



## EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Enlargement Directorate-General

Regional Cooperation and Programmes  
**Regional Programmes**

Brussels,  
DG ELARG D3/

### **- Minutes and Conclusions -**

## **Multi-beneficiary Coordination Meeting Brussels, 26 & 27 April 2012**

---

### **General Remarks**

The main objectives of the Multi-beneficiary (MB) meeting were to:

- Give an update of the programming process for IPA MB 2012 and 2013
- Get an update on the recent Regional Cooperation Council (RCC) activities
- Discuss the assessment of progress in the Sector Justice and Home Affairs (JHA)
- Get an update on IPA II regulation and draft Implementing Rules
- Brainstorm in break out sessions on (1) priorities for IPA assistance post-2014, (2) relations between the IPA MB programmes and the National programmes and (3) ways to increase the efficiency of assistance

### **General Conclusions**

- MB Programming 2012 and 2013 confirmed to be on track.
- RCC update on recent activities noted, self assessment presented.
- Main conclusion of the assessment of MB projects in the Sector JHA: good communication and coordination is key to success, ownership can be increased if all regional stakeholders are involved from the beginning; sustainability can be ensured if results are transferred to regional initiatives.
- NIPACs request to be regularly informed about IPA II progress and timeline.
- NIPACs request additional support for IPA II and SWAp.
- 2 new projects proposed by Serbia on Migration and Education to be circulated by D3 to the NIPACs for review and comments; D3 to analyse the proposals.
- Main conclusions of the break-out session 1/ Which areas or topics are most important for regional cooperation? Fight against organised crime and corruption, rule of law, develop a tailor made growth strategy for the region and employment.
- Main conclusion of the break-out session 2/ How does MB support fit into nationally defined sector strategies? Regional cooperation can help to push forward the political agenda also at national level.
- Main conclusion of the break-out session 3/ How to improve effectiveness and efficiency of MB IPA support? The existing regional initiatives should play an even bigger role in IPA II.

## • Minutes – 26 April 2012

### **Introduction**

*Speaker: Mr Gerhard Schumann-Hitzler, Director, Directorate D-IPA strategy, DG Enlargement*

Mr Gerhard Schumann-Hitzler welcomed the participants and opened the Multi-beneficiary Coordination Meeting on behalf of the European Commission. He said he is very pleased to see a broad audience with all the NIPACs offices represented including an Icelandic Delegation.

He mentioned that regional cooperation is a learning process where common problems are addressed allowing for economies of scale. He underlined the importance of identifying priorities in order to make a successful planning and the best use of available resources. He stressed the importance of a permanent dialogue with the beneficiaries. He recalled that the ownership by the countries is a key success factor of regional cooperation. He mentioned the existence of the RCC as a success.

He informed the participants that the MB programme 2012 and Tempus 2012 received a favourable opinion by unanimity from the IPA Committee on the 23 of April.

He concluded by wishing a successful meeting and fruitful exchanges and said he was looking forward to receive a debriefing on the outcomes of the different breakout sessions.

The agenda for the meeting was presented by *Mr Yngve Engström, Head of Unit D3*, who encouraged a frank and open dialogue and exchange of views during the meeting.

### **Update on the recent activities of the Regional Cooperation Council**

*Speaker: Ms Jelica Minic, Deputy Secretary General of the RCC*

Ms Jelica Minic gave a presentation on the recent horizontal activities of the RCC: (1) mainly the assistance to SEECF, in particular the preparation of a number of sectorial meetings; (2) monitor and streamline regional activities; (3) exert strategic leadership in regional cooperation; (4) provide a regional perspective in donor assistance; (5) support increased involvement of civil society in regional activities; (6) communicate on RCC activities.

She explained the main achievements of the RCC per priority area:

In the Sector of Economic and Social Development, she underlined the transfer of the South East Europe Investment Committee from the OECD to the RCC and the launch of a structured dialogue on the Western Balkans Social Agenda 2020 with the aim of developing a regional response to the Europe 2020 Strategy.

