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1. OPERATIONAL FRAMEWORK

This document contains the Final Implementation Report for the INTERREG IIIA Programme Austria – Slovenia covering the period January 1st 2000 to December 31st 2008. The programme was approved for the first time by the European Commission on August 6th 2001 and amended five times during the implementation period: July 26th 2002, October 19th 2004, December 5th 2005 and April 2nd 2007. In the course of the above-mentioned amendments of the programme document and due to financial shifts on measure level the Programme Complement (PC) was changed and sent to the European Commission (EC) for information. The final version of the PC was acknowledged by the EC on December 17th 2008. Costs arising on Austrian territory were eligible for ERDF-cofinancing beginning with July 11th 2000, on Slovenian territory with January 1st 2004 and ended for all beneficiaries on December 31st 2008. Costs arising within priority 4 “Special Support for Border Regions” were eligible for ERDF-cofinancing in Austria beginning with January 1st 2002 and ending with December 31st 2004.

At the date of closure the total budget of the programme according to the last approved financial plan amounts to 63.696.531 Euro (financial plan). The financial support from the European Fund for Regional Development amounts to max. 33,424,832 Euro, whereby 21.035,892 Euro is national public co-funding and 9.235,807 Euro stem from the private sector.

The programme was managed by the Austrian Federal Chancellery (Bundeskanzleramt der Republik Österreich) in close cooperation with the National Authority in Slovenia with the support of the Joint Technical Secretariat (JTS). On project level the responsibility for the operative management stayed at the Intermediate Bodies. The programme was steered by a Monitoring and Steering Committee composed of representatives from Slovenia and Austria.

The programme aimed to support a joint strategy for economic and social development. The key objective was the development of an economically as well as socio-culturally integrated border region.

Chapter 6 of this document reports on the activities of the programme in 2008.

1.1 Changes in the general conditions in the Period 2000-2008 with Relevance for the implementation of the assistance

In general it can be noticed that the objectives, priorities and measures of the programme were always relevant and coherent with the challenges and potentials in the programme area.

The most relevant change was without any doubt the accession of Slovenia to the European Union on May 1st 2004 (details see chapter 1.1.2.).
1.1.1. The main socio-economic trends

The main socio-economic trends are described in this chapter briefly. More detailed information can be found in the Operational Programme “Objective 3 Cross-Border Co-operation Austria – Slovenia 2007-2013” which was approved by the EC in December 2007.

Demography

In Slovenia, the population change in the period 1991-2002 is negative in all programme regions with the exception of Osrednjeslovenska and Gorenjska. The population decreased mostly in the least developed Pomurska region. Osrednjeslovenska, on the other hand, has the highest share of net migration because of people moving to the region for better job opportunities. In Austria, the negative change in the same period is recorded in Oststeiermark and strongly in Obersteiermark West.

Ageing of the population (increase of the population of age 64+) and decrease of the young population (age 0-14) is another characteristic of the Slovene programme area. In 2003, the ageing index for Slovenia reached 100, meaning that the share of old population is higher than the share of the young. In Austria, in particular in the industrial regions of Obersteiermark as well as in Graz the aging process has been going on significantly.

The population structure among the participating regions differs significantly. Ageing of the population (increase of the population aged 64+) and a decrease in young population (age 0-14) is another characteristic of the Slovene programme area. In 2006, the ageing index for Slovenia and all named regions exceeded 100, while in Gorenjsko, Savinjsko and Koroško it was still below 100. In Austria, in particular in the industrial regions of Obersteiermark Ost and Obersteiermark West the ageing process has been developing rapidly.

Moreover, the population density differs noticeably. Osrednjeslovensko with the capital city of Ljubljana has the highest density, which is two times the Slovene average; the regions of Savinjsko and Podravsko are above average as well, while the lowest population density has been recorded in the Koroško region. In Austria, the highest density is characteristic of the region Klagenfurt-Villach and Graz, while the lowest has been calculated for Oberkärnten. Except for Klagenfurt-Villach and Graz, all other regions are below the Austrian average.

Economic development

The cooperation area is highly industrialised with prospering urban areas and dynamic core regions (Ljubljana, Celje, Kranj, Maribor, Graz, Klagenfurt, and Villach), however, it also has a series of rural and peripheral sub-regions with a significantly lower level of economic development. Tourism plays an important role as well; however, it is only strongly focused on
specific geographic points. Thus, on the one hand there is a lot of economic potential, while on the other hand considerable disparities have to be considered.

In terms of GDP per capita, there are disparities not only between the two countries, but also when comparing the regions nationally. Compared to the EU-25 in 2003, the only Slovene region above the European average was Osrednjeslovensko. In Austria, Klagenfurt-Villach, Graz and Obersteiermark Ost were above average, while other participating regions were below the EU average, though still higher than Slovene regions.

**Table 1**

**GDP per capita by NUTS III regions compared to EU-25 average, 1995-2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EU 25</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Österreich</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Südburgenland</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klagenfurt-Villach</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unterkrnten</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberkrnten</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oststeiermark</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West- und Südstiermark</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graz</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obersteiermark Ost</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obersteiermark West</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slowenien</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomursko</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podravsko</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koroško</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savinjsko</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorenjsko</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osrednjeslovensko</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Human resources and labour market**

The unemployment rate of the programme area in general is below the EU-25 average; though Pomurska and Podravsko have exceeded the EU average (2003).

In Slovenia, the registered unemployment rate has been decreasing since 1998, most in Podravsko and least in Koroška region. The structural unemployment differs from region to region. Long-term unemployment is characteristic for all Slovene regions: the share is around 50%.
The situation of the Austrian border regions is somewhat better compared to Slovenia. In 2003, all the participating regions were below the national average (4.2%).

Cross border commuting has not changed significantly over the last years. It has been mostly directed from Slovenia to Austria. Furthermore Austria imposed restrictions to the free movement of labour after Slovenia’s accession to the EU.

The cross border cooperation in the field of labour market was not very intensive in the sense of collaboration of labour market institutions.

1.1.2. Changes in national, regional and sectoral policies

Accession of Slovenia to the European Union on 1st May 2004

The most relevant change was without any doubt the accession of Slovenia to the European Union on 1st May 2004 and thus the revision of the Interreg IIIA/Phare CBC programme on the former external EU border into a full Interreg IIIA programme at the current internal EU border.

Already in October 2002 the Federal Chancellery took initiative as Managing Authority to launch the process of Managing Transition for the four – at that time - external border programmes of Austria (future internal borders) and organised a series of seminars and workshops in Vienna during the years 2002 and 2003 (see also chapter 5.1. of the Annual Implementation Reports 2002 and 2003). Furthermore a bilateral Task Force (TF) was established by the Joint Monitoring Committee at the beginning of 2003 giving its members the mandate to prepare the revision of the programme documents. The Joint Programming Document (JPD) for the Interreg IIIA/Phare CBC Programme was reviewed with a participatory approach and active involvement of all stakeholders. It turned out that the objectives, the priorities and measures were still relevant and should be kept for the rest of the implementation period. With regard to the management structures the MA, PA were confirmed; the Government Office for Local Self-Government and Regional Policy became “National Authority” for Slovenia and the Regional Office in Maribor Intermediate Body. The parties agreed relations in a separate document – the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) – in order to support an efficient and effective management and implementation of the programme. At the same time the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation were discussed and included into the documents as well. The Community Initiative Programme (CIP) was approved by the European Commission in its decision (C) 4154 on 19th October 2004 increasing the available ERDF amount to EUR 33,446,827.00.

While the differences between Phare and Interreg have been a handicap to the co-ordinated implementation of the Interreg and Phare CBC programmes in the past, the new phase sets a solid foundation to achieve a real cross-border impact. The programme partners agreed that the
The implementation of genuine cross-border projects is one of the key objectives to be achieved in the Interreg IIIA programme Austria-Slovenia 2004-2006.

Programme relevant documents, e.g. Programme Complement, Rules of Procedures for MC/SC were adapted accordingly. The main documents CIP, PC and application form could be downloaded from the common website www.at-si.net. The MoU and the Rules of Procedure as well as annual reports could either be downloaded from the internal backoffice area (for programme members only) or are available on request at the Managing Authority1.

**Additional priority “Special Support for Border regions”**

Before the programme was changed due to Slovenia’s accession to the EU an additional priority “Special Support for Border regions” was introduced to the programme in 2002. Based on the Community action plan for border regions (communication by the EC on the request of the European Council December 2000) additional funds were allocated to all border regions of the “old” Member States in order to meet the challenges of the forthcoming enlargement.

The financial allocation of the programme was increased by a total amount of 1,744,000 EUR (872,000 EUR ERDF and 872,000 EUR national co-funding). The funds for this additional priority had been allocated entirely for the year 2002.

**Introduction of the Euro**

From 1st January 2007 onwards the Euro became the monetary unit of the Republic of Slovenia being thus the first new member state of the European Union which adopted the euro. The irrevocably set conversion rate between the tolar and the euro entered into force (1 EUR = 239,640 SIT).

**1.1.3. Changes in the Interreg policy frame reference**

In March 1998 the European Union formally launched the process that made the enlargement possible.

On 9th October 2002, the European Commission recommended that the negotiations on accession to the European Union have to be concluded by the end of 2002 with 10 countries including Slovenia. The negotiations with these 10 best-prepared candidates were concluded on the basis of their progress in implementing the acquis communautaire up to 2002, and on their commitment to continue doing so until their accession.

1 Until the end of 2008 the documents were available at the JTS. Due to the end of eligibility the JTS was closed on 31.12.2008.
This legal framework built the basis for the Managing Transition process that was launched by the programme partners Slovenia and Austria in order to amend the former Interreg IIIA/Phare CBC programme on the external EU border into a full Interreg IIIA programme at the internal EU border.

There has been one major change in the programme implementation structure: In October 2005 the Slovene Parliament adopted the new Law on Balanced Regional Development (Official Gazette, no. 93/05), which envisaged that the National Agency for Regional Development (NARD) would cease to exist and would be merged with the Government Office for Local Self-Government and Regional Policy (GOSP) responsible for all Structural Funds programmes and the Cohesion Fund in Slovenia.

As of 1st January 2006, all tasks and assets have been taken over by the Government Office for Local Self-Government and Regional Policy. The INTERREG and PHARE ESC Division was responsible for accomplishing the tasks of the National Authority, and the Finance and Control Division performed the tasks of the Sub-Paying Authority. The Regional Office in Maribor continued to perform the tasks of the Intermediate Body. In spite of structural changes all rights and duties have been retained and transferred to the legal person of GOSP.

In addition to the above mentioned changes there only took place internal personal changes at the Slovene JTS in 2007. Nevertheless the level of capacity remained the same.

1.2 Implication of changes for the mutual consistency of assistance

During the programme period the changes described above had no implications for the mutual consistency of the assistance.
2. IMPLEMENTATION OF PRIORITIES AND MEASURES

2.1 Achievements in relation to specific objectives and targets

It can be noticed that the Programme has achieved its objectives and targets which is shown in this chapter.

The projects, which were financed by this programme, were proposed by a variety of beneficiaries; amongst others: public administration and public bodies, research groups and other research bodies like universities, associations, trade unions and smaller acitity groups. Beneficiaries and project partners came from different state level: bodies and institutions of the national level (e.g. universities, ministries) as well as bodies of the regional or state level participated. Also the municipal level participated actively. The projects addressed different target groups (decision makers, SMEs, teachers and students etc.). Finally it can be noticed that a broad variety of outputs were produced, e.g. development of (management) tools, smaller investments, studies, training seminars etc. The aim to activate a broad set of interested project partners and to involve key players to work jointly in projects on common challenges was achived.

It can be noticed that projects were implemented in all priorities and measures.

The Programme consisted of 5 priority axes comprises a total number of 12 measures (including TA).
In total 279 projects were supported. 63.9 Mio Euro have been verified as ERDF-co-financed project costs; thereof 31.97 Mio ERDF (= 95.65 of planned ERDF). The public national cofunding amounts to 26.89 Mio Euro (=127.86% of plan); private co-financing amount to 5.02 Mio Euro (=54.34 %).

Detailed information is provided in Annex 1 Implementation – Number of projects and Expenditure per priority and measure level

According to Article 10 of INTERREG Guidelines (20% flexibility clause) the NUTS III regions Graz and Oberkärnten are considered to belong to the border area. Table 2 shows the funds committed and paid out in these regions.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art. 10 region</th>
<th>Total expenditure</th>
<th>In % of CIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graz</td>
<td>629,541.38</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberkärnten</td>
<td>416,199.0</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,045,740.38</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Quantification of the related indicators on the level of output, results and impacts

Indicators relevant for this Interreg Programme were distinguished on four different levels:

Programme (1)- and Priority (2)-level (in the CIP),

Measure (3) - and Project (4)-level (both contained in the Programme Complement)

These indicators were used for the joint programme monitoring procedure as well as for the joint project selection process.

The impact indicators were developed starting out from the project level – as this approach best permits to accommodate the great variety of expected effects. Subsequently, the question arose of how this wide range of individual impacts at the level of measures, priorities and programmes could be aggregated. In a next step content summaries based on the project indicators were formulated at the measures and priorities levels. Therefore the (partly quantified) programme
objectives for the thus created “aggregated” indicators were defined at the priorities and the overall programme levels.

Measure-specific objectives were laid down in the programme complement. In addition to the aggregated impact indicators, the output indicators were given at the programme or priorities level, which allowed for improved structuring of the supported projects.

The types of indicators on the different levels can be summarised as follows:

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggregated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A basic set of output indicators, used in the monitoring procedure, contained the following information (descriptive):

- total number of direct beneficiaries, broken down by main target groups [e.g. enterprises, citizens, institutions],
- number of projects
- financial monitoring (exploitation of means, financial steps of implementation)
- an aggregate qualitative project-indicator, based on the classification of cross-border-cooperation-intensity on one hand and of expected cross-border-impacts on the other, thus forming a typology of 4 categories of projects - AA, AB, BA and BB-projects – which has been also used on project level in project selection process.

The set of quality and impact indicators is focused on two dimensions:

(a) **Intensity of Cross-border Co-operation in project development and implementation**

In developing and implementing Interreg projects several distinct steps or phases can be distinguished:

- Preparation until application
- Planning the implementation
- Implementation / construction
- Financing
- Use / operation after completion of the project
Each of these steps can be performed in a cross-border co-operative way or independently. The assessment will focus on the cross-border quality of the steps in project development, which will have to be demonstrated in the project application.

(b) Expected impacts on cross-border regional development – functional integration as crucial quality

Projects contributing to functional (regional) integration are characterized by

a. a project design focused on generating developmental impulses for the Interreg region as a whole, oriented towards a (mid-range) perspective of an economically and socially integrated space across borders;

b. the combination of resources, partners or target groups from both sides of the border.

In order to be funded through the Interreg III A programme, projects had at least to meet minimum standards in both of the above outlined dimensions. An overview over the quality of the financed projects was reached through a qualitative typology, which combined both dimensions, i.e. (a) the quality of co-operation in project development and implementation and (b) the expected impacts and thus forms an aggregate quality indicator:

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected cross-border integration impacts:</th>
<th>Better: A</th>
<th>Minimum: B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better: A</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum: B</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>BB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, four different types of projects can be distinguished: AA, AB, BA, BB. AA would label top projects, AB and BA would be intermediate ranks, whereas BB contain s the projects which fullfil the minimum requirements only.

2.2.1. Indicators for objectives on programme level

Referring to the indicators for objectives on programme and priority levels the following progress can be stated:
Table 5

**Indicators for objectives on programme level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator on programme level</th>
<th>Planned figure according to CIP</th>
<th>Figure 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of so-called AA-projects</td>
<td>20 to 30% of projects approved</td>
<td>248 projects (89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of projects</td>
<td>5% large projects (total of public financial contribution above EUR 300,000)</td>
<td>44 projects (10%)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 to 40%-share of (very) small projects (total of public financial contribution below EUR 50,000) thereof 156 projects out of Kleinprojektfonds</td>
<td>209 projects (48%)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Basis: 435 projects = 279 “normal” + 156 “micro-funds” projects

**Project size**

The high percentage of large projects (total of public financial contribution above EUR 300,000) can be explained by a large number of so-called umbrella projects that comprise different modules. On the contrary the indicator of (very) small projects contains projects supported by the so-called micro-project funds. This fund has been introduced in Carinthia in the course of 2004 so that the overall number of very small projects increased.

