy with that of the Danube Region EUSDR. |

**5.5 Apportionment of liabilities among partner States in case of financial corrections imposed by the managing authority or the Commission**

(Reference: point (a)(vi) of Article 8(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

|  |
| --- |
| *<5.4 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘10500’ input=‘M’ >* |

**5.6 Use of the Euro** (where applicable)

(Reference: Article 28 of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

Method chosen for the conversion of expenditure incurred in another currency than the Euro

|  |
| --- |
| *<5.5. type=‘S’ maxlength=‘2000’ input=‘M’ >* |

**5.7 Involvement of partners**

(Reference: point (c) of Article 8(4) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

**Actions taken to involve the partners referred to in Article 5 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 in the preparation of the cooperation programme, and the role of those partners in the preparation and implementation of the cooperation programme, including their involvement in the Joint Monitoring Committee**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *<5.6 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘14000’ input=‘M’ Decisions=N>*  Participation of partners in the preparation of the programme.  The programme partners, including representatives of programme target groups, stakeholders, potential beneficiaries, where deeply involved in the programme preparation, with various tools of information and promotion and with meetings and conferences held since the first stages of the programming process.  The consultations for the Territorial analysis and SWOT  The stakeholders and potential beneficiaries were asked to contribute to the elaboration of the Territorial analysis and SWOT by participating in two workshops, one held in Romania at Drobeta Turnu Severin and one held in Serbia at Pancevo, that offered the opportunity to all participants to intervene actively and to bring they experiences and feedback.  In parallel, programme partners were asked to contribute with their vision through surveys based on questionnaires. The partners expressed their views and opinions by answering the open questions in the questionnaire provided, and offering a quantitative ranking for their agreement to the sections of the first draft of the SWOT, based on a scale of 5 levels from total disagreement (1) to perfect agreement (5).  The participation to all three parallel stages of consultation was large, and active, from all counties and districts of the eligible area. A little more of the 50% of the participants to the survey are partners of projects financed by the current programme, and among them were included representatives of NGO, educational and university institutions, local administrations.  The qualitative feedback, proposals of new items for the SWOT, critics to others, were considered for the revision of the SWOT, and are incorporated in the new draft proposed to the partners.  The quantitative evaluation, based on “agreement marks” from 5, maximum, to 1 minimum, produced very positive results.  The average of these quantitative appraisals is very high for all sections of the SWOT, as shown in the table below. The rankings made by Serbian and Romanian partners were very similar , proving that the analysis was equally accurate on both sides of the border and both target groups perceived that their specific needs and challenges well represented in the common framework.   |  | Average evaluation mark of SWOT items  (5 perfect agreement 1 total disagreement) | | | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | SWOT SECTION | Serbian stakeholders | Romanian Stakeholders | All interviews Average | | Social and demographic structure | 4,44 | 4,43 | 4,44 | | Economy, SMEs development, Labor Market | 3,89 | 4,39 | 4,25 | | Transport infrastructures, Accessibility, CBC connection | 4,50 | 4,43 | 4,45 | | Environment Natural and cultural resources, Tourism | 4,33 | 4,50 | 4,45 | | Education, R&D and  Innovation | 4,33 | 4,35 | 4,34 | | Local institutions and civil society | 4,44 | 4,67 | 4,60 |   The consultations for the definition of the programme strategy, priorities and specific objectives and actions.  A second round of consultations |

**SECTION 6 HORIZONTAL PRINCIPLES**

(Reference : Article 8(7) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)

**6.1 Sustainable development**

*Description of specific actions to take into account environmental protection requirements, resource efficiency, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster resilience and risk prevention and management, in the selection of operations.*