In the Sector of Energy and Infrastructure, she highlighted the establishment of the SEDRI Task Force and the preparation of the initial project inventory in the framework of the Sustainable Energy Development Regional Initiative (SEDRI), their participation in the preparation of a final draft project proposal on expanding air transport links within the region of SEE; the initiative for regional strategic action regarding railway transport and infrastructure development, the support to the establishment of a Road Safety Training Centre; and the mapping of the activities in the area of Climate Change Adaption in SEE.

In the Sector of Justice and Home Affairs, she reported on the endorsement by the SEECF Ministers of JHA of the Regional Strategic Document (RSD) and Action Plan, the coordination of the Steering Group for the implementation of the Regional Strategic Document which designed the Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism (M&EM) to measure the progress and the results of regional cooperation in JHA, the establishment, in cooperation with the Regional Anti-Corruption

Initiative, of the Integrity Experts Network-IEN as a SEE inter-governmental structure of the national agencies specialized in public officials' assets declaration and incompatibilities regime, the establishment of the Forum of the Heads of Consular Departments from SEECP Countries, in cooperation with SEECP Chairmanship-in-Office and MARRI.

In the Sector of Security Cooperation, she mentioned the initiation, with full support of the EU Military Intelligence Directorate, of a regional cooperation mechanism among the Chiefs of Military Intelligence SEEMIC, the regional cooperation of the Heads of the South East European National Security Authorities SEENSA and the regional cooperation of the South East European Counter-Intelligence Chiefs Forum SEECIC

In the Media activities, she reported they have initiated the establishment of the European Association of Public Service Media in SEE (EAPSSEE) and facilitated the signing of the Protocol on Regional Cooperation in Education and Training among 12 members of the EAPSSEE.

She presented a summary of the self-assessment report on the implementation of the RCC Strategy and Work Programme 2011-2013 (SWP) for the period January–December 2011. The main recommendations are as follows: increase political commitment, consolidate cooperation mechanisms; align with enlargement agenda, have longer-term view, involve national policy makers, improve management mechanisms, have a stronger platform for reaching out stakeholders.

#### **Update of the programming process for IPA Multi-beneficiary programmes 2012 and 2013**

*Speaker: Ms Gabriela Koehler-Raue, Head of Coordination Section, DG Enlargement, D3*

Ms Koehler-Raue gave an update of the IPA MB programming exercise 2012 and 2013.

She mentioned that the MB 2012 (11 projects) for a total of € 108 645 650 million received a favourable opinion by unanimity from the IPA Committee on 23 April and is planned to be adopted in May/ June.

She further explained that there will be an amendment to the Civil Society Facility, adding 2013 national and MB IPA funds to the Decision that is already including 2011-2013 allocations, to be presented to the IPA Committee in June together with the Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Programme.

She mentioned that consultations on the 2013 programming have started and thanked the participants for their comments received on the Projects Identification Fiches. She said the comments will be integrated during the development of the Projects Fiches. She explained that the Project Identification Fiches for the MBP 2013 were also subject to a critical assessment by the Quality Support Group on 19 April. She said that D3 intends to present, the Multi-beneficiary programme 2013 and Tempus 2013 to the IPA Committee in November 2012, together with or after the Regional Housing Programme 2012-2013 (provisionally planned to be presented to the IPA Committee in September). She explained that the progress in the programming exercise for 2013 is in line with the planning of DG Enlargement as it prepares the ground for the new financial framework and IPA II coming on stream in 2014.

She mentioned that outside the IPA programming, a 2012 programme for preparatory actions for Cultural Heritage worth € 3 million will be prepared separately for adoption. She also mentioned that an amendment to the MB programme 2010 if being prepared, adding € 3 million for the SIGMA project, as a bridging measure until the programme under preparation for IPA 2013 is in place.

Mrs. Milena Radomirovic, Serbia, proposed 2 new project ideas, one in the in education area (social development sector) "Strengthening Evidence Based Policy Making in Education" and another related to migration management (justice and home affairs sector) in Western Balkans, "Regional Coordination Mechanism for Return".

Mr Yngve Engström stressed that any new project ideas have to fit into the strategic approach taken in the region; there is a need to look at the overall policies in the various sectors as well as other existing networks set up in the region, especially in the education sector.

Mr. Besnik Konci, Albania, acknowledged receipt of the proposals and said that he has sent comments.