**Cooperation indicator**

As can be seen from table 5 a high percentage of projects funded fulfil the criteria of being marked as an “AA” project (at least two out of five stages of cooperation and at least two impact indicators fulfilled).

In the on-going evaluation the validity of these indicators in selected projects has been addressed in case studies. This revealed that most of these indicators indicated in the application are really accomplished in practice.

When the five co-operation indicators have been analysed in more detail in the up-date of the mid-term evaluation, joint implementation and especially joint financing are the least frequent.

Following the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation the use of this indicator has been made more transparent by using joint standards for classifying and selecting projects introducing common terms for “joint, mirror and other projects”.

- Joint projects: the project is developed jointly and foresees joint implementation of activities by participating project partners in large parts at the same time. The project partners shall nominate a functional lead partner responsible for the coordination of project activities. The project application is pre-assessed jointly and joint recommendation for ERDF funding is given by Intermediate Bodies. If the project is approved by Steering Committee, two
separate subsidy contracts are concluded with the Final Beneficiaries in Austria and Slovenia.

- **Mirror projects**: the projects are developed in co-operation, planning complementary activities to be implemented on both sides of the border but must not necessarily take place at the same time. Different project applications are submitted by project owners to the respective Intermediate Body in Austria and Slovenia. Mirror projects can be approved to already existing projects.

- **Other projects**: projects must show clear cross border impact, though they are financed only from one side with an ERDF subsidy contract.

Table 6 outlines all projects that fulfil the above-mentioned criteria for joint or mirror project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JPN</th>
<th>Project AT No. CMS</th>
<th>Project SI No. CMS</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Approved in LA (Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3_J_001</td>
<td>3AABA_0007 3-KTN-078 3AAAA_0025 3-STM-121</td>
<td>3AACA_0001</td>
<td>INNOVIN: Spin-off Inkubatornetzwerk (Carinthia), INNOVIN (Styria)</td>
<td>15-16/12/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_J_002</td>
<td>3ACBB_0011 3-KTN-085</td>
<td>3ACCA_0001</td>
<td>Spezialitätenpartnerschaft ohne Grenzen</td>
<td>15-16/12/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_J_003</td>
<td>3BABB_0008 3-KTN-081</td>
<td>3BACA_0001</td>
<td>TE.TR.A.P.A.C.S.</td>
<td>15-16/12/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_J_004</td>
<td>3ACAA_0009 3-STM-108</td>
<td>3ACCA_0002</td>
<td>Forst- und Holzoffensive Oesterreich-Slowenien</td>
<td>15-16/12/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_J_005</td>
<td>3CCBB_0007 3-KTN-094</td>
<td>3CCC_0001</td>
<td>Transthermal</td>
<td>04/10/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_001</td>
<td>3AAAA_0018 3-STM-082</td>
<td>3AACA_0003</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>15-16/12/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_002</td>
<td>3ABAA_0018 3-STM-107 3BABB_0006 3-KTN-061</td>
<td>3ABC_0003</td>
<td>Tourregio (Styria) and Neue Wege (Carinthia)</td>
<td>15-16/12/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_003</td>
<td>3ABAA_0010 3-STM-057</td>
<td>3ABC_0001</td>
<td>Internationale Gesundheits-destination</td>
<td>15-16/12/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_004</td>
<td>3BBBB_0003 3-KTN-072</td>
<td>3BBC_0001</td>
<td>FP-KÄ-SLO (Empowerment)</td>
<td>15-16/12/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_005</td>
<td>3BABB_0002 3-KTN-012</td>
<td>3BBC_0001</td>
<td>Regionalmanage-ment Kärnten</td>
<td>15-16/12/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_006</td>
<td>3BABA_0006 3-STM-078</td>
<td>3BBC_0002</td>
<td>EUREGIO Steiermark</td>
<td>15-16/12/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_007</td>
<td>3BCAA_0009 3-STM-043</td>
<td>3BBC_0001</td>
<td>Jugend-Grenze-Identitait</td>
<td>15-16/12/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_008</td>
<td>3CBBB_0004 3-KTN-035 3CBBB_0001 3-KTN-019</td>
<td>3CBC_0003</td>
<td>Fiedermausschutz im Alpen- und Adria-Raum</td>
<td>15-16/12/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_009</td>
<td>3DABA_0005 3-KTN-068</td>
<td>3AAC_0004</td>
<td>Wirtschaftsstandort Mittelkaemten</td>
<td>15-16/12/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_010</td>
<td>3CBBBB_0007 3-KTN-076</td>
<td>3CBC_0002</td>
<td>ERA-Eco Regio Alpe-Adria</td>
<td>15-16/12/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Short Name</td>
<td>Short Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_011</td>
<td>O.P.A. and ÖKOSAN-NET</td>
<td>3AAA_0016</td>
<td>3-STM-074</td>
<td>3-TMT-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_012</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>3AAA_0018</td>
<td>3-STM-082</td>
<td>3-STM-097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_013</td>
<td>O.P.A.C. and ÖKOSAN-NET</td>
<td>3AAA_0020</td>
<td>3-STM-097</td>
<td>3-STM-129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_014</td>
<td>Grenzenlos genießen</td>
<td>3ABCA_0006</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_015</td>
<td>Zaženi svoje inovativno podjetje!</td>
<td>3ABCA_0006</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_016</td>
<td>Erzherzog Johann Wien Kultureise Graz-Maribor</td>
<td>3ABCA_0008</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_017</td>
<td>Hemma Pilgerweg</td>
<td>3ABCA_0009</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_018</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>3ABCA_0010</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_019</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>3ABCA_0011</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_020</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>3ABCA_0012</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_021</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>3ABCA_0013</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_022</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>3ABCA_0014</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_023</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>3ABCA_0015</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_024</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>3ABCA_0016</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_025</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>3ABCA_0017</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_026</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>3ABCA_0018</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_027</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>3ABCA_0019</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_028</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>3ABCA_0020</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_029</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>3ABCA_0021</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_030</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>3ABCA_0022</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_031</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>3ABCA_0023</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_032</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>3ABCA_0024</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3_M_033</td>
<td>Technologieachse, 2. Phase</td>
<td>3ABCA_0025</td>
<td>3-KTN-066</td>
<td>3-SI-001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contribution to horizontal priorities - equal opportunities and sustainability

The environmental field was included within the context of the mid-term evaluation of the programme, including also the methodological further development of programme-relevant assessment/indicator systems and the harmonisation and concretisation of objectives of relevance for the implementation of environmental/sustainability requirements. As the programme only allowed small scale infrastructure projects no significant impact on environmental indicators (e.g. on the reduction of CO2 equivalents etc.) are expected. The assessment of environmental relevance of projects has been achieved by a descriptive approach.

Each project was assessed according to following categories by IBs with subsequent discussion of the applied category in the JSC:
- neutral in terms of equal opportunities / environmental sustainability,
- positive impact on equal opportunities / environmental sustainability,
- the focus of the project content is on equal opportunities/environmental sustainability

The tables below provide an overview on the share of projects in individual categories on measure level up to now:

Table 7
Impact of projects on environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>positive impact</th>
<th>focus of project content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P 1 Economic Co-operation</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.1 Economic Development</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.2 Tourism</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.3 Rural Development</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 2 Human Resources and Regional Co-operation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2.1 Human Resources Development – Labour Market</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2.2 Regional Co-operation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2.3 Co-operation in Education and Cultural Affairs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 3 Sustainable Spatial Development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3.1 Spatial Development and Transport</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3.2 Sustainable Spatial and Environmental Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3.3 Environment and Energy Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 4 Special Support for Border Regions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4.1 Support for Border Regions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 5 Technical Assistance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 5.1 Technical assistance in general</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 5.2 Technical assistance, further measures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total number of projects</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

**Impact of projects on equal opportunities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority (P)</th>
<th>Economic Co-operation</th>
<th>Human Resources and Regional Co-operation</th>
<th>Sustainable Spatial Development</th>
<th>Special Support for Border Regions</th>
<th>Technical Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1.1</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>M 2.1 Human Resources Development – Labour Market</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.2</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>M 2.2 Regional Co-operation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.3</td>
<td>Rural Development</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>M 2.3 Co-operation in Education and Cultural Affairs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M 3.1 Spatial Development and Transport</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M 3.2 Sustainable Spatial and Environmental Development</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M 3.3 Environment and Energy Management</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M 4.1 Support for Border Regions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M 4.2 Support for Border Regions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M 5.1 Technical assistance in general</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M 5.2 Technical assistance, further measures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| total number of projects | 259 | 17 | 3 |

Overall 57 projects with positive impact and 22 projects with a focus on sustainable environmental development have been financed by the programme. 20 projects have a positive impact on equal opportunities. The other projects are neutral in terms of horizontal priorities.

### 2.2.2. Indicators on priority level

Table 9 indicates if projects match with indicators for objectives on priority level. Following the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation a revised indicator system was included into the CIP. This revised system has been used since the end of 2004.
Table 9

**Indicators for objectives on priority level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator on priority level</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Number of projects or results obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>In %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P1: Economic cohesion:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of projects:</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>123</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of SMEs affected by projects of total of SMEs in the project area:</td>
<td>10 –15%</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of SMEs of participating enterprises:</td>
<td>&gt;95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Share of impact:**

| leading to market integration and/or integration of products | 50% | 44% |
| leading to transfer of knowledge and/or technologies | 15% | 17% |
| partner search and creation of networks | 35% | 39% |

**P2: Human resources and regional cooperation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of projects:</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thereof: 6-8 supported Euregios/CB-development organisations, (GEO)/regional managements</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participating institutions in the fields of labour market and training</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>1177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Share of impact:**

| development of implementation structures, generating and expanding networks | 45% | 47% |
| projects preparing the integration of labour markets | 15% | 19% |
| projects providing qualifications/knowledge with specific relevance to the neighbouring region | 40% | 34% |

**P3: Sustainable spatial development:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of projects:</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thereof: projects (studies) for strategic support investments projects</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investments projects</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Share of impact:**

| improved CBC transportation links | 10% | 10% |
| improving CB-mobility, accessibility and intelligent traffic solutions and integrated use of information technology and communication infrastructure | 15% | 13% |
| improving spatial development and the environmental conditions | 40% | 37% |
| enhancing environmentally friendly technologies or technical infrastructures with relevance to the improvement of environmental conditions | 35% | 40% |

Generally it can be stated that the implementation of the programme shows the expected results on priority level.

The indicator “share of SMEs affected by projects of total of SMEs in the project area” could not be provided because of the missing base line indicator in that respect. SMEs were not addressed in the programme as final beneficiaries. The activities on project level implemented in order to integrate SMEs as target groups in cross-border actions showed a broad variety: seminars, web sites, common marketing and tourism development. It would be meaningless to aggregate the figures on priority level. Therefore it was renounced to produce this aggregated indicator.
The high number of participating institutions in *P2: Human resources* is due to a high number of partners involved (in some projects up to 14 partners).

### 2.2.3. Indicators on measure level

Referring to the indicators on measure level listed in the Programme Complement the following tables give an overview of the outputs achieved.

Please see Annex 2 for best practice examples on project level.

**P1/M1: Economic Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>project providing support for building up or furnishing regional impulse centres and technology parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>projects providing support for information networks, operational expenditure, technology oriented business databases, software, presentations cooperation meetings, participation in fairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>cooperation networks created; 777 partners (SMEs) involved in cooperation networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>projects providing business advisory services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>projects creating networks or services for knowledge transfer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P1/M2: Tourism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>263.3</td>
<td>Km of cycling/hiking/horseback riding paths constructed (16 Projects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>cooperation networks created; 864 partners (SMEs) involved in cooperation networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>projects providing support for crossborder products and services in the fields of sport, leisure, culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P1/M3: Development of rural areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>cooperation networks created; 160 partners (SMEs) involved in cooperation networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>projects creating networks or services for knowledge transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>projects improving processing and marketing of agricultural products and bio-farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>projects improving harvesting, processing and marketing of forestry products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P2/M1: Development of Human Resources, Labour Market**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>vocational training and training projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>trainees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>cooperation networks created; 347 partners involved in cooperation networks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P2/M2: Regional Cooperation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>cooperation networks created; 189 partners involved in cooperation networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>regional and sectoral cooperation facilities supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P2/M3: Cooperation in Education and Cultural Affairs

15 culture or sport facilities supported
10 cooperation networks created (school, education); 641 partners involved in cooperation networks
0 information systems, exhibition projects supported

P3/M1: Spatial Development and Transport

13 research and planning projects supported (dealing with improvement of rail, roads, airports, urban transport, multimodal transport, intelligent transport systems)
9 cooperation networks created; 632 partners involved in cooperation networks

P3/M2: Sustainable spatial and environmental development

6 cooperation networks created; 90 partners involved in cooperation networks
7 research and planning projects supported (dealing with biodiversity, protection measures, securing natural and cultural landscape, water resources management etc.)
10 small scale landscape protection measure projects

P3 M3: Environment and Energy management

13 cooperation networks created; 802 partners involved in cooperation networks
4 research and planning projects supported (renewable energy, hydrology, river and water management, waste treatment and recycling etc.)
4 project supporting preventive measurements

P4/M1: Special Support for Border Regions

This priority has been closed by the end of 2004.

a) 0 projects providing physical support for SME (plant and equipment etc.) [number of jobs created]
   0 projects providing financial support to introduce environmental technologies or to develop eco-products
   0 projects providing business advisory services
   0 projects providing support for information networks, operational expenditure, technology oriented business databases, software, presentations, cooperation meetings, participation in fairs etc.
   3 projects creating networks or services for knowledge transfer
   1 vocational training and training projects (SMEs); 2200 trainees

b) 0 projects providing support for the improvement of rail, road, airport, urban transport, ports, multimodal transport intelligent transport systems;
   8.3 km of biking/hiking/horseback riding path constructed (2 projects)

c) 0 vocational education and training projects (number of participants).
   1 project supporting intercultural networks and exchange programmes.
2.3 Some remarks on the use of indicators

All indicators were collected in the Central Monitoring System. Information was provided at the application stage and was updated with the closure of the relevant project.

Based on the recommendation of the mid-term evaluation a proposal for improving the INTERREG indicator system was prepared and discussed within the Evaluation Steering Group. The proposal mainly oriented on defining joint standards and modifications of data input. It built the basis for the bilateral discussions on the joint monitoring system (see also chapter 2.2.1. and chapter 4.5. in this report).

Nevertheless some weaknesses remained and were stated in order to initiate a learning process for the new programme period.

- Quality indicator (share of AA projects): this aggregate indicator incorporates too many impact dimensions and the co-operation phases are not weighted. Joint standards for assessment were not elaborated enough and subsequent checks during implementation were not foreseen. High rating could be obtained rather easily, thus usefulness for project selection is doubtful.

- Aggregated impact indicators: due to potential multiple impacts of projects, it was not possible to produce absolute figures (number of projects) as foreseen originally in the CIP, but only relative shares by aggregating impact indicators at measure level. This relatively complicated calculation could only be done by the JTS and had therefore not a very high level of transparency.
3. **Financial Implementation**

This chapter gives an overview on the financial aspects of the INTERREG programme. Information is provided about allocations and commitments as decided by the MC and SC, payments made by the PA and payments received from the European Commission.

Chapter 3.1. provides an overview of the programme’s financial allocations and commitments as well as the progress made at Priority and Measure level. It informs about the n+2 situation. The chapter also informs about the use of Euro.

Chapter 3.2. gives a detailed overview of all claims of the Paying Authority and Payments made by the EC since the beginning of the Programme until the end of the Programme. It informs on the use of interests and on the use of Technical Assistance.

Chapter 3.3. reports on activities which were implemented in the framework of PHARE CBC.

### 3.1 General Information on the Financial Implementation

The total budget for the Programme is 63,69 Mio. Euro, 33,42 Mio Euro of which is ERDF (according to Commission Decision C(2007)1610 of April 2nd 2007).

The graph below provides an overview on the financial plan of expenditure (according to n+2 targets), to commitments and to the actual expenditure.

Figure 1

**Financial implementation**

![Financial Implementation Graph](image-url)
The implementation of the programme started with the approval of the Operational Programme in August 2001. In this year the EC submitted the advance payment of 7% of the total ERDF budget at that time.

