

Opening Monitoring Committee Meeting  
Sárospatak, 15<sup>th</sup> December 2015

---

MINUTES

**Agenda**

1. Approval of the Agenda, presentation of the purpose of the meeting (Managing Authority)
2. Presentation of the CP Interreg V-A SK-HU (JS)
3. Discussion and approval of the Rules of procedures of the MC
  - a. Rules of Procedures of MC
4. COM view on the role and functioning the MC during the implementation of the Interreg V-A Slovakia Hungary Cooperation Programme (EU COM)
5. Discussion and approval of ruling documents of Interreg V-A Slovakia Hungary Cooperation Programme
  - a. Eligibility rules
6. Approval of the framework of the Technical Assistance projects (MA)
  - a. Framework of TA (xls sheet, with total sums)
  - b. TA Manual
7. Indicative timeframe of the Calls for Proposals in 2016 (MA)
8. Communication Strategy
  - a. Communication Strategy
  - b. Visibility Guide
9. Information on the results of the Eurobarometer survey, focusing on the data from the SK-HU border area (EU COM)
10. Any other business
11. Conclusions and closure of the meeting

## 1. Approval of the Agenda, presentation of the purpose of the meeting

**Emil Pícha** welcomes the participants of the first monitoring committee meeting of the Interreg V-A Slovakia-Hungary Cooperation Programme on behalf of the Managing Authority and asks all participants for short introduction. Informs the participants that based on the proposal of Zsolt Szokolai the agenda point no. 4 is proposed to be discussed as point no. 3 and vice versa. No other proposal regarding the agenda was raised by the participants.

**Adrián Savanyú** also welcomes the participants of the monitoring committee on behalf of the National Authority.

**DECISION:** The modified agenda was approved.

## 2. Presentation of the Interreg V-A SK-HU CP

PRESENTATION: Csilla Veres

DISCUSSION

**Zsolt Szokolai** adds that the CP also includes the selection criteria that must be incorporated in the assessment grids, thus contributing to achieve the goals of the programme.

He highlights that the MC will have a key role in providing advice to the MA and the JS in order to achieve the objectives during the implementation which are described under the various priorities. He adds that the MC will not only supervise the programme but also entitled to comment the work of the MA. He trusts in the active participation of the MC members on the meetings. He considers avoiding one-way communication the strategic questions should not be discussed through written procedures. In addition he thinks that the Monitoring Committee meetings could be linked together with organized monitoring visits or it would be also possible to invite project owners to the meetings in order to listen to their experiences about the implementation of the programme. As a good practice he suggests to share and make available the non-sensitive documents and decisions of the MC on the programme webpage to the general public as well.

**Emil Pícha** agrees that the monitoring committee meetings should be more linked to the practice and suggests creating schedule of the work of the monitoring committee, furthermore suggests to rotate the venues among all regions involved in the programme and to integrate the members to the organization of monitoring committee meetings.

**TASK/DECISION:** N/A

## 3. Discussion and approval of the Rules of procedures of the MC

a. Rules of Procedures of MC

PRESENTATION: Peter Balun

## DISCUSSION

**Peter Balun** informs that based on the comments towards the Rules of Procedures (RoP) of the MC, the decision making rights related to all necessary steps for successful closure of the HUSK 2007-2013 Cross-Border Cooperation Programme should be incorporated among the task of the MC members.

**Nikoletta Horváth** proposes to include a new point to the RoP that from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2016 the new MC for the period 2014-2020 is authorized to decide about issues related to the programme closure of the HUSK 2007-2013 Cross-Border Cooperation Programme pursuant to the decision made on the 10<sup>th</sup> JMC meeting.

Regarding the ad-hoc observer status she suggests to ask the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade to convene those EGTCs that are relevant to the programme area and let them discuss that which EGTC and when is entitled to participate on the meetings on a rotating bases.

**Renáta Shiraisi** and **Gabriella Nagy** support the proposal.

**Julianna Orbán Máté** agrees and suggests discussing and deciding on the question of rotation principle of EGTC participations on the MC meetings at the seminars organized by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Hungary and CESCO. These seminars are organized on regular basis; 2-3 times in a year and represent forum on which the possibilities of cooperation of EGTCs in different programmes and projects are being formulated.

**Nikoletta Horváth** declares that it has to be included into the RoP that principle of rotation must be determined separately as it shall be coordinated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade with the involvement of the EGTCs.

**Martin Hakel** suggests making a short technical break in order to discuss some opened questions among the members of the Slovak national delegation.