Mr Aleksandar Drljevic, Montenegro, stressed the need to exchange ideas among the NIPAC offices before the MB Coordination meeting. Concerning the project idea in the education programme, he said we should keep in mind the support trough the Tempus programme.

Ms Nevena Marilovic, Bosnia and Herzegovina, said they received the project ideas late but give their initial support and would like to know the time frame.

Mr.Tomisav Belovari, Croatia, asked whether Croatia should reserve some funds from their national programme for the nuclear programme in 2013. Mr. Yngve Engström explained that Croatia will not receive more support to nuclear programme through a horizontal programme coordinated by Unit D3 as of now Croatia is in line with the EU acquis. However, if specific gaps and needs have to be addressed, that could be programmed through their national allocation.

Mr. Süreyya Süner, Turkey, mentioned that additional comments on the MB 2012 programme had been submitted to the Commission. He also stressed the importance of the areas addressed by the two new project ideas, in particular education. He also explained that Turkey is very attractive for migrants and confirmed his support to the project idea proposed by the Serbian Delegation. Ms Gabriela Koehler-Raue replied that the project fiches of the MBP 2012 will be corrected with regards to some technical and statistical updates. However, with regards to some suggestions on cross-cutting issues, the Project Fiche will follow agreed formulations and language of DG Enlargement.

Mrs. Orhideja Kaljoshevska, the former Yougoslav Republic of Macedonia, underlined that the MB programme is fully in line with their programming exercise and fully complement their national programme. With regard to the new projects ideas, she confirmed that she had received the proposals and will reply in writing.

Mr. Virgil Cucu Ivan, RCC, requested Mrs Milena Radomirovic to send the proposals to the RCC, to check their complementarity with 2 projects on migration already under implementation and regional networks in place, for example under MARRI.

Mr. Mladen Dragasevic, RCC, mentioned that a similar initiative in the education sector already exists, ERISEE, and that overlaps have to be avoided.

Mrs Sandra Roncevic, Croatia, said they support the idea of the Serbian proposal on education. However, any overlap with a similar initiative under SEECEL has to be avoided.

Mr. Yngve Engström replied that D.3 will circulate the projects proposals trough the NIPACs contacts points. He further explained that since 2007, every year a horizontal nuclear safety and radiation protection programme was adopted and that there is still a lot to be contracted and

implemented from the remaining programmes. Therefore no nuclear programme is foreseen for 2012. From 2013 onwards, the European Commission will examine the possibility of having multi annual programmes implemented by the Joint Research Centre in Petten.

**Assessment of progress in regional cooperation - Implementation Review for a selected sector: Justice and Home Affairs**

*Speaker: Mr. Kjartan Björnsson, Head of Regional Cooperation Section, DG Enlargement, D3.*

Mr Björnsson introduced the session with the objectives of the assessment of progress in regional cooperation in the JHA sector: (i) to ascertain the degree of success or not of MB programmes; and (ii) to learn lessons from planning and implementation of MB IPA assistance to improve future strategic planning and programming.

He said that he wanted to hear the perception of the beneficiary countries of what did work well and what did not work, the successes and the failures in the sector of Justice and Home Affairs.

Mr. Besnik Konci, Albania, selected WINPRO (Witness Protection) as a successful project in the area of Justice and Home Affairs. The project has contributed to a better harmonisation of the legislation and alignment to EU standards, to improved capacity building and upgraded equipment. He underlined how essential witness protection is for Albania and that the result of witness protection could increase the efficiency in fight against organised crime. He said that there were achievements and progress at national level and that the fight against crime is of high priority for the government. Albania also mentioned that they have high expectation regarding the IPA 2010 project "Strengthening the Prosecutors' Network" and the IPA 2011 "Corruption Surveys in the Business sector".

Mr. Samir Rizvo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, listed 3 projects: the "very successful" project is a CARDS 2003 project "Establishment of EU compatible legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks in the fields of asylum, migration and visa matters" which came to an end in 2005. He said it was very well designed and helped the process of visa liberalisation. The group of "successful" projects contained CARPO (CARDS 2003 on police cooperation), WINPRO and ILECU (International Law Enforcement Cooperation Units) as they helped to achieve higher standards. The "less successful" project is SECI/SELEC because of the lack of ownership and political problems from the beginning. As for the successful projects, he mentioned that the involvement of regional initiatives such as MARRI (Migration) and the transfer of results of the project on trafficking in human beings and illegal migration contributed to the regional ownership and the sustainability of the project.