In 2002 already 30% of total programm budget at that time had been committed to projects (budget was increased in 2004 due to the accession of Slovenia to the EU). The expenditure started slowly but increased steadily to reach in all years the n+2 target. In 2004 the priority “special support for border regions” was closed with a reduction of 21,995,00 EUR ERDF.

Mid of 2008 98.94% of the available funds were committed (95.6% of the ERDF). After verification of the costs declared by beneficiaries expenditure of 63.89 Mio Euro (=100.3% of plan) could be verified; thereof 31.97 Mio. Euro ERDF (=95.65% of plan).

It can be noticed that – with the exception of the implementation of Priority 4 “Special Support to Border Regions” at the end of 2004 - the n+2 target could be implemented successfully.

3.1.1. Development of the financial tables

Based on Commission decision C(2001) 2043 of 6th August 2001, the approved ERDF contribution amounted to 27,262,000 EURO.

Prior to the accession of Slovenia to European Union Community contribution (ERDF) was only available for Austria. For the year 2000 no funds have been allocated.

The programme financial tables have been

- revised by a Commission decision C(2002) 1703 of 26th July 2002

An additional priority “Special Support for Border regions” was introduced into the programme on the basis of a decision of the European Commission from 26th of July 2002 the approved ERDF contribution amounted to EUR 28,134,000.

As a consequence the financial allocation of the programme was increased by a total amount of 1,744,000 EUR (872,000 EUR ERDF and 872,000 EUR national co-financing). The funds for this additional priority have been allocated entirely for the year 2002.


The main change in 2004 was the accession of Slovenia to the European Union on 1st May 2004 and thus the revision of the Interreg IIIA/Phare CBC programme on the former external EU border into a full Interreg IIIA programme at the current internal EU border.

Consequently, the approved Joint Programming Document (JPD) for the Interreg IIIA/Phare CBC Programme has to be reviewed in the light of enlargement and the results of the mid-term
evaluation. The Community Initiative Programme (CIP) was approved by the European Commission in its decision (C) 4154 on 19th October 2004 increasing the available ERDF amount to EUR 33,446,827.00 including now ERDF share for Slovenia and indexation.

- revised by a Commission decision K (2005) 4971 of 5th December 2005

The additional priority “Special Support for Border regions” which has only been valid for the Austrian side of the border region was closed by 31st December 2004. For this priority the Commission received a payment request which allowed only a total Community contribution of 850.000 EUR ERDF and lead consequently to automatic decommittment of 21.995 EUR.

On the basis of the project applications and due to the focus of the programme some limited financial shifts on priority level were necessary.

The approved ERDF contribution amounted to EUR 33,424,832.


Based on requests of intermediate bodies on the Slovene and Austrian side the Monitoring Committee approved in December 2006 in written procedure the following changes in the financial tables. Consequently the changes were sent to the EC for approval:

**CIP:**
All available funds were concentrated in that priority where a series of projects were still in the pipeline that were ready for implementation in the course of the remaining programme period. Funds in priority 2 “Human Resources and Regional Co-operation” had been increased by EUR 317.000 (ERDF) by reducing funds in priority 1 “Economic co-operation”.

**Programme Complement:**
- Within priority 1 funds from all three measures were reduced by EUR 317.000 and shifted to all three measures under priority 2.
- There was a shift within priority 3 in reducing funds in measure 3 “Environment and Energy Management” to projects supporting “Sustainable Spatial and Environmental Development” in measure 2.
- In priority 4 (Technical Assistance) funds amounting up to Eur 44.932 from TA-1 were shifted to TA-2.

The Monitoring Committee decided in a written procedure closed at 10 October 2008 the final amendments of the financial table in the Programme Complement and submitted the new document to the EC for validation. The coherence with the PC has been stated in a letter of EC dated December 17th 2008.

Table 10 shows the programme financial allocations (per Priority and Measure) as applied during the programme period and following abovementioned revisions approved by the MC and accepted by the EC in December 2008.
### Table 10: Financial allocation according to the revised Programme Complement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities/Measures</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
<th>Total Public Expenditure</th>
<th>ERDF</th>
<th>National Total</th>
<th>National Public</th>
<th>National Private</th>
<th>Priority share of total</th>
<th>Priority share of ERDF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Cross-border Economic Co-operation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Economic Development</td>
<td>25,087,511.00</td>
<td>19,021,511.00</td>
<td>13,426,633.00</td>
<td>11,660,878.00</td>
<td>5,594,878.00</td>
<td>6,066,000.00</td>
<td>39,39%</td>
<td>40,17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Tourism</td>
<td>9,187,128.00</td>
<td>6,867,128.00</td>
<td>4,877,346.00</td>
<td>4,309,782.00</td>
<td>1,989,782.00</td>
<td>2,320,000.00</td>
<td>14,42%</td>
<td>14,59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Rural Development</td>
<td>10,390,007.00</td>
<td>7,646,007.00</td>
<td>5,699,505.00</td>
<td>4,690,502.00</td>
<td>1,948,502.00</td>
<td>2,744,000.00</td>
<td>16,31%</td>
<td>17,05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Human Resources and Regional Co-operation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Human Resources Development - Labour Market</td>
<td>15,712,492.00</td>
<td>13,253,685.00</td>
<td>8,076,965.00</td>
<td>7,635,527.00</td>
<td>5,176,720.00</td>
<td>2,458,807.00</td>
<td>24,67%</td>
<td>24,16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Regional Co-operation</td>
<td>7,749,971.00</td>
<td>6,479,164.00</td>
<td>3,948,548.00</td>
<td>3,801,423.00</td>
<td>2,530,616.00</td>
<td>1,270,807.00</td>
<td>12,17%</td>
<td>11,81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Cooperation in Education and Cultural Affairs</td>
<td>4,297,019.00</td>
<td>3,411,019.00</td>
<td>2,180,041.00</td>
<td>2,116,978.00</td>
<td>1,230,978.00</td>
<td>886,000.00</td>
<td>6,75%</td>
<td>6,52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Sustainable Spatial Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Spatial Development and Transport</td>
<td>18,417,078.00</td>
<td>17,915,078.00</td>
<td>9,571,149.00</td>
<td>8,845,929.00</td>
<td>8,343,929.00</td>
<td>502,000.00</td>
<td>28,91%</td>
<td>28,63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Sustainable Spatial and Environmental Development</td>
<td>7,317,342.00</td>
<td>7,307,342.00</td>
<td>3,690,202.00</td>
<td>3,627,140.00</td>
<td>3,617,140.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>11,49%</td>
<td>11,04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3. Environment and Energy Management</td>
<td>4,185,128.00</td>
<td>4,094,128.00</td>
<td>2,376,346.00</td>
<td>2,180,782.00</td>
<td>1,717,782.00</td>
<td>91,000.00</td>
<td>6,57%</td>
<td>7,11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Special Support for Border Regions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1. Special Support for Border Regions</td>
<td>1,700,010.00</td>
<td>1,491,010.00</td>
<td>850,005.00</td>
<td>850,005.00</td>
<td>641,005.00</td>
<td>209,000.00</td>
<td>2,67%</td>
<td>2,54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Technical Assistance</strong></td>
<td>2,779,440.00</td>
<td>2,779,440.00</td>
<td>1,500,080.00</td>
<td>1,279,360.00</td>
<td>4,139,360.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,36%</td>
<td>4,49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1. Technical Assistance I</td>
<td>2,185,315.00</td>
<td>2,185,315.00</td>
<td>1,171,486.00</td>
<td>1,013,829.00</td>
<td>1,013,829.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,43%</td>
<td>3,50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2. Technical Assistance II</td>
<td>594,125.00</td>
<td>594,125.00</td>
<td>328,594.00</td>
<td>265,531.00</td>
<td>265,531.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0,93%</td>
<td>0,98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>63,696,531.00</td>
<td>54,460,724.00</td>
<td>33,424,832.00</td>
<td>30,271,699.00</td>
<td>21,035,892.00</td>
<td>9,235,807.00</td>
<td>100,00%</td>
<td>100,00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source**

1. Cross-border Economic Co-operation
2. Human Resources and Regional Co-operation
3. Sustainable Spatial Development
4. Special Support for Border Regions
5. Technical Assistance

**Priorities/Measures**

- Cross-border Economic Co-operation
- Human Resources and Regional Co-operation
- Sustainable Spatial Development
- Special Support for Border Regions
- Technical Assistance

**ERDF**

- Economic Development
- Tourism
- Rural Development
- Human Resources Development - Labour Market
- Regional Co-operation
- Cooperation in Education and Cultural Affairs
- Spatial Development and Transport
- Sustainable Spatial and Environmental Development
- Environment and Energy Management
- Special Support for Border Regions
- Technical Assistance I
- Technical Assistance II
The following graphs show the share of total planned budget by measure at the time of approval of the CIP in the year 2004 and at the time of the last change in year 2008. It can be stated the changes in the distribution have not been substantial.

**Figure 2**
**Share of budget by measure – approval of CIP 2004 (total cost)**

**Figure 3**
**Share of budget by measure – programme closure 2008 (total cost)**

**3.1.2. Use of the EURO**

Since 1 January 2007 the EURO is the national currency of Slovenia. Until this time payments to Slovene project owners have been executed in SIT by the Sub-Paying Authority in Slovenia. For the purpose of establishing a statement of expenditure by the sub-PA the amounts of
expenditure incurred in SIT have been converted in EUR using the exchange rate as defined in Article 2 of Commission Regulation (EC) No. 643/2000.

3.2 Payments received and certified expenditure

During the programme implementation period the Paying Authority submitted 21 interim payment requests to the European Commission. The following table provides an overview on the respective dates and amounts.

Table 11:
Reimbursement by the European Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payment requests to the EC</th>
<th>Date of submission to the EC</th>
<th>Amount of requested ERDF</th>
<th>Date of receipt</th>
<th>Amount of payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7% in advance payment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>08.11.2001</td>
<td>1.908.340,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% in advance payment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>08.11.2001</td>
<td>1.908.340,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 03.12.2002</td>
<td>516.865,94</td>
<td>08.01.2003</td>
<td>516.863,12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 10.07.2003</td>
<td>951.406,57</td>
<td>03.09.2003</td>
<td>951.382,55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 06.10.2003</td>
<td>883.700,67</td>
<td>12.11.2003</td>
<td>883.663,58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 06.05.2004</td>
<td>989.930,62</td>
<td>05.07.2004</td>
<td>764.374,60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 04.04.2005</td>
<td>1.642.944,63</td>
<td>06.05.2005</td>
<td>1.642.944,63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 30.09.2005</td>
<td>1.059.050,59</td>
<td>27.10.2005</td>
<td>1.059.050,59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 09.05.2006</td>
<td>970.090,30</td>
<td>29.06.2006</td>
<td>931.529,05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 19.07.2006</td>
<td>964.457,64</td>
<td>07.09.2006</td>
<td>928.196,69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 30.10.2006</td>
<td>1.971.147,56</td>
<td>11.12.2006</td>
<td>1.954.437,09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 22.12.2006</td>
<td>3.446.182,93</td>
<td>02.02.2007</td>
<td>3.434.739,28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 06.07.2007</td>
<td>1.114.210,37</td>
<td>30.08.2007</td>
<td>1.114.210,37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 12.10.2007</td>
<td>1.656.088,81</td>
<td>26.11.2007</td>
<td>1.648.512,55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 18.04.2008</td>
<td>1.102.183,52</td>
<td>26.05.2008</td>
<td>1.086.565,31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 01.08.2008</td>
<td>1.273.948,23</td>
<td>01.09.2008</td>
<td>1.273.948,23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Annex 3 the total expenditure is broken down by field of intervention at measure level.
3.2.1. Information on the use of interests

During the implementation of the programme, the Paying Authority earned interests in the amount of 138,666,55 EUR.

The interests are used to cover the national co-funding of the operative Paying Authority (project in TA 1) as well as costs of the evaluation exercise (project in TA 2) and parts of the national co-funding of costs arised for publicity and information activities (project in TA 2).

3.2.2. Report on the use of the Technical Assistance (TA)

During the reporting period TA-1 was used for supporting both the Managing and the National Authority by the Technical Secretariat and for supporting both MA/NA and PA by the ERP-Fonds acting as operative PA and Central Monitoring Body. The IBs of Slovenia, Carinthia and Styria used TA-1 budget to finance monitoring and project implementation as well as cross-border activities (e.g. organisations of meetings).

Under TA-2 publicity and information activities have been supported (for details on public relation work see chapter 4.4). Furthermore external support for drafting of the Operational Programme as well as for the ex-ante evaluation and the Strategic Environmental assessment for the next SF-period 2007-2013 has been paid under TA-2.

Contracts concluded by Managing Authority – core management

In the framework of TA the MA has concluded the following contracts:

- One to ERP-Fonds concerning the set-up and implementation of the ERDF Monitoring and the fulfilling of tasks of the operative Paying Authority (release of payments, financial management, forecasts, n+2 reporting). This contract was extended to amend the Central Monitoring System (CMS) to the needs of a fully cross-border programme (set up English surface and reports, include Slovene data, implementation of functions for the exchange of currencies).

- One to ÖIR-Managementdienste GmbH (since 2008 metis GmbH) covering the tasks of a Joint Technical Secretariat for all four programmes at the new internal borders of the EU. The contract was also slightly extended in order to offer the Slovenian colleague of the TS a fully equipped working place at the premises in Vienna. The Slovene TS member is directly contracted by Government Office for Local Self-Government and Regional Policy, the National Authority.

- One to OAR-Regionalberatung GmbH to carry out the mid-term (including up-date) and the on-going evaluation.

---

2 for TA funds used in the reporting period please see chapter 2
One to Regionalentwicklung.at to assist in drafting the operational programme for the next programming period 2007-2013.

One to ÖAR-Regionalberatung GmbH to carry out the ex-ante evaluation and the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the next programming period 2007-2013.

In 2005 the National Authority of Slovenia concluded two framework contracts for TA-1 and TA-2.

Additionally the Intermediate Bodies implemented tasks on regional level under TA-1 and TA-2.

The full list of projects financed under TA is provided in Annex 5.

3.2.3. Unfinished or non-operational projects at the time of closure

At the time of programme closure all projects are finished and are operational.

3.2.4. Project suspended due to legal or administrative proceedings

There is no project suspended due to legal or administrative proceedings.

3.2.5. Measures funded by EAGGF

No measures have been funded by EAGGF Guarantee Section

3.2.6. Measures funded by FIFG

No measures have been funded by FIFG
3.3 Report on Activities in the framework of the PHARE CBC Programme Slovenia-Austria

3.3.1. Programme 2002 PHARE CBC SLO/AT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Allocated (MEUR)</th>
<th>Committed (MEUR)</th>
<th>Disbursed (MEUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI.2002/000-316-01 – Cross Border Region Goes Digital</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI.2002/000-316-02.01 – TA for management of SPF</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI.2002/000-316-02.02 – Small Projects Fund Scheme</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2002/000-316-01 – Cross Border Region Goes Digital**

**Aims**

The objective of the projects was to accelerate innovative e-business applications and digitized support mechanisms for SMEs in the cross-border region. This project was in line with the National Development Plan priority related to the information society, aimed at raising the capacity of the information infrastructure to the EU level. The project also addressed the Priority “Economic Co-operation” measure “business development” of the 2000-2006 Slovenia-Austria JPD, aimed at improvement of economic pre-conditions for enterprises by co-operation, networking and technological and infrastructure incentives.

**Activities Component 2002/000-316-01.0001 Secretariat (TA)**

All activities completed.

- Assistance to the beneficiaries by the preparation of the Inception, Monthly, Interim and Final Reports and by the preparation of invoices;
- Monthly evaluation of the results and indicators achieved under each grant and submission of reports to the NARD;
- Monitoring of the implementation – Ad hoc and regularly site visits;
- MRA was informing and assisting the beneficiaries through the internet web page of CBRGD. Information on the workshops for the beneficiaries as well as FAQ regarding the interim reporting were published at the web page on January 17, 2005 (according to the adjustment of the answers between NARD and CFCU FAQ were published on January 31, 2005);
Elaborated and printed Anthology summarising the general information on GS and 13 implemented projects, co-financed through the GS (300 copies in Slovene, German and English language);

Organisation of Final event on September 6, 2005 in Convention Centre Habakuk in Maribor;

Within the final event interviews on CBRGD GS results were given to the public media.