**Peter Balun** summarizes the proposals raised by the Slovak national delegation:

- The time limit for sending the invitation for the MC meetings to the MC members by the JS has to be increased up to 20 calendar days.
- The time limit for sending the briefing materials for the MC meetings by the JS to the MC members has to be increased up to 15 calendar days.
- The minutes from the MC meetings shall be sent to the MC members within 15 calendar days from the concerned MC meeting.
- The final minutes from the MC meetings shall be sent to the MC members within 30 calendar days from the concerned MC meeting.

Furthermore he explains that the reserve list tool has been included in the Rules of procedures so that the programme management bodies could achieve better absorption capacity of the available financial resources.

**Zsolt Szokolai** recommends modifying the conditions of use of the written procedures under Rule (7) point (5), that pursuant to the Regulation in case of predefined and foreseeable tasks the written procedure can not be applied.

**Nikoletta Horváth** adds that the written procedure is not applicable in the following cases: modification of the programme, adoption of the Annual Implementation Report, Evaluation Plan, and Communication Strategy.

**Peter Balun** informs that based on the objections raised by the members of the MC representing the regions, the original proposal of the MA, NA and JS with the recommendation of the EC will be modified and the working language of the MC will be Hungarian and Slovak, while all programme documents and all working documents of the MC will be in English language. The translation of any documents will be done only in very exceptional and justified cases and only with the condition that the original version of these documents will be approved by the MC in English language.

**Zsolt Szokolai** suggests again that the non-sensitive documents and decisions of the MC shall be published by the MA on the programme webpage, thus make it available to the general public, such as the presentations, the implementation report, the agenda and the conclusion of the meetings. Rule (9) point (2) should be modified accordingly.

**Emil Pícha** reacts that the programme management bodies have to be wise with the TA limits regarding the translation costs. He opens the voting on the modified version of the Rules of procedures of the MC. No further comments or objections were raised by the members.

Referring to the possibility of using interpreting services **Nikoletta Horváth** draws the attention that the TA budget should be reviewed and availability should be checked.

DECISION: The modified Rules of procedures of the MC were approved and the approved final document is attached to the minutes.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

#### 4. **COM view on the role and functioning the MC during the implementation of the Interreg V-A Slovakia Hungary Cooperation Programme**

PRESENTATION: Zsolt Szokolai

TASK/DECISION: N/A
--------------------

#### 5. **Discussion and approval of ruling documents of Interreg V-A Slovakia Hungary Cooperation Programme**

a. Eligibility rules

PRESENTATION: Bella Balázsy

## DISCUSSION

According to the discussion following the presentation the text of the eligibility guide was completed as follows:

- 2.2. Eligibility period was completed with the text *between 01<sup>st</sup> January 2014-31<sup>st</sup> December 2023.*
- 4.1.2.a) Forms of reimbursement: Text is completed with the list of direct costs (travel and accommodation costs, external expertise and services costs, equipment expenditure, infrastructure and works).
- 4.4.3.2.a) Guidelines and examples for visibility elements and external expertise: the maximum cost of public procurement is decreased to 1,5% of the estimated amount of the procurement concerned, the maximum amount of 6000 EUR is deleted.
- 4.4.3.2.b) Preparation: Text is completed with *translation* as eligible cost under preparation activities.
- 4.5.1.g) Text is completed with *special vehicles that contribute to the project goal achievement.*
- 4.5.3.1.j) Text is modified as follows: *...which is purchased after the first months of the project is not eligible.*
- 4.6.3.1.h) text is modified as follows: *... or at least a 10-year-long rental contract or owner's permit or handling right issued by the owner is needed.*
- 4.6.3.2.a) List is completed with: a.d. *Proof of the submission of the request to the building authority and .*

<b>DECISION:</b> The text of Eligibility Rules shall be modified accordingly.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## 6. **Approval of the framework of the Technical Assistance projects**

- a. Framework of TA (xls sheet, with total sums)
- b. TA Manual

PRESENTATION: Peter Balun

## DISCUSSION

**Nikoletta Horváth** asks the Managing Authority to reformulate the Framework of the TA; in case of TA/10 (Audit tasks of Audit Authority (AA) in Bratislava) should be

Interreg V-A Slovakia-Hungary Cooperation Programme

1016 Budapest

Gellérthegey u. 30-32.

[www.skhu.eu](http://www.skhu.eu)

modified as ‘organization(s) which is going to accomplish the audit tasks’. She emphasized that in case of TA/10 the costs for audit activity should be defined and not the name of audit body.

**Emil Pícha** confirms that MA supports this approach; the TA budget line for Audit means financing of Audit obligations (not a specific organization).

**Tünde Erényi** – on behalf of all IPs – would like to initialize a common technical meeting between IPs and MA.

**Nikoletta Horváth** says that it is important to clarify the details of the Hungarian transfer regarding the National contribution for the joint TA projects.