Mr Kjartan Björnsson underlined that the success mentioned was a "process" rather than a "project" and asked the question of the necessity to create structures if they do not exist.

Mr. Tomislav Berovari, Croatia, mentioned 3 projects: 1) IPA 2008 Fight against organised crime, in particular illicit drug trafficking, and the prevention of terrorism with a ranking of 10/10, 2) WINPRO with 7/10 and 3) Cybercrime. He explained that the first project was a success with regard to the participation of the experts at the regional level. They shared knowledge and best practices. There were no bottlenecks or constraints. The WINPRO and Cybercrime projects contributed to strengthen the role of the contact points. Networking and exchange of best practices are among the benefits of the projects. As for future action, he suggested to consider a special role for Croatia and to apply a tailored made approach.

Mr. Kastriot Halili, Kosovo\*, mentioned ILECUS II as fully functioning with a dedicated team. Kosovo has no access to international databases, and belonging to the ILECU network is definitely beneficial. Significant progress has been achieved with the WINPRO project too.

Mrs. Orhideja Kaljoshevska, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, selected WINPRO and Cyber Crime, because of their overall highly positive impact. In particular, she underlined that the WINPRO project has substantially contributed towards strengthening compatibility of the national systems for criminal justice with the regional level, European and international level regarding the witness protection. In addition, she said that it has facilitated the cooperation between the units for witness protection and increased the professional capacity of the witness protection units with the aim of establishing and implementing of proper, effective and sustainable programs for protection. Regarding the project WINPRO, she mentioned the progress achieved in practical implementation of the law and the by-laws, especially in the areas of international relocation and re-identification, threat assessment, usage and management with intelligence information and protection of the witnesses in the prison system. One useful lesson learned from the implementation of the project is the need for enabling the trainings to be conducted in all languages of the participating countries. With regards to the project on Strengthening the capacities in the fight against Cyber Crime, which is also highly ranked by their institutions, it can be noted that the project has contributed towards improved awareness of Cyber crime and digital evidence, strengthened capacities for fight against Cyber crime through undertaken trainings for cyber crime investigators and developed resources for cyber crime investigation, improved cooperation and communication with international institutions, improved relations with the private sector and the established 24/7 contact point at the national level.

Mr. Aleksandar Drljevic, Montenegro said they received the outline for the assessment too late to be able to make comments. They will send in writing their evaluation. He mentioned that the regional cooperation should focus more on Chapter 23 and 24 and on strengthening the judicial institutions.

Mrs Danka Vasik, Serbia, insisted on the complementarity with the national programmes and the importance to circulate the information. She named Cybercrime as a successful project for prosecutors and other law enforcement agencies as they are actively involved in the project and it improved their collaboration in the region. She said that the capacities of Judicial Academy have improved. She underlined training and workshops, exchange of information and good coordination in organising activities as best practices. She also mentioned ILECU and said more activities should be done to be operational. She also said that the corruption survey produced very valuable assessments.

Mr. Süreyya Süner, Turkey said that the project (1) Customs and blue print exercise has produced good results in terms of a common data base and regular exchange of data. He also mentioned (2) the IPA 2008 DET ILECU II project and Cybercrime.

Mr. Virgil Ivan-Cucu, RCC, reminded about the challenges of the regional cooperation in JHA: (1) Crime phenomenon persisted and even aggravated internationally; (2) SEE region is particular vulnerable to organized crime, corruption and rule of law deficits; (3) the regional specificity of crime phenomenon in SEE.

He explained the areas of improvement: information pooling, cross-border intelligence exchange and collection (ILECUs and DET ILECU's II; risks and threats analysis (OCTA-SEE, SEPICA;

---

\*This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence.

legislative harmonization (SELEC ratification and the implementation of SEE-PCC, of CoE and UN legislative framework); cross-border exercises, operations and joint investigations (SELEC, PCC-SEE Secretariat, SEEPAG, WB Prosecutors' Network, MARRI); Witness protection (WINPRO); democratic policing (SEPCA, OSCE); personal data protection (ILECUs, SEPCA, SEE-PCC).