**NARD – Regional Office Maribor**

- Reporting to the Ministry of Finance, State Aid sector about data regarding “de minimis” rule;
- CBRGD GS Steering Committee Meeting was implemented on September 6, 2005 in Maribor.

**Activities Grant Scheme**

On 16\(^{th}\) February 2004: signed contracts with selected beneficiaries. In 2005, the following results of selected projects were achieved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Območna obrtna zbomrica Maribor (OOZ)/Chamber of Craft Maribor</td>
<td>Craft Goes Digital</td>
<td>Information and communication tools for the interactive database OFFER OF CRAFT was prepared; the development and update of the website of the chambers of craft and the Štajerska Technology Park; created CD ROM presenting individual partners in the project and members of the chambers. The end of project: 16.05.2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sklad za razvoj in usposabljanje človeških virov (EIM)/Human Resource Development Fund</td>
<td>E-marketing as a Tool for Conquering the European Market</td>
<td>The development of innovative eMarketing supported environments. For entrepreneurs, the web portal eMarketing and web-based marketing tools were established. The end of project: 16.02.2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Univerza v Mariboru (UNI MB)/University of Maribor</td>
<td>Slovenian-Austrian Cooperative E-learning Space (SACELS)</td>
<td>A multi-language virtual learning environment (Slovene-English-German) for the implementation of e-learning adapted to the needs of SMEs. Three online educational programs were successfully implemented with the use of the virtual learning environment: &quot;Development of human resources&quot;, &quot;Strategic thinking for strategic planning&quot; and &quot;Qualification of e-tutors/e-mentors&quot;. The number of direct users of the program was 18 SMEs in the border regions, and 30 employees of SMEs. • Awakening of interest in the development of a life-long learning culture in SMEs in the border regions with complete technological and methodological solutions. The end of project: 26.04.2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UM – Fakulteta za elektrotehniko, računalništvo in informatiko (FERI)/Faculty for Electro technical Engineering, Computer Science and Information Technology</td>
<td>Fostering cross border E-Cooperative environment through advanced networked E-learning and E-business services, FOCUS-SIAT</td>
<td>13 courses implemented, in which 161 candidates out of 196 participants successfully acquired the given knowledge. Evaluation was carried out on the quality of the courses on the basis of analysis of questionnaires which were distributed to the candidates. A high level of cooperation with Austrian partners was achieved. The end of project: 16.04.2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GZS, Območna</td>
<td>e-SLOG for SMEs</td>
<td>Preparation and translation (SLO-ANG) of a business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Project results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>zbornica Maribor Chamber of Commerce and Industry</td>
<td>Final Implementation Report</td>
<td>Model and documentation for SMEs on the basis of eSLOG specifications. • Definition of criteria for agents (providers &amp; vendors). • Definition of criteria for SMEs – users, preparation of a draft contract between users and agents. • Integration of references and standards by agents for services for eBusiness providers. • Implementation of a pilot project with users – cross border testing. • Analysis of the business model on the Austrian side of the border. • Survey and analysis of willingness of SMEs to do eBusiness in Slovenia. • Business meetings between Slovenian and Austrian SMEs, a source of potential users. • Presentation of project results in Graz, Nitra and in Maribor. The end of project: 16.02.2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BSC Kranj</td>
<td>Wandering E-School</td>
<td>414 participants acquired new knowledge in the beginner computer classes, while 396 upgraded their knowledge in the advanced classes. At the conclusion of the project, a telecentre was set-up, aimed at users from the following target groups: entrepreneurs, enterprise owners, employees of companies, farmers and all those thinking of taking an entrepreneurial route. Computer training will be available at the telecentre adapted to the needs of the target groups. The end of project: 16.04.2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A.L.P. Peca</td>
<td>Standardization of IT competence and promotion of new forms of eWork cooperation</td>
<td>Eighty participants acquired the ECDL certificate. • Preparation and publishing of expansive handbooks for all seven modules of the ECDL (theory + practice). • A business strategy for SMEs with an emphasis on implementing eWork was created. • A handbook for eWork was created. • An employment centre was set up for eWork. The end of project: 16.04.2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Zavod za turizem Maribor/Tourist Board Maribor</td>
<td>E-tourist destination</td>
<td>The entire information-sales web portal Tourist Area Pohorje <a href="http://www.pohorje.si">www.pohorje.si</a> is the key result of the project. The portal enables tourists, touristic providers and agencies a fast, effective and up-to-date exchange of desired information. Within the framework of the project, a complete picture of Tourist Area Pohorje was created, as well as the beginnings of a brand name and communication strategies and plan for further development. Photographs, video materials, maps and suitable equipment and education for the use of contemporary information technologies were secured. The end of project 31.03.2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Center informacijskih tehnologij/Center of information technology</td>
<td>eProjects – Web-based Environment for Project Management in SMEs</td>
<td>The Web environment ProjectVia.net offers its users the following: • work with project documentation, • management of a project calendar and calendars for individual members of the project teams in which they can enter various types of events, • publishing of news and frequently asked questions regarding the project, • management of a dictionary as the basis of understanding, • design and use of typical proposal phase implementations for defined types of projects, • administration of projects (determination of project groups, notification and similar), • secure use of the ProjectVia.net environment. The end of project: 16.02.2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mestna občina Maribor (MOM)/Municipality of Maribor</td>
<td>Forming spatial and real-estate information centre for supporting small and middle sized business</td>
<td>The e-geocentre was designed which is: • a provider of information and services regarding spatial and real estate fields in the region of the municipalities of the Podravje region, • the Initiator and developer and promoter of spatial and real estate activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Project results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Regionalna razvojna agencija Mura (RRA Mura)/Regional Development Agency Mura</td>
<td>CBEBC- Cross Border EBusiness Centre</td>
<td>An educational plan and implemented training for Companies prepared. The functionality of the Internet portal was developed on the basis of interviews with companies. To promote the website, we prepared CD-ROMS in both the Slovenian and German languages, as well as television programmes which presented eBusiness to audiences in more detail. Upon conclusion of the project, around 30 companies had registered, and a half year after the formal conclusion of the project, around 60 companies, of which 13 are Austrian are now registered users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>PIA d.o.o. Velenje</td>
<td>Central forms on internet</td>
<td>The result of the project has presented solutions which bear the answer to the majority of problems encountered with surveys. It's modern Internet design, user-friendly service for planners and users and effective results have become an indispensable tool for our customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Regionalna razvojna agencija SORA/Development Agency Sora</td>
<td>Cross Border Business Cooperation by the help of E-knowledge</td>
<td>The main activities of the projects involved the organisation of eLearning and eTraining, the organisation of cross border workshops and the creation of the web portal &quot;KanalZnanja&quot;. Classes on basic computing and specialised workshops covering actual issues in the field of eBusiness were offered within the scope of eLearning. At the same time, an eBusiness application was developed which teaches users how to prepare a business plan, step by step right from their homes (<a href="http://pcmg.ltfe.org">http://pcmg.ltfe.org</a>). The purpose of the web portal &quot;KanalZnanja.com&quot; is to collect educational programme offers in one place, enabling easier insight into current novelties in this field (<a href="http://www.kanalznanja.com">www.kanalznanja.com</a>).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delivered outputs

The following results have been achieved and already implemented:

Grant Scheme:

- implementation of 13 projects;
- developed and applied software applications for exchange of data between CB economic development institutions; cross-border portals; software applications for secure systems; SMEs tailored e-commerce applications for simplified the business transactions;
- provided on-line assistance to SMEs, cross-border promotional e-commerce campaign;
- prepared and distributed marketing material;
- prepared and used e-learning applications;
- trained SMEs to use e-commerce applications;
E-commerce strategies for SMEs elaborated and implemented.

**Secretariat:**

- “Daily open hours” assistance to the beneficiaries for preparation of reports and Tender Dossiers provided;
- Network of beneficiaries with on-line assistance in the home office of the Secretariat implemented and functional (see www.mra.si); no. of web page visits: 3058 (min. 1000 required); number of e-mails within on-line assistance: 92/1.005.
- Press releases after the signature of the grant contracts launched; info published in public media (Radio, TV, newspaper, see www.mra.si). In addition, press releases on the implementation of projects were published.
- 9 Site visits carried out.
- Final event implemented; number of people attending the final event: 47
- CBRGD GS Anthology prepared; number of copies: 300.

**SI.2002/000-316-01 – Small Projects Fund**

**TA for management of SPF Slovenia/Austria 2002**

PF/CRIS Number: SI.2002/000-316-02.01

Type of Contract: Service

Partner Country: Austria

Budget (in EUR): 34,500

Contract Signature Date: 30 April 2004

Contract End Date: 31 October 2005

**Aims**

Provision of technical support to the Contracting Authority in managing the Small Projects Fund in accordance with the Specific Guidelines for Management of the Small Projects Fund.

**Completed and on-going activities**

All activities completed.

1. Organising the first meeting with all selected beneficiaries in the region
2. Assisting the beneficiaries during project implementation, especially with required GGAPPI procedures for procurement
3. Monitoring the projects implementation through regular 4 – month site visits
4. acting as a focal point for the beneficiaries and all other interested parties

5. assisting beneficiaries with the interim reports and checking completeness and corrections of its technical and financial part

6. Assisting the beneficiaries with their final implementation report and submission of requests for payments to the Contracting Authority

7. Evaluation of the completed projects

8. Checking the completeness and correctness of final report in its technical and financial part

9. Publication of Anthology on the Small Projects Fund Slovenia/Austria 2002 in English and Slovene language

10. Public presentation of project results

11. Evaluation of project results

12. Compilation of the database of the implemented and evaluated projects.

**Outstanding Problems & Actions to be taken**

No open issues.

**Delivered outputs**

All envisaged results for Phase I and Phase II of the service contract achieved by the Secretariat, the interim and final report approved by the Contracting Authority.

**Small Projects Fund Scheme Slovenia/Austria 2002**

PF/CRIS Number: SI.2002/000-316-02.02

Type of Contract: grant

Partner Country: Austria

Budget (in EUR): 498,900

Contract Signature Date: 30. 11. 2004

Contract End Date: 31. 08. 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Title of the Action</th>
<th>Grant - Phare contribution (EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Občina Vuzenica, Vuzenica</td>
<td>Project Bartolomei Soboth-Muta-Vuzenica</td>
<td>36,697.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ŠENT Slovensko združenje za duševno zdravje, Kranj</td>
<td>Interlaced tradition, work and art</td>
<td>39,627.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>KGZS Kmetijsko gozdarski zavod Kranj</td>
<td>Where fruit trees blossom, man lives</td>
<td>33,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>KGZS Kmetijsko gozdarski zavod Ptuj</td>
<td>With present to tradition</td>
<td>21,002.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. IPAK Inštitut za simbolno analizo in razvoj tehnologij, Velenje: Virtual network of young inventors 41,000.00

6. Občina ob Dravi Radlje, Radlje ob Dravi: Farmer market Radlje 26,021.46

7. BSC Postovno podporni center Kranj, Kranj: Youth business energy in tourism 47,216.40

8. Inštitut za ekološke raziskave ERICo Velenje: Thermal power plant Šostanj & transboundary air pollution Education – steps to development 49,979.57

9. KGZS Kmetijsko gozdarski zavod Celje, Celje: Education – steps to development 40,160.22

10. Čebelarska zveza Zg.Gorenjske, Žirovnica: Breeding Centre Zelenica 50,000.00

11. Društvo Mozaik, Murska Sobota: New ways towards social inclusion 39,970.00

12. Srednja kmetijska šola Maribor, Maribor: Production of prime fruit brandy 26,798.84

13. PRA – Prleška razvojna agencija GIZ, Ljutomer: Grossmann 2005: 100 years of film 47,376.06

Aims

The aim was to boost the development potentials of the cross-border region seen as one single unit and thus achieving better living and working conditions.

Completed and on-going activities

The SPF scheme has been completed. All 13 projects have been accomplished and the planned results have been achieved.

Outstanding Problems & Actions to be taken

No problems were encountered.

Delivered outputs:

- the first information workshop for the beneficiaries took place on 17 Jan 2005
- the monitoring of the project results have been accomplished in the period April-May 2005 and July 2005
- the interim and final reports have been checked, approved and the final payments have been executed
- the presentation of project results was taking place on 21 Oct 2005
- the anthology of projects has been published in 500 copies and distributed
- the evaluation of projects has been prepared.
3.3.2. Programme 2003 PHARE CBC Slovenia/Austria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Allocated (MEUR)</th>
<th>Committed (MEUR)</th>
<th>Disbursed (MEUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003/004-939-01 – TA for management of the project Cross-border biodiversity conservation and sustainable development</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/004-939-01 – Cross border biodiversity conservation and sustainable development – GS</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/004-939-02.01 – Secretariat for SPF 2003</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/004-939-02.02 – Small Projects Fund</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Phare</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.499</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross Border Biodiversity conservation and sustainable development

*TA for management of the project Cross Border Biodiversity conservation and sustainable development*

CRIS Number: SI.2003/004-939-01.01

Type of Contract: Service

Budget (in EUR): 140,000

Contract Signature Date: 22.11.2004

Contract End Date: 30.11.2006
Aims

Providing support for managing of the grant scheme for the project Cross Border Biodiversity conservation and sustainable development.

Completed and on-going activities

- Expert and financial counselling on the implementation of projects for beneficiaries.
- Assistance for beneficiaries in preparing tender dossiers and selecting subcontractors.
- Publication of questions and answers on the website.
- Assistance for beneficiaries in preparing monthly, interim and final reports.
- Organization of the workshop for preparation of the final reports.
- Preparation and presentation of the instructions for beneficiaries to prepare summeries for final anthology.
- Signature of Addendum to prolong the Contract.

Outstanding Problems & Actions to be taken

All the problems have been solved.

Delivered outputs

All activities related to the grant scheme have been performed according to the plan. The final report has been submitted with the detailed description of the role, scope, activities and goals achieved by the technical secretariat.

Cross Border Biodiversity conservation and sustainable development Grant Scheme

CRIS Number: SI.2003/004-939-01.02
Type of Contract: Grant scheme
Budget (in EUR): 1,860,000
Contract Signature Date: 26.07.2005
Contract End Date: 26.08.2006, 9 on 26.10.2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Grant contribution (EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center za kartografijo favne in flore Antoličičeva 2204 Miklavž na Dravskem polju</td>
<td>Zonation Plan of Selected Natura 2000 Sites</td>
<td>267,363.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Občina Tržična Trg svobode 18</td>
<td>Karavanke Natura 2000</td>
<td>371,297.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Aims

The aim of the project is to strengthen co-operation between Austria and Slovenia in the fields of biological and landscape diversity protection, protected areas and ensuring sustainable development.

## Completed and on-going activities

- Regular monitoring of projects, including reviewing and approving all tender dossiers for the selection of subcontractors on individual projects.
- Every 5th day of the month, contractors submit monthly reports.
- In September and November 2006 meetings of the Steering Committee were held.
- The Anthology of Co-financed Projects was published.
- November 2006: Public presentation of the Grant Scheme and the achieved results together with the press conference has been organised in Bled.
- The evaluation of the projects results by independent external expert has been carried out.
- All activities were completed, final payments 28 December 2006.

## Outstanding Problems & Actions to be taken

The problems were solved during the implementation.
Delivered outputs

Most projects achieved the planned results and goals set out in the Project Fiche. The results can be summarized in the following sections: an inventory of individual species of fauna and flora are obtained and a mapping of habitat types in the Natura 2000 area made, new or updated existing management plans are prepared in line with EU requirements, organisation structure models were prepared and tested in protected areas, models of public-private partnership in protected areas were prepared and tested, landscape areas were prepared with a special emphasis on the protection of exceptional landscapes, ecologically significant habitats are renewed and corridors established, info centres are outfitted and Natura 2000 promotional campaigns have been carried out. It is evident from final reports that most indicators have been achieved.

Small Projects Fund CBC Slovenia/Austria 2003

TA for management of SPF Slovenia/Austria 2003

CRIS Number: 2003/004-939-02.01
Type of Contract: services
Partner Country: Austria
Budget (in EUR): 35,000
Contract Signature Date: 20.06.2005
Contract End Date: 30.11.2006

Aims

The specific goal of the Secretariat is to provide assistance to potential applicants during the tender period, especially with regard to the project idea development, application preparation and execution of selected projects in line with the GGAPPI rules and in agreement with the Contracting Authority.

