

Separate supplement to the On-going Report

Abstract of Long Minutes of the plenary meeting
14th Monitoring Committee
Ferrara (Italia)
November 20th, 2013



Agenda of the meeting:

1. On-going evaluation: presentation of the Reports;

-OMISSIS-

1. On-going evaluation: presentation of the Reports

-OMISSIS-, representative of the evaluator Greta Associati and MK Projekt, presents: the evaluation reports, a table with the evaluator's comments to the remarks and observations sent during the summer months and the conclusions and recommendations (see documents published on MC intranet section).

-OMISSIS-, representative of Republic of Slovenia, asks the Managing Authority (hereinafter MA) regarding the remarks and integrations to the conclusions of the report sent by the Programme partner Republic of Slovenia within the discussion of the report, which occurred from August 14th, 2013 to the end of the summer, since no feedback to this matter has been received. Furthermore she stresses that the version of the documentation presented to the MC is the same as the one presented in July 2013.

-OMISSIS-, representative of the MA, points out that the evaluator has an independent role; the MA has forwarded to the evaluator the remarks and observations made by the Republic of Slovenia and the evaluation group autonomously prepared the conclusions to the report. He stresses that any other interference of the MA or any other subject would be a violation to the autonomous role and to the conclusions reported by the evaluator. The results achieved independently by the evaluator were presented to the MC and any remark to the report has to be presented directly to the evaluator in relation to the conclusions. The MA can not interfere in the independent role of the evaluator.

-OMISSIS-, representative of Republic of Slovenia points out that the Republic of Slovenia is disappointed about the management of all the procedure related to the on-going evaluation. Since the reports are considered very important documents for the analysis of the past experiences and for future planning, they are discussed also within the meetings of the Task Force for the future programming period. The duty of the MC is to approve and agree with the presented evaluations, even if now has been stressed that the role of the evaluator is independent. -OMISSIS- Representative of RS explains that the Programme is a joint programme, all the involved parts contribute to its implementation and also the provisions for the MC in relation to this kind of documentation is clearly stated. Since the responsibilities of the subjects involved in this matter seem to be confused, she once more repeats for the record the already presented remarks to the report and asks to consider them as they come from an important analysis and are connected to the discussion which will follow during the MC meeting:

1. It is necessary to establish the reasons for the huge delays occurred in the implementation of the Programme; furthermore it is necessary to ascertain that in the first years, due to different interests and the predomination of single authorities on the Programme, the implementation of the Programme has been blocked, crisis meetings with the European Commission (hereinafter EC) have been organized and parallel rules for cooperation in the form of a position paper have been stated. The present members of the MC, who participated to these procedures will agree, but in the presented report this was not included.



2. The beneficiaries waited for a long time for the results of the public calls. Between the first and the second step of the call for strategic projects some modifications were published, which determined a significant increase of the number of project partners. -OMISSIS- (The representative of the evaluator Greta Associati and MK Projekt) mentioned the great extensiveness of the partnerships and in the report has been stated that wide partnership represent a problem, but no connection with the mentioned reason is included.
3. The information related to the reason for the long duration of the harmonisation of the text of the third public call (so called land border call) is not correctly specified in the report. The reason was not linguistic incomprehension but the lowering of the amount of funds for the call foreseen by the Programme.
4. The delays in the decision process, related to the first step of the public call n. 01/2008, resulted in the simultaneous publication of the second step of the public call n. 01/2009 and the public call n. 02/2009, which consequently determined an inflation of applications and contents (seen also during the presentation of the projects in the touristic field yesterday). The repetitive contents are not leading to quality and there are clear reasons for that. Beneficiaries decided to present the same projects also under public call n.02/2009. The long harmonisation related to the increase of funds for public calls n. 01/2009 and 02/2009 resulted in the lack of time for the arrangement of the small project fund. The evaluators have not considered this factor and its significance for the Programme. The decision method represented a negation of the Lead Partner (hereinafter LP) principle and the predomination of the quantity parameters above the quality parameters, that resulted in the numerous difficulties encountered in the implementation of the projects. In fact, the number of approved modifications is now probably near 200.
5. The last remark regards the information on report page n. 105, connected with the change of article 3 of the MC Rules of procedure, concerning decision-making. The modification of this article was not discussed and is not the result of a partnership agreement, therefore the Republic of Slovenia proposes to cancel this paragraph, which is taken out of the context.
6. Regarding the thematic report discussed during the meeting of the 4th Task Force, the representative of the Republic of Slovenia proposed to cancel all the paragraphs with financial information, concerning data of the extension of NUTS3 areas and the number of citizens in the year 2011 and ponderation. Regarding this matter **-OMISSIS-, representative of Republic of Slovenia** asks where are such criterion used to evaluate cohesion policy. She furthermore stresses that during the presentation of the first report in Trieste **-OMISSIS-, representative of Republic of Italy** did not permit the presentation of financial data per single territorial unit. Therefore the significance of those data is not clear.

-OMISSIS-, representative of Republic of Slovenia also clarifies that the remarks are referred only to the contents of main importance, which are directly connected with the quality of the implementation of the Programme and do not regard the methodology and correctness of the single projects. The purpose is a joint contribution and wish to analyse the current situation to act better in the new programming period.

-OMISSIS-, representative of the MA, confirms that the MA has forwarded the remarks to the evaluator and asks, if the MC members agree, the evaluator to clarify and point out how the remarks and observation have been acknowledged or have not been acknowledged, which



were the contacts with the Slovenian part and the results of that interaction in the evaluation report, which were the decisions taken jointly with the Slovenian part and if some parts need to be clarified.

He asks, if the evaluator agrees, to present an explanation regarding the development process which originates in the report at the next MC meeting and any further integrations needed, taking into consideration the remarks pointed out by the Slovenian delegation. In his opinion this would be the most correct approach to highlight the requests of the Republic of Slovenia in connection to evaluator's statements included in the report.

-OMISSIS-, representative of the evaluator **Greta Associati and MK Projekt** expresses her availability to answer to any question, she points out that the evaluator carried out a very serious work and considered all the Programme partners, some of them even more than others. The Republic of Slovenia presented 30 remarks, which were included in the table with the changes introduced in the report presented in the slides. If some of them have not been included a motivation has been given. She stresses that the evaluator is independent and decides independently what to analyse. The MC does not approve the Evaluation report but takes note of it and is clear that the Programme has delays if there are such long discussions on a report, firstly presented in July and still discussed in November, thus even this can be a reason for delays.

-OMISSIS

-OMISSIS-, representative of Republic of Slovenia expresses her disagreement with the proposal of conclusion, saying that the MC is not credible, considering also the previous actions of the MA, who forwarded the report to the MC on August, 14th 2013 with the request to present integrations and remarks. She asks which is than the meaning of such a request to the MC members if the report is a concluded document. She moreover proposes that if the MC members do not share the presented remarks, they should be included in the report as a separated proposal made by the Republic of Slovenia in the form of a supplement, taking into consideration that the reports are public documents, which will be published on the Programme website and everyone who wants to acquire some information about the Programme can read them.

-OMISSIS-

The meeting ends at 4 p.m.

-OMISSIS-