|  |
| --- |
| *<7.1 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘5500’ input=‘M’ decision=N>*  **Sustainable Development**  Cross Border Cooperation Programme Authorities must *ensure that environmental protection requirements, resource efficiency, climate change mitigation and adaptation, biodiversity and ecosystem protection, disaster resilience and risk prevention and management are promoted in the preparation and implementation of the programmes.*  *In the case of the Romania-Serbia Programme the biggest challenges are related to environmental and biodiversity protection* *and sustainable use of natural resources and the addressing of climate change, e*nvironmental risks management and emergency preparedness. These challenges relate to the protection of the environment as an intrinsic value of the region and as a prerequisite for sustainable tourism.  The Programme is implemented via a number of projects. The assessment of the quality of the eligible project proposals should be based on a set of quality criteria which are common to all Priority Axes and Investment Priorities. When examining project proposals the guiding question is:  *“Is the operation contributing to the promotion of sustainable development?”*  The contribution of each project to these principles will be addressed in a qualitative manner in the frame of project selection and programme monitoring and evaluation.  As a technical tool for the assessors the following aspects will be considered in project selection:   * Contribution to energy efficiency, renewable energy use and reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions * Contribution to efficient water supply, waste-water treatment and water reuse * Application of green public procurement in a systematic manner * Contribution to efficient waste management, re-use and recycling * Contribution to the development of green infrastructures including Natura 2000 sites on the Romanian side and equivalent natural protected areas on the Serbian side; * Contribution to reduced transport and mobility-related air pollution; * Contribution to sustainable integrated urban development; * Contribution to enhanced awareness of adaptation to climate change and risk prevention; * Contribution to more employment opportunities, education, training and support services in the context of environment protection, risk management and sustainable development etc.   The estimated decrease of greenhouse gas emissions, the increase in energy efficiency and in renewable energy production are EU 2020 headline target indicators and should be monitored across supported operations. |

**6.2 Equal opportunities and non-discrimination**

*Description of the specific actions to promote equal opportunities and prevent any discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation during the preparation, design and implementation of the cooperation programme and, in particular, in relation to access to funding, taking account of the needs of the various target groups at risk of such discrimination, and in particular, the requirements of ensuring accessibility for persons with disabilities.*

|  |
| --- |
| *<7.2 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘5500’ input=‘M’ decision=N>*  **Equal opportunities and non-discrimination**  Non-discrimination transcends gender issues and adopts a wider focus. While anti-discrimination legislation is an acquired aspect of EU legal systems, the practical implementation of anti-discrimination practices is lagging behind. Equal access to information, and controls on whether equality and non-discrimination requirements are being met, is also an issue.  In the course of Programme preparation, the Programme has observed non-discrimination and addressed relevant issues related to the ethnic and religious composition of the area, the age structure and the ensuing socio-demographic developments in the programme area (mainly related to migration and ageing) in the SWOT analysis. The strategy of the programme puts emphasis in the availability of programme benefits to everyone through knowledge diffusion and dissemination, equality in the quality and access to social and public services, promotion of resources efficiency, as well as availability of public environmental goods and services.  This strategic orientation of the programme can be enhanced by a targeted selection of projects. When examining proposals the following “guiding question” should be assessed – where appropriate:  *“Is the operation contributing to the promotion of equal opportunities and non-discrimination?”*  The assessment of the quality of the eligible project proposals will be based on a set of quality criteria which are common to all priority axes and investment priorities.  During the implementation the Programme emphasizes on the principle of equal access to information of the possibilities offered by the programme. This includes targeting different social groups adequately; removing barriers in the communication of the programme (e.g. media, language etc.), promoting barrier free approaches etc.  In the course of programme implementation attention will be given to equal opportunities and non-discrimination in a qualitative manner in the frame of project reporting and Programme monitoring and evaluation. |

**6.3 Equality between men and women**

*Description of the contribution of the cooperation programme to the promotion of equality between men and women and, where appropriate, the arrangements to ensure the integration of the gender perspective at cooperation programme and operation level.*

|  |
| --- |
| *<7.3 type=‘S’ maxlength=‘5500’ input=‘M’ decision=N>*  The aim of equality between women and men, in particular, belongs to the fundamental values of the European Union and is set out in the Treaty on the European Union. Article 3 states that the Union shall “combat social exclusion and discrimination, and shall promote social justice and protection, equality between women and men, solidarity between generations and protection of the rights of the child”. The elimination of inequalities and the promotion of equality between women and men are also included in the consolidated version of the TFEU. These fundamental values must be respected in the regulations and implementation of the Programme.  The **same approach proposed above for the issues of non-discrimination** can be used to ensure equality between men and women with a focus on the gender issue. |