Completed and on-going activities

- 28 November 2006 – Anthology of completed projects in Slovene and English language published and distributed to the interested public.

- 28 November 2006 - final event organised in Prevalje;

- by 30 November 2006 - all Beneficiaries’ final reports checked by Secretariat;

- 4 December 2006 – approval of Secretariat’s final progress report by CA.

Outstanding Problems & Actions to be taken

None.
Delivered outputs

All services successfully completed by Secretariat on time.

Small Projects Fund CBC Slovenia/Austria 2003 (Grant Scheme)

CRIS Number: 2003/004-939-02.02

Type of Contract: Grant

Partner Country: Austria

Budget (in EUR): 465,000

Contract Signature Date: 07.11.2005

Contract End Date: 30.09.2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Title of the Action</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Grant (Phare &amp; national contribution) EUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OBČINA PREVALJE, Trg 2A, 2391 Prevalje</td>
<td>Trails of the cultural heritage</td>
<td>Carinthian</td>
<td>50,212.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ZAVOD ZA ZDRAVSTVENO VARSTVO MURSKA SOBOTA, Ulica arhitekta Novaka 2/B, 9000 Murska Sobota</td>
<td>Greenbelt between Slovenia and Austria</td>
<td>Rural Tourism Koroška – Kaernten</td>
<td>63,560.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RRA KOROŠKA, Regionalna razvojna agencija za regijo, Koroška cesta 47, 2370 Dravograd</td>
<td>Rural Tourism Koroška – Kaernten</td>
<td>49,824.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SREDNJA BIOTEHNIŠKA ŠOLA KORANJ</td>
<td>Longlife learning in ecological fruit growing</td>
<td>42,978.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ZAVOD ZA ZDRAVSTVENO VARSTVO RAVNE NA KOROŠKEM, Ob Suhi 11, 2390 Ravne na Koroškem</td>
<td>Health without borders</td>
<td>57,381.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ZAVOD ZA ZDRAVSTVENO VARSTVO KRANJ, Gosposvetska ulica 12, 4000 Kranj</td>
<td>Reproductive health protection</td>
<td>53,685.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>KOROŠKI MLADINSKI KULTURNI CENTER KOMPLEKS, Čečovje 5, 2390 Ravne na Koroškem</td>
<td>Infokik – Info for Carinthia</td>
<td>55,612.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A.L.P. PECA d.o.o. Podjetje za razvoj in trženje produktov Mežiške doline, Prežihova ulica 17, 2390 Ravne na Koroškem</td>
<td>e-knowledge to the farms</td>
<td>66,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>OSNOVNA ŠOLA GORNJA RADGONA, Prežihova 1, 9250 Gornja Radgona</td>
<td>The red balloon</td>
<td>16,053.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>INŠTITUT RS ZA REHABILITACIJO, DE Maribor, Čufarjeva 5, 2000 Maribor</td>
<td>Job-tailored knowledge</td>
<td>66,258.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MLADINSKI CENTER VELENJE, KULTURA IN IZOBRAŽEVANJE, Šaleška cesta 3, 3320 Velenje</td>
<td>Common market – a new opportunity</td>
<td>54,926.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>REGIONALNA RAZVOJNA AGENCIJA MURA d.o.o., Lendavska ulica 5a, 9000 Murska Sobota</td>
<td></td>
<td>53,506.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Aims**

The general aim is to encourage a long-term connection between the local and regional actors in the specific Slovene/Austrian border area, to provide them support in developing the capability to generate, develop and to carry out joint projects.

**Completed and on-going activities**

- by 30 September 2006 - all beneficiaries completed the project implementation;
- on 14 December 2006 - the last of 12 final reports was approved by CA and the last balance payment order issued on that date;
- on 28 November 2006 - final event organised in Prevalje, the Secretariat presented the Phare grant scheme SPF Austria 2003 and the results achieved; five beneficiaries presented to public their completed projects;
- by 31 December 2006 - all beneficiaries received their balance payment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of completed projects</th>
<th>Achieved indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of participants involved directly (target groups, beneficiaries)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of participants indirectly involved</td>
<td>76,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Austrian cross border organisations involved</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Slovene partner organisations involved</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of renovated (equipped) development units</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of new tourist products</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of long-term cooperation concepts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of publications</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of internet pages</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of training programmes</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outstanding Problems & Actions to be taken**

None.

**Delivered outputs**

The outputs of the grant scheme, successfully delivered by 12 beneficiaries, are listed in the Anthology of Small Projects Fund Phare programme Slovenia-Austria 2003. The disbursement rate achieved was 98.87%.
4. **ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT**

4.1 Steps taken by to ensure the quality and effectiveness of implementation

In this chapter the steps taken by the Programme Managing bodies to ensure effectiveness in delivery and to raise the impact of the programme activities on the programmes clientel are described.

It reports the major problems encountered, the main activities conducted by the MA, the Programme Secretariat, the IBs and the MC.

In general the management and steering of the Programme was a shared responsibility of:

- the Managing Authority (MA) and National Authority on Slovenian side (NA)
- the Paying Authority (PA) and Sub-PA,
- the Monitoring Committee (MC) and Steering Committee (SC)
- the Intermediate Bodies (IBs) and the Joint Technical Secretariat (JTS)

These bodies have worked together to steer and manage the programme and were therefore responsible for the quality and effectiveness of implementation.

4.1.1. Report on the activities of the Managing Authority and National Authority

The Managing Authority (MA) within the meaning of Art. 9 lit. n and Art. 34 of Council Regulation No. 1260/1999 was given to the Austrian Federal Chancellery, Division IV/4 (Bundeskanzleramt der Republik Österreich, Abteilung IV/4). In order to fulfil the responsibilities of the Member State in Slovenia according to Art. 38 of Council regulation No. 1260/1999 and Art. 2 of Commission Regulation No. 438/2001 the MA was assisted by the National Authority in Slovenia, the Government Office for Local Self-Government and Regional Policy – GOSP (former NARD).

The location of the MA in Austria has proved to be efficient as the whole programme benefited of the experience and skills developed in the Austrian public administration sector. The Federal Chancellery was in the period 2000-2006 Managing Authority for three other cross-border-programmes. Synergy effects could be used but also the effect of mutual learning was a benefit. Overall a tendency to operate according to a non-hierarchical approach (state government and regions) emerged which fitted appropriately with the programmes’ management structure.

With regard to the steps taken to ensure the quality and effectiveness of implementation the MA was in charge of setting up, running and adaption of the monitoring system (together with the
PA). The MA took initiative to amend Programme Documents (CIP, CP), it submitted the annual implementation reports to the EC. Furthermore the MA organised the evaluation (mid-term, update and ongoing evaluation) and sent the reports in time to the EC. It had been in charge for the communication regarding Art 5 and the day to day coordination between all programme bodies (including Financial Control Group).

Regular meetings were usually held every two weeks between Managing Authority and JTS to discuss ongoing issues.

In addition to this the MA initiated workshops, some of them in cooperation with INTERACT, for the programme’s stakeholders such as workshops on strategic project development, cross-border project development or financial control.

4.1.2. Paying Authority (PA)

The Federal Chancellery, Dept. IV/4, has been designated, pursuant to Art. 9, item o) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1260/99, to handle the financial aspects of the Programme INTERREG IIIA Austria- Slovenia and to perform the tasks defined in Art. 32 of Council Regulation (EC) No. 1260/99 and is entitled to outsource these tasks to an external institution.

In order to fulfil the responsibilities of the Member States in Slovenia according to Art. 32 of Council Regulation (EC) No. 1260/1999 the PA has been assisted by the Government Office for Local Self-Government and Regional Policy (GOSP), Sector for system and control – as Sub-Paying Authority (sub-PA).

The PA performed all tasks defined in Art. 32 of Council Regulation (EC) No. 1260/99, in particular making payments to final beneficiaries, submitting applications for payment and recording incoming and outgoing amounts. In this respect, the PA cooperated closely with the IBs. A separate account for the Programme is established with the PA. All Structural Funds resources are received at this account. Interest income, if any, is exclusively allocated to this account and, thus, to the Programme as required by the last sentence of Art. 32 (2). Appropriate organisational measures are to ensure efficient financial management so that the arising needs for financing can be covered by the advance payments of Structural Funds resources and a forfeiture of Structural Funds financing is prevented.

The PA submitted the forecasts of applications for payment for the current year and the forecast for the following year according to Art. 32/7 Council Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999 to the Commission.

Recommendations of the Financial Control according to Art. 10 of Commission Regulation No. 438/2001 were discussed with relevant programme partners and were implemented with the respective body – e.g. during a revision of a project ERDF payments were suspended.
4.1.3. Report on the activities of the Joint Monitoring Committee

In accordance with the rules of procedure of the INTERREG IIIA AUSTRIA – Slovenia Monitoring Committee for the Implementation of the INTERREG IIIA Programme Austria – Slovenia 2000-2006 a Joint Monitoring Committee (JMC) was established for the implementation of the Community Initiative Programme INTERREG IIIA Austria – Slovenia 2000-2006. In line with point 39 of the INTERREG guidelines, the JMC for the CIP as described in point 28 has formed a single committee, which has performed the tasks as described in Article 35 (3) Council Regulation 1260/99.

Main steps taken by the MC to ensure the quality and effectiveness of the programme:

- proposal and decision on revisions of the JPD/CIP and the Programme Complement (PC), including changes of financial tables of the CIP and PC.
- examination and approval of project selection / approval procedures as well as selection and priority criteria and project categories
- revision of project results as an integrated part of the programming process.
- discussion of the main findings and recommendations of the mid-term and on-going evaluation.

Table 12
Meetings of the JMC and the JSC by date and locality from 2001 until 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme year</th>
<th>JMC</th>
<th>Total JMC</th>
<th>JSC</th>
<th>Total JSC &amp; JSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>12th of July in Keutschach / Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13th of July in Keutschach / Austria, 22nd of November in Velenje / Slovenia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5th of November in Bad St. Leonhard / Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11th of March in Seggauberg / Austria, 18th of June in Šentanel / Slovenia, 6th of November in Bad St. Leonhard / Austria</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>29th of September in Graz / Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11th of June in Murska Sobota / Slovenia, 2nd of December in Bled / Slovenia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3rd of February in Pörtschach am Wörthersee / Austria, 13th of April in Kranj / Slovenia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13th of April in Kranj / Slovenia, 8th of July in Seelach am Klopeinersee / Austria, 15th/16th of December in Murska Sobota / Slovenia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>29th of June in Seggauberg / Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28th/29th of June in Seggauberg / Austria, 4th of October in Celje / Slovenia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>30th of May in Bad St. Leonhard / Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30th of May in Bad St. Leonhard / Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore some of the decisions have been taken in written procedures.

4.1.4. **Report on the activities of the Joint Steering Committee**

In accordance with the rules of procedure of the INTERREG IIIA AUSTRIA – Slovenia Steering Committee for the Implementation of the INTERREG IIIA Programme Austria – Slovenia 2000-2006 a single INTERREG IIIA Austria – Slovenia Joint Steering Committee (JSC) was set up as a body responsible for the joint (pre-)selection of all INTERREG IIIA projects and the co-ordinated monitoring of the projects’ implementation within the scope of the Programme. With the following tasks the JSC ensured the quality and effectiveness of the programme (tasks in compliance with points 29 and 38 of the INTERREG guidelines and with Chapter 9 of the CIP):

- discussion and approval of projects applying the project selection criteria and the scoring system as defined in the Programme Complement and as approved by the JMC;
- regular reports on projects approved with conditions and on necessary amendments;
- strategic project development: a workshop was organised to discuss helpers and hinderers in (strategic) project development;
- on-going evaluation: discussion of results and recommendations.

4.1.5. **Intermediate Bodies (IBs)**

In the meaning of Art. 2 of Commission Regulation 438/2001 the Intermediate Bodies were responsible for the operative management of the programme at the project level. In this respect the IBs contributed to the quality and effectiveness of the programme in particular with the following tasks:

- advising potential applicants for funding with regard to the programme objectives and the terms and conditions attached to INTERREG assistance;
- IBs registered all project applications into the Central Monitoring System (CMS)
- pre-assessment of project applications according to the criteria defined in PC
- concluding subsidy contracts relating to ERDF funds on the basis of the decisions by the JSC;
- auditing the project financial statements and reports that must have been submitted by the final beneficiaries of the assistance as well as confirming the correctness of the financial statements in terms of content and compliance with accounting regulations
- Reporting to the Central Monitoring System
- public relations work on a regional level.

More information on the responsibilities of the IBs due to Art. 4 controls (FLC) is described in chapter 4.2.
4.1.6. Joint Technical Secretariat (JTS)

The JTS was contracted and supervised by the Managing Authority. From 2004 the Slovenian part of the JTS was contracted and supervised by the National Authority of Slovenia. The purpose of the Secretariat was to act as facilitator, organiser and ‘mentor’ for the programme.

The JTS and its responsibility for day-to-day management of the programme was outsourced by the MA to ÖIR-Managementdienste GmbH, since 2008 called metis Gmbh. Since 2004 the JTS Team in Vienna was completed by a JTS member in Maribor to support the Slovenian programme bodies and beneficiaries locally.

In accordance with the tasks described in the CIP and the Internal Manual for the Technical Secretariat INTERREG IIIA the JTS covered the following tasks:

- secretariat to the Joint Monitoring and Joint Steering Committees: preparation of the meetings in close co-operation with the programme management bodies (MA/NA, PA/Sub-PA) and IBs, preparation of decision making process in JSC, generation of project sheets as a basis for the decisions in the JSC, compilation of data on request (e.g. check of indicators); drafting the Annual Implementation Reports; management of translation services (many documents were provided in both languages);
- organisation of bilateral task-forces, workshops and other events: e.g. information meeting for the priority “human resources” in 2002, numerous meetings of bilateral Task Forces within Managing Transition process, cross-programme seminars on specific questions (more information see below), workshops and task forces in preparation of the new programme 2007-2013
- support of the MA/NA in drafting the revised programme documents (CIP, Programme Complement, and Art. V communication) and support in implementing the communication activities: folders, broschures, etc. (for more details see chapter 4.4.)
- operating and up-dating of the web-site: www.at-si.net
- supporting efficient project management: drafting common standards and principles of cooperation (e.g. standardised formats like application form),
- supporting external experts, e.g. mid-term /on-going and ex-post Evaluators;
- organisational support to the Financial Control Group
- internal project management: quality control, communication and coordination: e.g. co-ordination and co-operation with partners in the GOSP - Government Office for Local Self Government and Regional Policy (former NARD) in Ljubljana and Maribor who were in charge of programming for Phare CBC 2002 and 2003 and implemented the JSPF 2001;

A main part of the TS-workload was covered by preparing and accompanying the Managing Transition process: in 2003 five Task Force meetings and one workshop were held with the Slovenian programme partners, two cross-programme seminars were organised.
In order to find a common understanding of tasks and division of labour of the enlarged JTS and to discuss the inclusion of new team members into the JTS the MA invited programme stakeholders (NA and TS) to a working meeting that was held in Vienna on 24th March 2004.

The cooperation between the Austrian and the Slovenian JTS team members were gradually improved over the years. From accession onwards the cooperation was tightened and the Slovenian member was fully integrated into the JTS-team. In the course of the Programme many meetings of the JTS XL were held in Vienna, among others the following items were on the agenda: common standards, principles of communication and cooperation, programme PR activities, organisation of work flows and project life cycle, possible role of JTS in future period 2007-2013 (lessons learned); project documentation on programme web-site.

With the support of the INTERACT programme (IP Managing Transition) several cross-programme seminars were organised, eg seminar on Lead-Partner in 2005, seminar on indicators in 2006, programme on closure exercise in 2007 and finally the event “CBC so-far” in 2008 (some more information see chapter 4.4.).

Due to the fact that the eligibility of the programme ended on 31.12.2008 the JTS had been closed by the end of 2008.

4.2 Development of Control System according to Art. 5

4.2.1. Description of the Accounting and Information Systems

On behalf of the MA a Central Monitoring System for the collection of data according to Art. 34, para 1, lit. a of Council Regulation No. 1260/99 was established at the – ERP Fund acting as operative PA. Ungargasse 37, A-1030 Wien. These functions were outsourced by the Federal Chancellery acting as PA in the framework of a contract for services and were performed by ERP-Fonds (gathering of data) and the TS (processing and evaluation of data).