**Peter Balun** says that it is the tasks of the IPs to set the BLs within the financial frame for IPs. TA projects have to be approved by MC. TA Manual has to be modified that if member states apply stricter rules regarding public procurement, then national legislation should be followed.

**DECISION:**

TA budget frame is approved with the condition that TA/10 is for audit purpose and further negotiation is needed.

TA Manual has to be modified that if member states apply stricter rules regarding public procurement, then national legislation should be followed.

## 7. Indicative timeframe of the Calls for Proposals in 2016

PRESENTATION: Iveta Námerová

DISCUSSION

**Iveta Námerová** adds to her presentation that “Closed call” means that the call have straight deadlines for submitting project proposals while “Open calls” are permanently open. No other restrictions are planned to be applied.

**Julianna Orbán Máté** added that the call for SPF project is foreseen in the first half of 2016. She asked about selection of SPF umbrella project organization; open call would be launched or predefined criteria with restricted call would be applied for selection of SPF umbrella project? She asked that it is possible to set the criteria for selection for the next MC meeting in March.

**Iveta Námerová** added that the selection will be on the base of setting up minimal criteria in a restricted call. Once the selection criteria are approved by MC the applications can be approved via written procedure.

**Martin Hakel** asked whether the umbrella projects have to operate simultaneously or any of them can start earlier its operation. Is it possible to start to communicate about

availability of SPF in the course of 2017? Which date can be foreseen for launching PP Light Scheme?

**Peter Balun** added that in case technical problems on the western side still persist, eastern side can start separately its operation (after the approval of the MC). In case of PP Light Scheme; the Slovak side found interested organizations; the negotiations between partners could start. As soon as the relevant partners set partnership, MC could approve their participation.

**Julianna Orbán Máté** adds that EGTC Via Carpathia would like to initialize meeting with MA in January 2016 in order to speed up the setting up of SPF umbrella project.

## 8. Communication Strategy

- a. Communication Strategy
- b. Visibility Guide

PRESENTATION: Arianna Biriki

### DISCUSSION

**Zsolt Szokolai** says that the compulsory elements of the communication strategy set in the CPR are missing from the draft. No strategic directions, types of activities, detailed budget or capacity of the implementing body are described. Strategy should have details that how the TA and project beneficiaries will be involved into the communication activities to create synergy and have multiplication effects. He suggests the document not be approved.

He highlights that MA will present the annual plans to the MC about communication but MC will not make a decision about communication strategy in the future. Communication reports will be part of the implementation report only in 2017 and 2019. Therefore MC now has chance to describe direction for communication strategy and based on the strategy the communication activities will have more independence in the upcoming years.

<p><b>DECISION:</b> The communication strategy is not approved. The modified communication strategy will be discussed again during the next MC.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Péter Kalmár** says that appropriate decision on the type, allocation and timing of Call for proposals cannot be made until thorough background information on the prospective spending forecast (and related n+3 targets) is presented to the MC and until the scheduling of the Calls is elaborated and discussed for the entire life cycle of the programme.

## 9. Information on the results of the Eurobarometer survey, focusing on the data from the SK-HU border area

PRESENTATION: Zsolt Szokolai

## 10. Any other business

### DISCUSSION

**Martin Hakel** suggests that a working group should be organized for finalization of implementation documents.

**Peter Balun** proposes a smaller group with representatives from MA, NA, JS and 2 members from regions.

**Nikoletta Horváth** says that MA, NA and JS should prepare documents up to 15<sup>th</sup> of January 2016 and send them to MC for two weeks to express their opinion.

**Peter Balun** suggests the end of the month instead of 15<sup>th</sup> of January.

**Csilla Veres** proposes that national delegations should present their common position.

**Peter Balun** also proposes a meeting among national representatives.

**DECISION:** The MA, NA and JS have to prepare the implementation materials (Call for Proposals, Applicants' Manual and Beneficiaries Manual) and have to submit to the national delegation for consultation by the end of January 2016. 2 weeks after the submission the national delegations have to send their common opinion to the MA.

**Gábor Jenei** recommends including to the next MC meeting agenda the presentation of the Danube strategy.

**DECISION:** The JS have to include to the next MC agenda presentation of the Danube strategy.

**Martin Hakel** asks about the opportunity of pre-financing system in Slovakia.

**Iveta Námerová** says that MA is waiting for the answer from the Ministry of Finance of the Slovak Republic on this issue.

**Nikoletta Horváth** answers Gabriella Nagy that on the next MC meeting the Small Project Fund and PP Light Scheme will be discussed as well.

## 11. Conclusions and closure of the meeting

**Emil Pícha** closed the meeting.