He underlined 2 main bottlenecks: (1) the insufficient level of coordination and (2) the negligence or insufficient use of existing regional structures.

He concluded with 6 recommendations: to enhance the convergence, complementarities, reciprocal support among regional mechanisms and EU agencies, to have an holistic approach to the rule of law sector and judicial control of regional operations; to enforce the existing regional cooperation instruments, to address the needs of citizens and practitioners, to increase the cooperation between judicial structures and the national central authorities, to develop integrated regional activities in cross cutting issues such as fundamental rights, justice and security; anticorruption, money laundering and legal professions.

Mrs Roberta Cortese, Task Manager for the sector of Justice and Home Affairs, said the projects WINPRO and ILECU showed good results as they were part of a strategy and there was a good communication between the implementing agencies and the beneficiaries.

Mr Kjartan Björnsson concluded the session and summarised the main recommendations: (1) to focus on practical aspects and the operational approach, (2) to ensure ownership from the identification phase of programming and involve stakeholders from the beginning, (3) to ensure transfer of results to regional initiatives, (4) to use local expertise, (5) to take into account the need of each country for a more tailored made approach, (6) to ensure good communication between the implementing agencies and the Beneficiaries.

## **IPA II Regulation and draft Implementing Rules**

*Speaker: Mr Andre Lys, Head of Unit, Financial Instruments and contracts, DG Enlargement, DI*

Mr André Lys reminded that the Commission proposal for the overall envelope for external action under the next MFF is € 70 billion whereof € 14.1 billion would be available for enlargement policy.

He said that an overall objective for external action is to have new harmonised, simplified and flexible implementing rules common to 4 geographic instruments (DCI, ENI, IPA, and PI) and 3 thematic instruments (IfS, EIDHR, INSC), but detailed implementing rules will still be needed under IPA II, in particular for territorial and cross-border cooperation.

He explained that the main objectives of IPA II are to support the political reforms for EU integration as well as economic, social and economic development, with a view to a sustainable, smart and inclusive growth. To measure the results, indicators will be defined and a mid-term review will be conducted in 2018 to assess the performance of the indicators for the period January 2014-December 2017.

The main changes over the current IPA are as follows: the financial assistance will be granted in similar terms to both candidate countries and potential candidates, the component structure will be replaced by comprehensive country strategies addressing policy areas, the move towards logic of (co) financing policy strategies instead of individual projects, the performance reserve (the level of which is still being discussed) and the possibility to shift allocations between policy areas (within a given country allocation) and between country allocations if needed, the support to a gradual

transition to decentralised management and a more systematic use of innovative financing instruments (blending of grants and loans for leveraging funds).

The time-line is as follows: in 2012, discussion and adoption of the 2014-2020 Multi-annual Financial Framework for the EU, discussion of draft regulations for external action in Council and European Parliament and preparation of draft IPA Implementing Regulation, adoption only after the IPA main regulation has been adopted. In 2013, the preparation of IPA strategic documents is planned with submission to IPA Committee beginning of 2014.

IPA II foresees that beneficiary countries must be able to manage the assistance themselves (under "indirect management" under the terminology of the new Financial Regulation) in order to increase ownership and effectiveness, therefore detailed implementing rules are needed. They already exist under the current IPA instrument but the Commission intends to streamline, harmonise and simplify the rules in light of the lessons and the best practices learned during the implementation of the current IPA.

The new implementing rules will cover the following topics: management and control systems, conferral of management powers, monitoring, evaluation, reporting, financial management, transparency and visibility and specific rules for territorial cooperation.

There is a requirement from the Member States to improve the visibility of what is done under the IPA instrument, and this will require improved information systems, using standard formats for disclosure and exchange of data.

Mrs. Milena Radomirovic, from Serbia, requested to be informed step by step, said that policies, sectors and projects are different area and requested assistance to prepare the requested documents.