The technical framework as well as the structure and content of reporting to the Central Monitoring System (CMS) was agreed by the programme partners on the basis of given EU standards. The MA and the IBs reported all data necessary to the CMS and confirmed the correctness of data. The data sent to the CMS was considered as official data. All data within the CMS were available via read access to the MA/NA, PA, JTS, IBs as well as to FCG members. Reports (e.g. on the commitment and payment situation) were sent to the MC and SC members.

Regular reports for the n+2 status were programmed by the ERP-F and could thus be used by programme partners for continuous monitoring.

4.2.2. Controls according to Art. 4 of Com. Reg. No. 438/2001

In compliance with Art. 4 of Commission Regulation No. 438/2001 the IBs are responsible for all projects co-financed by ERDF funds under the INTERREG III A Programme Austria-Slovenia.
They secure compliance with the terms and conditions for assistance under the programme as well as the correctness of financial statements settled with regard to expenses eligible for assistance and assistance funds to be granted is continuously ensured both in factual and accounting terms and, if necessary, audited on site.

With regard to the FLC the IBs were responsible for (other tasks of IB see chapter 4.1.5.):

- advising potential applicants for funding with regard to the programme objectives and the terms and conditions attached to INTERREG assistance;
- concluding subsidy contracts relating to ERDF funds on the basis of the decisions by the JSC
- auditing the project financial statements and reports that must be submitted by the final beneficiaries of the assistance as well as confirming the correctness of the financial statements in terms of content and compliance with accounting regulations
- prompting the disbursement of ERDF funds by the PA to the final beneficiaries as well as demanding the repayment of ERDF funds if applicable
- Reporting to the Central Monitoring System

In this context care has been taken to ensure the proper separation (and if applicable, also the organisational and functional separation) of the personnel conducting financial control from the project consulting activities and, in particular, from the project development in order to avoid conflicts of interests and to reduce the risk of irregularities.

After examining a project’s implementation and the financial statements, the Austrian IBs handed over to the PA the result of the control and a Certification of Expenditure (relating to all items mentioned in Article 9 Para. 2 lit. b of Commission Regulation (EC) No. 438/2001 (as amended)) and a Payment Claim. On this basis the PA pays the ERDF funds to the account of the (Austrian) project owner. The project information provided in the (interim or final) financial statements as well as the payment executed by the PA is reported to the CMS.

On the Slovenian side the FLC control of the final beneficiaries’ applications for payments was executed by the department for financial control at GOSP. The Financial Department at GOSP released the payments to the final beneficiaries. The Sub-PA authority – Sector for system and control at GOSP – performed controls according to Art. 9 of Regulation (EC) No. 438/2001.

On the basis of the reported data and a sub Application for Payment and sub-statement of expenditure - which was sent in parallel to the data transfer - the PA reimbursed the ERDF to the Sub-PA.
4.2.3. Controls according to Art. 10 and winding up

A Financial Control Group (FCG) was set up for the implementation of the Financial Control according to chapter IV and Winding Up of the Community Initiative Programme "INTERREG IIIA Austria – Slovenia" according to chapter V of Regulation (EC) 438/2001. The rules of procedure have been adopted by a decision of the delegations of both participating states on 19th May 2005. The FCG met at least once every year in order to discuss important findings and the drafts of the common annual reports before sending to the Commission.

The FCG consists of a limited number of representatives from national authorities of the two Member States of the INTERREG IIIA Austria – Slovenia programme. These national authorities are responsible according to their national regulatory requirements for

- a. Financial Control according to Chapter IV of reg. 438/2001 and those for
- b. issuing final declarations according to Chapter V of reg. 438/2001.

The audits required pursuant to Chapter IV of Regulation (EC) 438/2001 have been conducted on the Austrian and the Slovenian side according to the annual audit plan of the respective years. Reports on the single audits were made and executive summaries have been sent to the European Commission.

In Austria some weaknesses were detected and reported. The necessary follow-ups and improvements within the Monitoring/Management and Control System which had been ascertained in previous years were carried out by the responsible Intermediate Bodies in close cooperation with the Managing Authority and Paying Authority.

On the Slovenian side, the auditing process showed that the management and control systems were set according to the requirements of respective EC Regulations and in compliance with recommendations of the European Commission.

Details to the weaknesses and the problems detected are described in chapter 4.3.

4.3 Summary of significant problems

Set up of FLC systems took more time and efforts than expected

It should be noticed that the set up of FLC systems took more time and efforts than expected.

It took considerable time and efforts until the FLC systems in Austria and Slovenia were installed properly: it was difficult to foresee systems that met both the national requirements of the single MS and the respective EU-regulations without clear provisions or guidance provided by the EC).
Especially at the end of each year the FLC bodies as well as the Sub-PA and PA were confronted with some lack of capacities: due to the fact that a number of projects submitted the progress and financial reports later in a year than expected (due to fulfilment of conditions or unforeseen events the implementation was lagging sometimes behind the plan), the FLC bodies had to check many reports especially at the end of the years.

Based on the analysis several actions were taken in order to avoid any de-commitment, especially:

- the programme bodies IBs, MA and JTS intensified assistance and guidance for approved projects (monitoring of project implementation, seminars on technical aspects of project implementation);
- possibility of extraordinary reporting of expenditure was offered to the projects, i.e. to report costs additionally to the agreed reporting deadlines;
- awareness-raising was done in the sense of making the project participants aware of the importance to report costs according to the approved budget plans and projects were closely monitored on that aspect by IBs;
- intensified efforts were made to establish a well-functioning FLC system.

Due to this considerable efforts the programme bodies could avoid de-commitment of funds. Only in priority 4: Special support for border regions the target could not be met at the closure in year 2004 (more information see chapter 3.1.).

### 4.4 Information and publicity activities undertaken (TA 2)

A variety of information and publicity activities were undertaken during the reporting period. Print media, websites and information events were successfully provided to target groups as well as the interested public.

Based on the communication plan in the Programme Complement the following activities were carried out:

#### 4.4.1. Activities of the MA/NA/TS

**Common brochure (2004):** the programme partners agreed already in October 2003 to produce a bilingual brochure at the occasion of Slovenia’s accession to the EC highlighting the successful cooperation under INTERREG and Phare CBC so far. The brochure was published in May 2004 and 12,000 pieces were printed and distributed among programme partners and the wider public (only 500 pieces are still available at the TS). The brochure could be downloaded from the programme website [www.at-si.net](http://www.at-si.net).
Folder (2001, 2002) and folder for pupils (2007): JTS has elaborated the concept and layout of a folder informing of the start of all four external border programmes. 10,000 pieces of this folder were printed in November 2001 and have been distributed to all responsible institutions at state and federal state level. A second edition of the programme folder was produced in 2002 (3,500 pieces). Moreover, 12,000 pieces of a bilingual INTERREG folder targeted to pupils aged 14 to 19 years old and teachers were printed in April 2007. It was distributed to all communities, schools, beneficiaries and other partners in the programme area before the summer break. An electronic version could be downloaded from the programme website www.at-si.net.

Project documentation and documentation of project results: based on the information on committed projects in the CMS the JTS started in 2003 to set up a project documentation comprising all relevant information which was used for different purposes (project description on the programme website, requests from institutions or organisations surveying INTERREG Programmes, information for politicians, etc.). This documentation was regularly up-dated. At the end of 2005 around 70 projects were described. Based on the already established project documentation the JTS started in autumn 2007 to complete it by adding results and outputs of nearly finalised projects. Project owners have been asked to provide additional information (such as reports, studies, photos, websites etc.). The results have been published from February 2008 onwards on the programme website under projects/"Success Stories" (overview of projects by priorities and measures). For each project additionally a documentary archive (*.zip) has been created so that project results can be downloaded.

Programme website www.at-si.net: the website is on-line since February 2002 (closed in November 2009) in German, Slovene and English. The programme website was regularly up-dated by the JTS where monthly web reports were available. A common introductory page to both the INTERREG IIIA programme 2000-2006 as well as to the Objective 3 Territorial Cooperation Programme 2007-2013 was installed.

The Backoffice area under www.at-si/Service/intern: from December 2002 until November 2009 the MA/JTS offered all Committee members an information repository which can be accessed through the programme website. Basically, it consists of a personal calendar and a file manager which contains all necessary internal programme information such as invitations to meetings and documents in a download section. A detailed user manual was elaborated and
disseminated to all potential users. The Backoffice area has been widely used by programme partners and has also been regularly up-dated.

**Information events:** The JTS organized seven seminars with overall 593 participants – some of these seminars were organised in close cooperation with INTERACT. In detail the JTS held a seminar on indicators and selection criteria with 80 participants, a seminar on labour market and qualification with 140 participants, a seminar on the Lead Partner Principle with 57 participants, a seminar on programme management in the framework of Managing Transition INTERREG IIIA with 84 participants, a seminar on financial control and project cycle management in the framework of Managing Transition INTERREG IIIA with 93 participants, a seminar on closing the Interreg IIIA programmes 2000-2006 with 70 participants and the seminar “CBC so far” on the use of project experience from INTERREG IIIA Programmes with 69 participants.

**In the framework of INTERACT,** the JTS attended seven seminars on INTERREG IIIA programme management, the situation between EU enlargement and the new programme periods, Communication plan and tools for cross-border programmes, territorial cooperation project management as well as European territorial cooperation programmes 2007-2013. The JTS also participated in an INTERACT conference on European territorial cooperation programmes 2007-2013 in Budapest. Furthermore in the framework of INTERACT the JTS participated in a study on monitoring systems in EU25. The JTS organized an information day for the representatives of social partners and NGOs in the JMCs. Moreover, the JTS organized in total four presentations and discussions with delegations from other countries, e.g. Latvia and Finland. Within the framework of INTERACT, a staff exchange to five INTERREG IIIA programmes for learning about the application of the Lead Partner Principle was also organised.

### 4.4.2. Activities of the Intermediate Bodies

The **IB of Styria** has given up-dated information to the target groups and the public via Internet [http://www.raumplanung.steiermark.at/cms/beitrag/10978491/280089/](http://www.raumplanung.steiermark.at/cms/beitrag/10978491/280089/), by email (electronic newsletter of the department 16A), press releases and information activities at meetings. The Euregio has provided information for target groups and the public via the Internet ([http://www.euregio-steiermark.at/](http://www.euregio-steiermark.at/)), press releases and information activities at meetings, too. Moreover, a bilingual folder was produced in 2004. On project level the presentation of the European Union support (ERDF) according to the information and publicity regulation has been monitored by the IB. On programme level an event took place in November 2004 where the SF-programmes in Styria (Objective 2, URBAN, LEADER+ and INTERREG) presented their achievements made so far. An annual report was published in 2005 and sent to all relevant stakeholders on local, regional and national level in Austria.

The **IB of Carinthia** published the brochure “INTERREG IIIA Österreich – Slowenien; Projekte 2000 – 2006; Neue Chancen durch grenzüberschreitende Kooperationen” in October 2003 which describes best practice examples. The IB published another brochure in 2007 titled “Kraftvolle Ideen für den Ländlichen Raum – EU-Projekte 2000-2006 und wie es weitergeht” in
which two project examples of the INTERREG IIIA programme are presented. The website has provided information on available funding and project descriptions relating to the INTERREG IIIA programme and has been regularly up-dated by the IB of Carinthia: www.ktn.gv.at/ eupgst. A series of announcements and articles has been launched in regional newspapers in Carinthia.

The IB Regional Office Maribor has regularly up-dated the GOSP - Government Office for Local Self Government and Regional Policy (former NARD) - website www.svlr.gov.si and the common web page www.at-si.net including information on INTERREG IIIA as well as general information on Objective 3 Slovenia - Austria. A first and a second call for project proposals comprising the whole application pack has been published on the website as well as invitations to and reports from workshops and frequently asked questions (FAQ). The first and the second call for proposals has additionally been announced in the newspapers. The IB has offered consultation hours for potential applicants; 10 consultation days with 55 participants from 36 institutions were held in 2005. Information to potential applicants about the programme has also been given by telephone and by e-mail. Regular information work has also been done for the interested public on INTERREG IIIA Slovenia-Austria and Objective 3 Slovenia-Austria. Furthermore, the IB has organised and implemented 18 workshops on the INTERREG IIIA Slovenia-Austria programme for potential applicants, public procurement procedures for final beneficiaries and INTERREG staff, as well as interim statements and interim/final reports for final beneficiaries. The workshops have been attended by 547 participants. Articles about the programme have been published in the newspapers like the first call for proposals in the “Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia”. The IB has also published four announcements of information workshops for potential applicants for the second call for proposals in four local newspapers. Information about the programme has additionally been sent through different electronic version of news. A Brochure “Initiative Programme INTERREG III” has been printed that contains inter alia basic information about the INTERREG IIIA Programme Slovenia-Austria. Promotion materials have been permanently distributed such as notebooks, bags, pencils, folders, umbrellas, memory sticks, calendars, USB-keys, paper cubes and clothing bags.

4.5 Evaluation on the programme

According to the regulations the INTERREG IIIA Programme Austria-Slovenia has been subdued to three evaluation exercises, all implemented by experts independent from the programme partners:

- Ex-ante Evaluation (EaE);
- mid-term Evaluation (MTE);
- up-date of the mid-term Evaluation (update)

In addition to these evaluations the evaluators of MTE were asked and contracted to support the programme bodies with some more detailed analysis within the so called “on-going” evaluation.
4.5.1. The main evaluations on the programme

Ex-ante evaluation

The ex-ante evaluation was conducted in close cooperation with the programming process and comprises internal activities by the working groups that created the programme as well as external activities carried out by consultants not involved in the programming process. It was carried out by ÖAR-Regionalberatung.

As a result of this close interlinking of programming and ex-ante evaluation, comments and recommendations by the evaluators were discussed in the Bilateral Workshops or with the experts involved, and its outcome was incorporated in the programming work in an on-going manner. Thus every new version of the JPD already contained the results of the foregone evaluation loop. Altogether the ex-ante evaluation provided a valuable learning cycle for all partners involved, and led to notable improvements of the overall quality and coherence of the JPD.

Mid-term evaluation

Due to the involvement of Austria in four Interreg IIIA programmes on the external borders of the EU one single firm - ÖAR-Regionalberatung GmbH - was contracted by the MA in 2003 to prepare the mid-term and on-going evaluation for the Interreg IIIA programmes Austria with the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary and Slovenia. Especially the on-going evaluation made use of synergy effects by covering cross-programme aspects.

A cross-programme Steering Group Evaluation was set up consisting of the main programme partners of all five countries concerned (MA, PA, JTS, intermediate bodies, programme partners from Czech and Slovak Republic, Hungary, Slovenia and Austria).

The Group met twice in 2003:

- a kick-off meeting was held on 30th June to present the mid-term evaluation team and the proposed methodology and to agree on a work plan for the mid-term evaluation.
- A second meeting was held on 25th November to discuss the main findings and recommendations of the mid-term evaluation.

The mid-term evaluation report was sent to the Commission on 22nd December 2003. The Commission confirmed the completeness of the report in its letter dated 20.2.2004.

---

3 See Annex 7 for a summary of the mid-term evaluation
**Main results of MTE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation of evaluators</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>More transparency within project selection</strong></td>
<td>The project selection process was discussed and harmonised in the following way: In the pre-evaluation phase the compliance with formal criteria was checked. The Intermediate Bodies (IBs) examined the applications according to administrative criteria and eligibility criteria. The IBs evaluate the project also according to (a) core selection criteria, which is based on a standardised survey of the cross-border quality in the projects’ development, and implementation and (b) a survey and typology of the projects expected impacts on functionally integrated regional development. After completing the examination a summary assessment of these criteria was drawn up and reported by the respective IB to the Central Monitoring System (CMS). All projects with complete application form were reported in the CMS with status level 1 (first entry in CMS – obligatory) with defined minimum requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shorten procedures for approval and contracting and project implementation</strong></td>
<td>The programme bodies intensified the regular contact with beneficiaries. Furthermore seminars and workshop were held to inform beneficiaries about necessary steps and requirements during implementation (e.g. reporting; FLC standards). Further to workshops individual consultation was offered by the IBs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure transparency and wide publicity</strong></td>
<td>Information on selected projects and on projects results were communicated via different media (detailed information see chapter 4.4.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements within the indicator system</strong></td>
<td>The use of the cooperation indicator was discussed and made more transparent by using joint standards for classifying and selecting projects; common terms for “joint”, “mirror” and “other projects” were defined and included in the Programme Complement – Chapter 3 (definition of the common terms see chapter 2.2. in this report).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrate social partners in the operation of the programme committees</strong></td>
<td>Actually social partners were members of the JMC. The JTS offered these representatives (regular) information but in the end it had to be noticed that the representatives could not participate regularly in all the meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Standardized Reporting Tool</strong></td>
<td>The use of a Standardized Reporting Tool was proposed. Piloting took place in some of the projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Detailed information on the recommendation and the implementation is given in the up-date MTE report (there chapter 3)*
Up-date of the Mid-term evaluation

According to Working Paper 9 of the European Commission the up-date of MTE addressed the following issues:

- review of implementation of recommendations of MTE
- analysis of outputs and results
- analysis of impacts and likely achievement of objectives
- conclusions on efficiency, effectiveness and impact

It should be noticed that at the time the up-date MTE report was drafted most programme funds were already allocated to approved projects. Regarding project development and selection there was therefore little room for manoeuvre left.

