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TERMS OF REFERENCE
Deadline for submission

12:00 (CEST time)
Procedure: Online system

www.iolf.eu
Thematic scope

All investment priorities open

Projects on environment and resource efficiency encouraged
Budget available

EUR 147 million

- Innovation: 23.2
- SMEs: 37.5
- Low carbon: 39.2
- Environment: 47.1
Third call tips

Be innovative!

Most covered topics so far

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance of RIS3</th>
<th>Internationalisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clusters within RIS3</td>
<td>Innovation capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular economy</td>
<td>Urban mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Energy efficiency in buildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Third call tips

Explore new topics!

- Financial instruments
- Renewable energy
- Water management
Third call tips

Involve new comers
REMINDER ON ASSESSMENT
Selection procedure

2-step procedure

- I. Eligibility assessment
  fulfilment of technical requirements

- II. Quality assessment
  2-step qualitative evaluation

Detailed description in the programme manual (§5.3)
Eligibility principles

- Technical **yes** or **no** process
- **No correction possible**
- Only eligible applications are further assessed
Eligibility checklist

- Is your application **complete** (partner declarations, support letters)?
- Is the application **filled in** according to instructions?
- Is it in **English**?
- Are all **partner declarations**:
  - Signed and dated
  - With name of partner identical to application form
  - With stated amount covering **at least** the amount of partner contribution
  - With no amendments to the standard text
Eligibility checklist

✓ Are **all support letters**:
  - Attached to the application form
  - Signed and dated by relevant organisation (check the country-specific list!!)
  - With name of partner(s) **identical** to application form
  - With no amendments to the standard text

✓ Are at least **3 countries** of which **2 are EU members** involved and financed by Interreg Europe?

✓ Are at least **half** of the policy instruments addressed Structural Funds programmes?
Quality assessment

Second step only for eligible applications!

2-step approach

Strategic Assessment

C1: Relevance of proposal
C2: Quality of results
C3: Quality of partnership

Operational assessment

C4: Coherence of proposal & quality of approach
C5: Communication & Management
C6: Budget and finance

- Decision by monitoring committee.
- Only projects reaching at least an overall adequate level (≥3.00) are recommended for approval (with conditions) to the monitoring committee.
LESSONS LEARNT
Talking about eligibility…

One NO disqualifies whole project \(\rightarrow\) no assessment!

- High rate of ineligibility (29.4%)
- Main causes of ineligibility:
  - Letters of support (missing or incorrect)
  - Partner declaration (incorrect – amount lower than necessary!)

Make sure all documents are provided and correct. Don’t prepare them at the last minute!
Talking about quality…

1. **Issue addressed**: What do I want to change?

2. **Policy instrument**: How do I want to change it?

3. **Partners**: Who can change it?
1. What do I want to change?

Some examples:
- Regional Operational Programme ERDF-ESF of Molise 2014-2020
- Regional Transport Strategy for South-East Scotland (RTS)

Policy Instrument

Improves a territorial situation

Specific geographical coverage

Local
Regional
National

Is the body responsible for the PI involved in the project?

YES
Well done!
- Are they able to influence the PI?
- Do they count on the support of the responsible body?

NO

The specific territorial situation to be improved = issue addressed

Increasing mobility demand with higher congestion levels

Precarious access of EU SMEs to the international market.

- Does it fit in the EU 2020?
- Is it relevant to Interreg Europe?
- How could it be improved by means of cooperation?
Common weaknesses

Topic addressed (Criterion 1):

- **Too broad** scope / **poorly** described
- **Not in line** with priority axis
- **Not reflected** in policy instruments addressed and territorial contexts
2. How do I want to change it?

Some examples:

- Regional Operational Programme ERDF-ESF of Molise 2014-2020
- Regional Transport Strategy for South-East Scotland (RTS)

Policy Instrument

- Improves a territorial situation
- Specific geographical coverage

Increasing mobility demand with higher congestion levels

Precarious access of EU SMEs to the international market.

Is the body responsible for the PI involved in the project?

- Yes: Well done!
- No: Are they able to influence the PI? Do they count on the support of the responsible body?

Does it fit in the EU 2020?
Is it relevant to Interreg Europe?
How could it be improved by means of cooperation?
Common weaknesses

Policy instruments (Criterion 1):

- Not **precisely defined** in the AF (e.g. indication of the specific priority addressed)

- Misunderstanding for Structural Funds (instrument indicated not the **Operational / Cooperation** programme)

Check country-specific pages for list of policy-relevant bodies for Structural Funds programmes at: [http://www.interregeurope.eu/in-my-country/](http://www.interregeurope.eu/in-my-country/)
3. Who can change it?

Some examples:

- Regional Operational Programme ERDF-ESF of Molise 2014-2020
- Regional Transport Strategy for South-East Scotland (RTS)

Policy Instrument

Improves a territorial situation

Specific geographical coverage

- Local
- Regional
- National

Increasing mobility demand with higher congestion levels
- Precarious access of EU SMEs to the international market.

The specific territorial situation to be improved = issue addressed

- Does it fit in the EU 2020?
- Is it relevant to Interreg Europe?
- How could it be improved by means of cooperation?

is the body responsible for the PI involved in the project?

YES Well done!
- Are they able to influence the PI?
- Do they count on the support of the responsible body?

NO
Common weaknesses

Policy relevance of partners (Criterion 3):

- No direct involvement of bodies responsible for the policy instrument addressed
- No clear policy relevance of the partners involved: involvement in the policy-making process & capacity to influence the policy instrument

Letter of support is not sufficient

Core elements of quality of partnership: dedicated questions in section B.2 of the application form
Common weaknesses

Geographical features (Criterion 3)

- Coverage limited to transnational areas

Go beyond transnational area!
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
Start from your challenges
Be specific and focused
Take the learning process seriously

- We talk to each other
- We are able to conclude and go further
- Learn from good practice
- We try to learn from data and good evaluations
Read the programme manual
Useful links

Interreg Europe community
www.interregeurope.eu/account/dashboard

Application pack (incl. programme manual)
www.interregeurope.eu/apply

Online application system
www.iolf.eu
Thank you!

Questions welcome