Mr André Lys replied that the work on the main regulation should end in October/November and a draft Implementing Regulation should be available by then. The beneficiary countries will be consulted between October and the end of the year to incorporate lessons learned. He confirmed that support for preparing for IPA II can be foreseen and that the NIPACs should be in contact with the Delegations to see how use existing support or project preparation facilities for this purpose. He said that the sector approach will be an important aspect of the new system, and guidelines and training on this will be rolled out as soon as possible (after summer).

Mr. Yngve Engström said that the beneficiary should start to think already about what needs could be best addressed at the national level and what at regional level. He also said that the World Bank has a lot of experience in sector wide approach and that the beneficiaries could benefit from this experience.

Mr. Pedro Andreo informed about the agreement with the World Bank that the Commission is about to sign to develop a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for a number of sectors in the beneficiaries. The contract is for 18 months and it is foreseen that the experts provide training in the region.

Mr André Lys highlighted the need for the beneficiaries to prepare themselves for decentralised management, to build structures in order to manage policies, to identify the needs in the country. He concluded by saying that the beneficiaries should start to develop their strategy based on the needs in their country and regionally (collective needs) and then develop the adequate support.

Mr Yngve Engström concluded by saying that MB assistance can help to share experience in strategic planning.



## Minutes – 27 April 2012

### **Brainstorming in Break-out sessions – Priorities for regional cooperation and programming of IPA post**

*Speaker: Mr Yngve Engström, Head of Unit, Regional Programmes, DG Enlargement, unit D3*

Mr. Yngve Engström presented the subjects of the 3 break-out sessions and asked each beneficiary to send a member to each group. The groups were as follows:  
Session 1: "Which areas or topics are most important for regional cooperation?" with Mr. Kjartan Björnsson as facilitator;

Session 2 "How does Multi-beneficiary support fit into nationally defined sector strategies?" with Mr. Pedro Andreo Andreo as facilitator;

Session 3: "How to improve effectiveness and efficiency of Multi-beneficiary IPA support?" with Mr Yngve Engström as facilitator.

### **The conclusions for session 1: "Which areas or topics are most important for regional cooperation?" were presented by Ms Lidija Topic, from RCC.**

- What are the common needs and shared challenges to be addressed in this area?
- How does this area/topic contribute to prepare for accession?
- How does this area/topic contribute to achieving the goals defined in the Europe 2020 strategy and SEE 2020 vision?
- What is the best method of supporting with IPA in each area/topic?

The top priority is to fight organised crime and corruption, to establish the rule of law, as basis for security and stability to allow growth and employment.

In details, the priorities listed were as follows:

1/ Sector Justice and Home Affairs: Fight against organised crime and corruption with solid regional cooperation, to share experience, to harmonise actions with EU "acquis", Rule of law, Security situation to create better conditions for growth as high presence of organised crime is an obstacle to growth, stability, trans-border crime, illegal migration, Judicial cooperation in civil and criminal matters, judges and prosecutors cooperation; related to Chapter 24, regulation to extradition, more info to be shared and exchanged between judges and prosecutors at regional level.

How? Increase regional cooperation, increase support to the existing regional cooperation initiatives, strengthen regional cooperation of existing structures, increase regional cooperation of judges and prosecutors, strengthen regional cooperation among intelligence and classified information authority, and use examples of private sector development.

2/ Sector Environment and Climate Change: Energy and infrastructure projects, concrete issues to be decided, climate change, environment, disaster risk management.

How? Use existing regional structures WBIF, ECS, REC, DPPI, and SEETO

3/ Private sector Development: Economic cooperation: Private sector development regional forums; Cooperation of financial institutions to ensure SMEs access to finance, economic and social

cohesion; employment, indirectly through support to SMEs; Non tariff barriers; New computerised transit system (NCTS), flow of goods, EU accession criteria – trade facilitation.

How? Set of regional headline targets and indicators identified in the Private Sector Development Working Group and Investment Committee;

4/ Sector Public Administration Reform, working together would benefit to establish a common mind set within administrations; regional cooperation in negotiation process, exchange of experience in negotiation; additional support to statistics and link statistics with negotiation process;

How? Increase regional cooperation in training, share accession experience, use RESPA more; Smart growth; protection of intellectual property, link science with businesses, investment, research, development and innovation related networks would contribute to integration to ERA and EU accession criteria; education, market oriented vocational educational training with inclusion policy, to share experiences, similar characteristics in the region, competitive advantage on knowledge.