When the five co-operation indicators were analysed in more detail it was identified that joint implementation and especially joint financing were still the least frequent. The rates for both indicators had only increased marginally since the MTE, which meant that even under INTERREG conditions joint implementation, let alone joint financing were still very difficult to achieve. Regarding joint financing two major imbalances existed: Costs occurred on the Slovene side could be (and were) accepted by the Austrian authorities, but funding of personnel costs of Austrian partners was not allowed by Slovene authorities. And in certain measures there were no more funds available for co-financing on the Austrian side.

It turned out that still a high percentage of projects fulfilled the criteria of being marked as “AA” project (at least two out of five stages of cooperation and at least two impact indicators fulfilled) – see table 4 – chapter 2.2. in this report.

With regard to the recommendation to analyse weaknesses of information flows and to agree on early cross-border exchanges of project information it can be reported that the IBs fostered bilateral informal exchanges. In these meetings they exchanged their views on the quality of project applications and they informed about project implementation.

With regard to the recommendation to use irritations in programme implementation as a joint learning opportunity the partners discussed differences and identified advantages and disadvantages (to remain/to be changed) for the next period.

The contact with project holders was intensified and they were assisted in case of interrupted partnerships and in identifying suitable replacements.

The up-date of the mid-term evaluation report Interreg IIIA Austria – Slovenia was finalised in due time and sent to the Commission on 22nd December 2005. The EC confirmed the completeness in its letter of February 17th 2006.

5 The conclusions on efficiency, effectiveness and impact as well as the recommendations of the up-date MTE report see Annex 8
On-going evaluation

In the framework of the on-going evaluation a research on the intensity and quality of cross-border cooperation on project level were conducted in the first half of 2004. Interviews with Austrian and Slovenian project partners were performed. The findings and conclusions were presented and discussed in bilateral meetings.

In the on-going evaluation the validity of the cooperation indicators in selected projects was addressed in case studies. This revealed that most of these indicators indicated in the application are really accomplished in practice.

The evaluators concluded the on-going evaluation by organising so called “learning platforms”: one took place in Vienna and addressed the Austrian programme stakeholders; a second addressed the Slovenian programme stakeholders. Finally on December 12th 2005 all partners discussed the results and draw a common picture. The workshops aimed at

- a structured reflection of programme authorities at the end of the evaluation process, at the interface of current and new programmes.
- a clarification of concerns/interests of programme partners and discussion of recommendations contained in the Up-dates of Mid-Term Evaluations.
- an identification of main experiences, which should be taken into account in the preparation of the new programmes and discussion of new requirements which are contained in the Commission proposals for the new Programme Territorial Co-operation (cross-border strand).
5. **Statement by the Managing Authority: Measures Taken to Ensure Coherence Between Community Policies and Overall Coordination**

It can be stated that the Managing Authority took the necessary measures pursuant to Art. 37(2)e) of Council Regulation (EC) No. 1260/1999 to ensure coherence with the community policies pursuant to Art. 12 of Council Regulation (EC) No. 1260/1999 and to ensure coordination with the overall Structural funds policy of the Commission pursuant to Art. 19(2) para 2 of Council Regulation (EC) No. 1260/1999.

In the course of pre-assessing project applications the responsible authorities verified whether the project applied for additional subsidies or whether such grants had already been given. Thereby it was secured that projects did not get double-financing and thus did not receive support from other funds (such as the EAGGF).

The MA took where applicable and within the scope of the Memorandum of Understanding appropriate measures within the framework of the assistance to ensure conformity with community policies (e.g. minimum requirements for subsidy contracts, rules for procedures for MC and SC).

According to the programme and the programme complement a project should not be funded if the EU policies, including the rules on competition, on the award of public contracts, on environmental protection and improvement and on the elimination of inequalities and the promotion of equality between men and women, were not respected.

Concerns of environmental protection, the promotion of equality between men and women, compatibility with the common rural policy, in particular with Art. 37, par. 2 of Council Regulation (EC) No. 1260/1999 and the contribution to the realisation of the European Employment Strategy were obeyed insofar as institutions/bodies/persons representing these concerns were represented in the programme committees. Project proposals were discussed by these committees during selection.

In the project application, among others, the contribution of the project to sustainable development and to equal opportunities had to be indicated.

During the project evaluation process the above-mentioned aspects were carefully checked to ensure that projects not coherent or in contrast with the relevant regulations on EU and national level were not selected.

In the ERDF contracts beneficiaries obliged themselves to comply with the European Union’s and national legislation, especially structural funds regulation, competition and public procurement law.

At the occasion of seminars bilateral contacts IBs, JTS and MA informed the project participants about legal provisions and programme rules that shall be observed by them.
During the project implementation phases the compliance of a project with relevant national and EU-regulations was checked by the first level control bodies (control according to Art. 4). In the course of the second level control (controls according to Art. 10) this aspect as well as the work performed by the first level control bodies were checked as well.

The Managing Authority monitored the developments in EU competition and procurement law and also used the Interact-platform for an exchange of experiences and best practises with regard to these issues with other programmes and the EC. In this way, it was ensured that appropriate information was provided to the responsible programme bodies and actors in the member states as well as the project participant.

The areas defined by the nature protection instrument Natura 2000 were respected by the programme administration and therefore, no negative effects are expected of the programme measures.

5.1 Coordination within Austria and within Slovenia

In Slovenia, the National Authority took every appropriate step in order to ensure the coordination of all of the community structural supports which were distributed to Slovenian beneficiaries. With regard to coherence with other Programmes, the National Authority participates in the Monitoring Committees of other Community Initiatives in Slovenia such as Equal and assures coordination with the Agriculture and Rural Development OP that contains a Leader+ type measure. The National Authority had also direct access for the Slovenian Joint Monitoring and Information System (EMIR) of all the relevant OP’s of the CSF. Thus the overall information about the possible project list of the different instruments was concentrated in “one hand”.

As an Austrian internal discussion forum the Austrian Conference on Regional Planning (ÖROK) had installed a specific working group for authorities participating in the management of EU programmes. The working group met regularly to discuss topics and requests of interest from a cross-programme perspective for the stakeholders of EU-programmes in the Austrian administration. It developed its role as an important information network, coordination framework and decision-making body. In the working group all Managing Authorities of programmes for Objective regions and Community Initiative Programmes plus the co-funding ministries at national level were represented.
6. **Activities 2008**

The following chapter describes activities carried out in the year 2008.

The activities primarily focused on the following areas of work which are:

- **on project level**
  - sound finalization of projects including the reporting into the monitoring system

- **on programme level**
  - financial implementation (including payments to final beneficiaries, preparation of closure exercise)
  - information and publicity activities
  - support of new programme ETC Austria - Slovenia 2007-2013 – knowledge transfer

6.1 **Changes in the general conditions with importance for the implementation of the assistance**

No significant changes in the general conditions with importance for the implementation of the assistance can be reported. Thus the objectives, priorities and measures of the programme are still relevant and coherent with the challenges and potentials in the programme area.

Detailed information on the general trends of the last years is provided in the socio-economic analysis of the operational programme ETC Austria-Slovenia 2007-2013 (which was approved in December 2007 by the European Commission). A summary of the trends is provided in chapter 1.2. of this document.

6.2 **Progress at Priority and measure level**

General implementation went smoothly and according to plan in 2008.

In the year 2008 additional ERDF funds were approved for 3 projects by the Joint Steering Committee (JSC). Furthermore the JMC approved changes in the financial plan of the PC and the JMC approved the annual report 2007.

Already at the end of 2007 it became clear that in some measures not all projects would use the originally planned (and therefore committed) budgets but less whereas in other measures more money could be spent. In order to make full use of the remaining funds another shift of financial allocation on Programme Complement level was initiated and approved by the Joint Monitoring Committee (JMC) in October 2008. The revised financial tables and the revised Programme Complement (PC) were sent to the Commission on 27.10.2008. The EC confirmed the revised PC in a letter dated December 17th 2008.
Detailed information to achieved Indicators on programme, priority level and measure level as well as information on the use of Technical Assistance is provided in chapter 3 of this document.

6.3 Financial Engineering

Annex 5 provides a detailed overview of the financial implementation of the intervention on priority and measure level for the year 2008. Cumulated figures for the programme period 2000-2008 are provided in Annex 3. It can be noticed that in every single measure and hence in every priority - with the exception of priority 4 “Special Support to Border Regions” - expenditure was effected in 2008.

6.3.1. Forecasts and payments received in 2008

Table 13 compares the annual forecast of application for payment for 2008 with payments received from the EU in 2008 as well as the cumulated payments 2001-2008. The forecast was submitted in April 30th 2008.

Table 13
Forecast for and Payments received in 2008 (in Euro)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forecast (ERDF) 2008</th>
<th>Payments received in 2008</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Advance Payments received 2001</th>
<th>Payments received 2001-2008</th>
<th>Total ERDF allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.360.000</td>
<td>3.571.314,36</td>
<td>21.02.2008</td>
<td>1.908.340,00</td>
<td>29.845.250,40</td>
<td>33.424.832,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.086.565,31</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.05.2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.273.948,23</td>
<td></td>
<td>01.09.2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.421.037,64</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.12.2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.352.865,54</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 Steps taken by the Managing Authority and the Monitoring Committee to ensure the quality and effectiveness of implementation.

For detailed information on steps taken by the MA (in close cooperation with the NA) and the MC to ensure the quality and effectiveness of implementation of the programme please see chapter 4 of this report.

As already mentioned in chapter 6.2, the MA initiated and the MC approved a financial shift within the financial table on Programme Complement (PC) level in order to maximise the full use of the remaining funds. The revised financial tables and the revised Programme Complement was sent to the Commission on October 27th 2008. The EC confirmed the revised PC in a letter dated December 17th 2008.
6.4.1. Report on the activities of the JMC and JSC

No JMC or JSC meeting took place in 2008. Written procedures concerning amendments and/or changes of financial tables were launched on:
- June 5th 2008
- July 14th 2008
- September 12th 2008

The written procedures were launched for the approval of the increased ERDF contributions for two TA projects, for the approval of changes in the financial table of the Programme Complement, for the approval of additional funds for one TA project and on the Annual Implementation Report 2007.

Knowledge transfer between “old” and “new” programme:

The Federal Chancellery in its function as Managing Authority for four INTERREG IIIA programmes took initiative to organise a cross-programme seminar on the exchange of experience made in CBC projects in the programme period 2000-06 and to discuss how future programme partners can best build on this knowledge base.

The seminar “CBC SO FAR” took place on October 16th 2008 in Eisenstadt. All programme partners of the INTERREG IIIA and Objective 3 programmes of Austria with its neighbouring countries Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, Hungary and Slovenia were invited. Hans Niessl, Governor of Burgenland, and Commissioner Danuta Hübner provided statements.

Table 14

Programme of the seminar „CBC SO FAR – lessons learned from the programme period“

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Alexandra Deimel</th>
<th>Federal Chancellery</th>
<th>Setting the frame for the seminar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speeches</td>
<td>Moray Gilland</td>
<td>European Commission - Unit E1</td>
<td>What does the Commission expect from good programmes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katrin Stockhammer</td>
<td>INTERACT Point Vienna</td>
<td>Activities of INTERACT for the initiation of good projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Csaba Horváth</td>
<td>VATI/former Hungarian JTS</td>
<td>Project Rap – The experience in Hungary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irene Brickner</td>
<td>Der Standard (Press/Austrian Newspaper)</td>
<td>What does the press need to sell good projects?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a result “food for thought” was provided to all programme partners of the old and the new programmes (see also Annex 6).

6.5 Actions taken by the Financial Control

The audits required pursuant to Chapter IV of Regulation (EC) 438/2001 have been conducted on the Austrian side according to the annual audit plan of 2008. Reports on single audits were made and executive summaries have been sent to the European Commission.

The summarising annual report 2008 pursuant to Art. 13 of Regulation (EC) 438/2001 has been communicated in a written procedure and has been submitted by June 2009 to the European Commission under no. BKA-403.621/0011-IV/3/2009.

6.6 Summary of problems encountered in managing the assistance.

No problems occurred during the reporting period.

For more details on problems which occurred during the whole implementation period see chapter 4.3. of this report.

6.7 Use of Technical Assistance

Within priority 7 “Technical Assistance” no new project was approved in 2008. Within the projects of the MA/NA and the IBs activities were implemented and most of the activities were finalised in December 2008 as the eligibility ended at 31.12.2008 (e.g. JTS was closed in December 2008). Some management tasks (e.g. Central Monitoring System, costs of operative PA) will be financed by national means until the final payment of ERDF is received from the European Commission.
Detailed information on the use of the TA within the programme is provided in chapter 3.2. of this report.

6.8 Information and publicity activities undertaken

6.8.1. Project Documentation on Website

Concerning the description of key projects the JTS finished in 2008 a “project documentation” collecting and compiling results and outputs of (nearly) finalised projects. For each single project additional information (such as reports, studies, photos, websites etc.) was collected in an documentary archive. For that purpose the JTS asked the project owners for relevant information and comprised the information at the programme’s website www.at-si.net under the heading “projects/results”. Below you find a screenshot of a project described in German and one in Slovene language. For more information have a look at the programmes website www.at-si.net.

Due to the end of eligibility of costs and due to the fact that the web site was visited only sporadical since summer 2009 the web-site was closed in November 2009.
6.8.2. Activities undertaken by IBs in 2008

Information and publicity activities undertaken


Detailed information on publicity activities which were implemented by the MA, NA and Intermediate Bodies is provided in chapter 4.4 of this report.