**ANNEXES (uploaded to electronic data exchange systems as separate files):**

* Draft report of the ex-ante evaluation (including an executive summary of the report)
* Confirmation of agreement in writing to the contents of the cooperation programme (Reference: Article 8(9) of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013)
* A map of the area covered by the cooperation programme
* A "citizens summary" of the cooperation programme
* Strategic Environmental Assessment

1. Based on the Recommended model for cross-border cooperation programmes under the IPA instrument [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Legend:

   *type: N=Number, D=Date, S=String, C=Checkbox, P=Percentage, B=Boolean*

   *decision: N=Not part of the Commission decision approving the cooperation programme*

   *input: M=Manual, S=Selection, G=Generated by system “maxlength”= Maximum number of characters including spaces.* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. While many definitions are attempted to explain European Territorial Cooperation (ETC) and CBC Programmes, most of them end up being very broad or indistinguishable from other forms of ETC like cross-border cooperation (e.g. addressing challenges beyond national borders or actions of common planning and management). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. INTERACT, working documents. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Excluding Technical Assistance [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. DG Regio: draft implementing acts. list of ETC programmes: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional \_policy/what/ future/experts \_documents\_en.cfm#2](http://ec.europa.eu/regional%20_policy/what/%20future/experts%20_documents_en.cfm#2) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. <http://www.icpdr.org/main/danube-basin/countries-danube-river-basin> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. According to the Law 46/2010 [http://www.mrrls.gov.rs/sites/default/files/attachment /UREDBA%20O%20NOMENKLATURI%20STATISTICKIH%20TERITORIJALNIH%20JEDINICA%20latinica.pdf](http://www.mrrls.gov.rs/sites/default/files/attachment%20/UREDBA%20O%20NOMENKLATURI%20STATISTICKIH%20TERITORIJALNIH%20JEDINICA%20latinica.pdf) Last accessed January 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. NIS Serbian Census 2011. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Evaluation Report Romania-Republic of Serbia Programme 2012 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Serbia, as candidate country has not established quantitative targets, current progress in the strategic areas are described according to available information, with direct and secondary, indirect indicators. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. NIS Labour Force Survey 2012 published by the Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia page 15 [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. World bank Data <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/GB.XPD.RSDV.GD.ZS> [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. European Commission, (2014), SERBIA 2013 PROGRESS REPORT Accompanying the document COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2013-2014, Brussels Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning, (2010), Initial National Communication of the Republic of Serbia under the United Nations Framework Convention On Climate Change, Belgrade [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. World data on Education UN International bureau of education. 2014. <http://www.ibe.unesco.org/en/services/online-materials/world-data-on-education.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. ERAWATCH Platform on Research and Innovation policies and systems <http://erawatch.jrc.ec.europa.eu/erawatch/opencms/information/country_pages/rs/country?section=ResearchPerformers&subsection=HigherEducationInstitutions> [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. <http://silk.stat.rs/Documents/PD10_366_engl.pdf> and Government of the Republic of Serbia

    “Monitoring Social Inclusion in Serbia” <http://www.inkluzija.gov.rs/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Monitoring-Social-Inclusion-in-Serbia-Aug-2012-ENG-revizija.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Target values may be qualitative or quantitative. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. To be defined after final decision on financial al location and project types. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Target values may be qualitative or quantitative. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. To be defined after final decision on financial allocations [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Target values may be qualitative or quantitative. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Target values may be qualitative or quantitative. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Required where the Union support to technical assistance in the cooperation programme exceeds EUR 15 million. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Required where objectively justified by the given the content of the actions and where the Union support to technical assistance in the cooperation programme exceeds EUR 15 million. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. The target values can be qualitative or quantitative. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. European Investment Bank [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. *In this context the term “danubic” does not arise from the usual “danubian”, referring only to the river itself. “Danubic” refers to the political concept of Danube Region, a space delimited by socio-economic and political consideration.* [↑](#footnote-ref-28)