5/ Human rights, minority rights, fundamental rights, vulnerable groups, freedom of expression, disadvantaged groups, victims of violence, integration into society; refugees; social development; and Cultural heritage.

General issues:

- a. The civil society must be empowered and involved also in regional programmes
- b. This debate should continue also at national level
- c. Diaspora's involvement should be encouraged as a means to foster growth and development in the region
- d. The use of broader and larger frame should be considered as work support contracts rather than specific project interventions.

**The conclusions of session 2 "How does Multi-beneficiary support fit into nationally defined sector strategies?" were presented by Mr Umut Ergezer, from CEFTA Secretariat.**

- How could the objectives at national level be used/coordinated for/with the objectives pursued at regional/horizontal level?
- Which baselines and type of indicators could be used at regional level?
- How could indicators be better defined and monitored?

1/ Coordination and consultation is working satisfactorily at the level of programming the financial assistance but a need assessment for regional intervention should be carried out well in advance before starting the programming.

2/ A clear need exists to improve the coordination between national and regional programmes at the level of monitoring/implementation of regional programmes. The system of monitoring committees for regional programmes could be an appropriate mechanism to address this need.

3/ Regional Strategies to be developed in collaboration with regional organisations and beneficiaries. Existing national strategies should be taken into account. However, developing regional strategies should not be delayed if some national strategies are not in place. Regional organisations may play a role to increase the accountability of regional strategies/programmes within beneficiaries when those beneficiaries are signatories of regional organisations.

4/ Definition of objectives and indicators at regional level to be made in consistency with national programmes but the potential leverage of regional objectives/indicators to trigger action at national level should not be underestimated.

5/ Role of the regional organisations to identify and monitor indicators to be taken into account.

**The conclusions from session 3: "How to improve effectiveness and efficiency of Multi-beneficiary IPA support?" were presented by Mrs Sandra Roncevic, from SEECEL.**

- What role to play for beneficiaries, contractors, IFIs, regional and international organisations?
- Scope for joint programming with other donors?
- How can the administrative burden be reduced, procedures simplified?
- How to use grants and loans for regional investments?

1/ NIPACs office to be more actively involved in the coordination of IPA Multi-beneficiary projects for the purpose of monitoring of the implementation. First it should be consolidated what is going on, after that the streamlining will be needed, as well the sector approach shall be applied. The EU delegations as well have to be more actively involved in the process of monitoring and the overall coordination of IPA MB projects.

2/ On the long-term perspective also IPA Multi-beneficiary projects should be included in the planning and be interlinked with other donors assistance in order to include the achievements and the results and where possible to build up on them by applying the financial assistance of other donors in the country (ies). The existing instruments developed under IPA MB should be definitely wider applied out of IPA. The donor coordination mechanism establishment might be a good solution. Also at national levels some more concrete steps should be taken such as dedication of the direct budget line in the national budget within the line ministries responsible for IPA MB projects (the example of the Republic of Croatia and the link to Danube strategy).

3/ For already existing regional initiatives there should be guidance for national levels in identifying what is working at regional level to be linked with national needs and to use those results and achievements wherever possible. It is important to concentrate on how various mechanisms are applied, as well as to identify the regional ownership.

4/ For regional investments both grants and loans are of a great importance; in the WBIF instrument we have a great example how grants work for the preparatory phase (such as developing technical documentations and studies) prior to applying for the loan for the real investment. But still there should be also taken into consideration how better plan where to apply grant and where to apply loan as in some cases grants could easily cover part of the loan for the investments. Better planning and assessment needed for use of the combination of those two.

### **Concluding remarks**

Mr Yngve Engström thanked the participants of the meeting for the fruitful exchange of views and stressed that the discussions in the break-out sessions of day 2 were only the beginning of a longer term process of strategic planning for the period 2014 to 2020.

He announced that the next MB coordination meeting will take place in November 2012, further information will follow in due course.