6.9 Measures taken to ensure coherence between community policies and overall coordination

See chapter 5.
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## Annex 1

### Implementation: Total Number of Projects - Expenditure on Priority and Measure level 01/01/2000-31/12/2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Total/Plan</th>
<th>Total Public Expenditure</th>
<th>Total Public / Plan</th>
<th>ERDF</th>
<th>ERDF / Plan</th>
<th>National Total</th>
<th>National Total / Plan</th>
<th>National Public</th>
<th>National Public / Plan</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Private / Plan</th>
<th>Share of Total</th>
<th>Share of ERDF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Economic Co-operation</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>24.022.068,01</td>
<td>95,75%</td>
<td>21.249.364,30</td>
<td>93,32%</td>
<td>12.529.344,49</td>
<td>12.529.344,49</td>
<td>11.492.723,52</td>
<td>98,56%</td>
<td>8.720.019,81</td>
<td>155,86%</td>
<td>2.772.703,71</td>
<td>45,71%</td>
<td>37,60%</td>
<td>39,19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Tourism</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10.094.118,99</td>
<td>97,15%</td>
<td>8.903.102,26</td>
<td>92,85%</td>
<td>4.801.963,81</td>
<td>4.801.963,81</td>
<td>3.610.977,08</td>
<td>185,51%</td>
<td>1.191.016,73</td>
<td>43,40%</td>
<td>15,80%</td>
<td>16,55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Rural Development</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.243.782,86</td>
<td>95,16%</td>
<td>4.203.544,67</td>
<td>94,45%</td>
<td>2.552.207,41</td>
<td>2.552.207,41</td>
<td>1.511.969,22</td>
<td>91,16%</td>
<td>1.040.238,19</td>
<td>103,82%</td>
<td>8,21%</td>
<td>8,42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Human Resources and Regional Co-operation</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15.448.707,75</td>
<td>98,32%</td>
<td>13.833.363,39</td>
<td>93,52%</td>
<td>7.895.397,68</td>
<td>7.895.397,68</td>
<td>6.280.053,32</td>
<td>121,31%</td>
<td>1.615.344,36</td>
<td>65,70%</td>
<td>24,18%</td>
<td>23,63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Human Resources Development - Labour Market</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.411.980,45</td>
<td>93,08%</td>
<td>3.107.583,49</td>
<td>92,39%</td>
<td>1.759.228,63</td>
<td>1.759.228,63</td>
<td>1.652.751,82</td>
<td>96,25%</td>
<td>304.396,96</td>
<td>55,34%</td>
<td>5,34%</td>
<td>5,50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Regional Co-operation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.622.091,74</td>
<td>98,35%</td>
<td>7.310.710,38</td>
<td>96,77%</td>
<td>3.800.963,53</td>
<td>3.800.963,53</td>
<td>3.489.582,17</td>
<td>137,89%</td>
<td>311.381,36</td>
<td>24,50%</td>
<td>11,93%</td>
<td>11,95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Co-operation in Education and Cultural Affairs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.414.635,56</td>
<td>102,74%</td>
<td>3.415.069,52</td>
<td>90,50%</td>
<td>2.441.682,33</td>
<td>2.441.682,33</td>
<td>1.442.116,29</td>
<td>117,15%</td>
<td>999.566,04</td>
<td>112,82%</td>
<td>6,91%</td>
<td>6,17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sustainable Spatial Development</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>19537523,16</td>
<td>106,08%</td>
<td>19021926,57</td>
<td>106,18%</td>
<td>9.584.957,05</td>
<td>9.584.957,05</td>
<td>9.436.969,50</td>
<td>113,10%</td>
<td>515.596,59</td>
<td>102,71%</td>
<td>30,58%</td>
<td>29,98%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Sustainable Spatial and Environmental Development</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.329.161,74</td>
<td>103,44%</td>
<td>4.260.216,74</td>
<td>104,06%</td>
<td>2.415.770,71</td>
<td>2.415.770,71</td>
<td>1.913.391,03</td>
<td>105,78%</td>
<td>68.945,00</td>
<td>75,76%</td>
<td>6,78%</td>
<td>7,56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3. Environment and Energy Management</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.943.754,03</td>
<td>100,42%</td>
<td>6.627.666,63</td>
<td>104,82%</td>
<td>3.469.384,86</td>
<td>3.469.384,86</td>
<td>3.358.281,77</td>
<td>111,61%</td>
<td>116.087,40</td>
<td>28,95%</td>
<td>10,87%</td>
<td>10,85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Special Support for Border Regions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.176.414,34</td>
<td>128,02%</td>
<td>2.061.238,04</td>
<td>138,24%</td>
<td>847.702,58</td>
<td>847.702,58</td>
<td>1.213.535,46</td>
<td>189,32%</td>
<td>115.176,30</td>
<td>55,11%</td>
<td>3,41%</td>
<td>2,65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1. Special Support for Border Regions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.176.414,34</td>
<td>128,02%</td>
<td>2.061.238,04</td>
<td>138,24%</td>
<td>847.702,58</td>
<td>847.702,58</td>
<td>1.213.535,46</td>
<td>189,32%</td>
<td>115.176,30</td>
<td>55,11%</td>
<td>3,41%</td>
<td>2,66%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Technical Assistance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.701.936,18</td>
<td>97,21%</td>
<td>2.701.936,18</td>
<td>97,21%</td>
<td>1.455.708,88</td>
<td>1.455.708,88</td>
<td>1.246.227,30</td>
<td>97,41%</td>
<td>1.246.227,30</td>
<td>97,41%</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
<td>4,23%</td>
<td>4,55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1. Technical Assistance I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.113.795,30</td>
<td>96,73%</td>
<td>2.113.795,30</td>
<td>96,73%</td>
<td>1.135.647,36</td>
<td>1.135.647,36</td>
<td>978.147,94</td>
<td>96,48%</td>
<td>978.147,94</td>
<td>96,48%</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
<td>3,31%</td>
<td>3,55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2. Technical Assistance II</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>588.140,88</td>
<td>98,99%</td>
<td>588.140,88</td>
<td>98,99%</td>
<td>320.061,52</td>
<td>320.061,52</td>
<td>268.079,36</td>
<td>100,96%</td>
<td>268.079,36</td>
<td>100,96%</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
<td>0,92%</td>
<td>1,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>279</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.886.649,44</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,30%</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.867.828,48</strong></td>
<td><strong>108,09%</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.971.023,09</strong></td>
<td><strong>95,65%</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.915.626,35</strong></td>
<td><strong>105,43%</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.896.805,39</strong></td>
<td><strong>127,86%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.018.820,96</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,34%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2 – best practice projects – examples

Measure 1.1.

Sinergija tehnologij, znanja in inovativnosti: Tehnološka os Maribor - Gradec / Synergie der Technologien, des Wissens und der Innovativität: Technologieachse Maribor – Graz

Nositel projektu / Projektratgeber:
Štajerski tehnološki park
Pesnica pri Mariboru 20 a, 2211 Pesnica pri Mariboru, Tanja Senčičk

Projektni partner v sosednji državi / Projektpartner im Nachbarland:
Fast Forward Region GmbH
Peter Perkun

Nadaljnji projektni partnerji / Weitere Projektpartner:
MRA – Euro Info Center Maribor, G2S – Območna zbomica Maribor, Območna obrtna zbomica Maribor, CIMRŠ Univerze v Mariboru (vsi Slovenija) ter Technologieachse GmbH, Avstrija

Povezava do projektno spletno strani / Link zur Projektwebsite:
www.stp.uni-mb.si

Ergebnisse / Rezultati:

Projekt je bil usmerjen v izvedbo naslednjih komplementarnih aktivnosti zrcalnemu projektu Technologieachse Graz–Maribor pod okriljem avstrijske SFG, z namenom kreiranje konkurenčne pozicije podjetij v cilni regiji, njihovega prekomejšega sodelovanja, aktivnega transferja tehnologije in uspešne gospodarske promocije prekomejšte štajerske regije kot celote:

1. analiza potencialov tehnološkega in organizacijskega znanja in potreb po njem, vzpostavitev spletnega platforme z bazo ponudbe in povpraševanja po znanju;
2. povezovanje podjetij in razširjanje znanja (2 posvetovanj za promocijo inovacijske dejavnosti, srečanje zainteresiranih partnerjev na področju transferja tehnologij, medinstitutionalna srečanja za področje informacijskih in komunikacijskih tehnologij – IKT ter prehrane, 2 čezmejni podjetniški srečanj na področjih IKT in prehrane ter 2 delavnic »Know-How-Express« za pripravo podjetij na uspešno prekomejšno povezovanje);
3. promocija aktivnosti za ustvarjanje pogojev za gospodarsko uveljavitev SLO in A Štajerske regije kot celote in njeno učinkovito promocijo z informiranjem o projektu (4 trskane izvode »Novic STPz založenka za področje prenosa znanja in tehnologij, 14 izvodov elektronskih e-novic)

Če povzamemo izkušnje STP, je bil odziv podjetij na izvedene aktivnosti zelo pozitiven, saj so dobili kar nekaj novih možnosti za izkanje partnerjev, pridobivanje informacij splo. STP namerava v prihodnje projekti še nadgraditi in nadaljevati s takšnimi in podobnimi aktivnostmi.

Na nivoju projektnega partnerstva smo dosegli sinergijo sodelovanja v okviru projektnih aktivnosti ter na podlagi dobrih izkušenj že zasnovali nove skupne projekte, na osnovi poglavljenega sodelovanja pričakujemo dosagevanje skupnih pozitivnih rezultatov tudi v prihodnje.
Measure 1.2.

Naturraum Vellachtal - Logarska Dolina Infrastruktur Naturpark Karawanken / Infrastruktura Naravni park Karavanke

Projekträger / Nosilec projekta: Verein Regionalentwicklung Südkiöten Klagenerfurter Straße 10, A-9100 Völkermarkt Peter Pemmer

Projektpartner im Nachbarland / Projektni partner v sosednji državi: Logarska dolina d.o.o., Avgust Lenar

Weitere Projektpartner / Nadaljnji projektni partnerji: Tourismusverein Bad Eisenkappel, Marktgemeinde Bad Eisenkappel, Obir-Tropfsteinhöhlen-Errichtungs- und Betriebsges.m.b.H. (OTH)

Link zu Projektwert / Povezava do projektna spletna strani: keine vorhanden

Realisierungszeitraum / Obdobje uresničevanja: 01/2003 – 05/2005

abgerechnete Gesamtkosten / Obračunani celotni stroški: 433,851,85 €
EFRE: Anteil / od tega delež ERDF: 216,925,92 €
nationale Kofinanzierung / nacionalni vir sofinancranja: BMWA, Eigenmittel des Projektträgers

Ergebnisse / Rezultati:

Ziel des Projektes war einerseits die Grundlagenerhebung für die Errichtung eines Naturparks Karawanken und andererseits die Attraktivitätssteigerung des Naturdenkmals Obir Tropfsteinhöhlen und eine weitere Aufbereitung und Präsentation der Trögener Klamme und der Mineralquellen des Vellachtales als specifische naturnahliche Attraktionen.

Die Planung eines Landschaftsparks Karawanken/Steiner Alpen umfasste: zwei Exkursionen; Mitarbeit an der Erstellung des grenzüberschreitenden Ausflugskataloges und einer touristischen Karte; Workshop zu grenzüberschreitenden Entwicklungsszenarien eines gemeinsamen Naturparks unter zusätzlicher Beteiligung von CIPRA Slowenien; Vorbereitung und Planung eines Spiegelprojektes unter dem Titel „Regionale räumliche Entwicklung der Steiner Alpen“, regelmäßige Abstimmungen der Entwicklungen beiderseits der Grenze – v.a. SWOT-Analyse im Auftrag von Logarska dolina d.o.o. zum Thema Regionalpark Steiner Alpen; Teilnahme an der Konferenz „Zukünftiger Regionalpark entlang der Grenze“ im Landschaftspark Topla Tal.

In der Trögener Klamme konnten alle Vorhaben mit Ausnahme des Holzlagerplatzes umgesetzt werden. Auch der Mineralquelle-Erlebnisweg wurde fertiggestellt. Dazu wurde eine wissenschaftliche Auswertung abgeschlossen und die notwendigen Infrastrukturmaßnahmen gesetzt. Das Teilprojekt Obir Tropfsteinhöhlen wurde bereits zum Zeitpunkt der Zwischenauszahlung fertiggestellt.
Measure 1.3.

BIO ALPE ADRIA „Ökokommunikation“ / Ekološka komunikacija

Projekträger / Nosilec projekta:
BIO ERANTE AUSTRIA – Steiermark
Krottendorferstraße 81
8052 Graz-Weizelsdorf
Josef Renner

Projektpartner im Nachbarland / Projektni partner v sosednji državi:
BIODAR Zveza združenj ekoloških kmetov
Slovenije, Metelkova 6, SI-1000 Ljubljana
Anamaria Slabe

Weitere Projektpartner / Nadaljnji projektni partnerji:
Weitere Projektpartner

Link zur Projektwebsite / Povezava do projektni spletni strani:
www.ente-steiermark.at

Realisierungszeitraum / Obdobje uresničevanja:
05/2004 - 06/2008

abgerechnete Gesamtkosten / Obračunani celotni stroški: 214.884,88 €
EFRE-Anteil / od tega delož ERDF: 107.442,44 €
nationale Kofinanzierung / nacionalni vir sofinanciranja: Land Steiermark,
Eigenmittel des Projekträchers

Ergebnisse / Rezultati:


Measure 2.1.

TE.TR.A.P.A.C.S. - Razvoj standardov kakovosti za mentorje v integrativnem izobraževanju in usposabljanju / Die Entwicklung von Qualitätsstandards für Mentoren in der integrativen Aus- und Fortbildung

Nosilec projekta / Projektträger:
Inštitut Republike Slovenije za rehabilitacijo Linhartova 51, 2000 Ljubljana
Zdenka Wlavianky

Projektni partner v sosednji državi / Projektpartner im Nachbarland:
BFI Klagenfurt
Monika Meszar

Nadaljnji projektni partnerj / Weitere Projektpartner:
Zavod Republike Slovenije za zaposlovanje
Ekonomski inštitut d.o.o. Maribor

Povezava do projektne spletni strani / Link zur Projektwebsite:
www.ucpoodlete-ins.orgetrapacs

Obdobje uresničavanja / Realisierungszeitraum:
03/2005 – 03/2007

Obračunani celotni stroški / abgerechnete Gesamtkosten: 84.299,23 €
od tega delež ERDF / EFRE-Anteil: 63.224,41 €
nacionalni viši sofinanciranja / nationale Kofinanzierung: SLVR in lastno financiranje

Ergebnisse / Rezultati:

Namen projekta je bil izobraževanje mentorjev v programih za izobraževanje odraslih v obeh državah, v Sloveniji in Avstriji in razvoj poklicnih kvalifikacij za osebe, ki delajo na programih, skupen razvoj kvalitativnih in kvantitativnih standardov znanj ter realizacija pilotskega usposabljanja mentorjev z certificiranje programa.

V okviru projekta so razvili metodologijo in standardne kakovosti za mentorje, ki usposabljajo z delom mlade in brezposelne osebe brez delovnih izkušenj. V obeh državah, v Sloveniji in Avstriji, so sočasno izvedli usposabljanje skupine mentorjev »Mentor« – usmerjavalec učnih in delovnih procesov v štirih modulih. Izvedli so dve čezmejni izmenjavi mentorjev. Končni produkt projektne aktivnosti predstavlja Priročnik za mentorje pri usposabljanju z delom. Vsa se najde kratka navodila, ki bodo v pomoč mentorjem, ki delajo in poučujejo udeležence v procesu praktičnega usposabljanja z delom.

S projektom so bile vzpostavljene prekomejne in teritorialne povezave tako glede uspособljanja in zaposlovanja mentorjev kot na področju raziskovalnega dela ter značilne priateljske vezi. Skupen cilj projekta je razviti gospodarsko, družbeno in kulturno povezavo omejenih regij Slovenije in Avstrijne za učinkovito združevanje novih priložnosti, ki jih prinaša pristop Slovenije k Evropski uniji. Partnerstvo v projektu omogoča transparentnost in primerljivost poklicnega standarda ter vzpostavitev prekomejnih povezav glede usposabljanja in zaposlovanja mentorjev. S tem se je povečala konkurenčnost in mobilnost kandidatov (udeležencev usposabljanja) na Evropskem trgu dela. Model usposabljanja mentorjev je postal trajna oblika usposabljanja mentorjev v Sloveniji in Avstriji.

- 5 strokovnih srečanj projektne skupine iz obeh držav za izvedbo skupine evalvacije projekta
- 2 čezmejni izmenjavi skupine mentorjev, eno v Avstriji in eno v Sloveniji

  Priročnik za mentorje pri usposabljanju z delom, informativna zloženka in zbornik konferenca
  pridobitev TETRAPACS
  zloženka TETRAPACS
  Spletna stran
  Organizacija in izvedba zaključne konferenca v Mariboru

A Avstriji obstaja zrcalni projekt.
Measure 2.3.

Jugend-Grenze-Identität / Mladina Meja Identiteta

Projektreger / Nosilec projekta:
Jugend- und Kulturzentrum HOUSE,
Quellengasse 2, 8440 Mureck
Roland Aldren, Baldi.

Projektpartner im Nachbarland / Projektni
partner v sosednji državi:
Mladinski Kulturni Center Maribor
Dragica Marinic: Tel: +386 52300239-0

Weitere Projektpartner / Nadaljnji projektni
partnerji:
Weitere Projektpartner

Link zur Projektwebsite / Povezava do
projektne spletni strani:
www.politzen.at

Ergebnisse / Rezultati:


Der Satz Misli preko meje / Denken über die Grenze erscheint als probates Motto für jugendliche Initiative.

Weitere aktuelle Inhalte über das Projekt:

- Erstellung einer Dachmarke
- Vernetzung der relevanten Organisationen
- Aufbau der Internetplattform
- Zusammenarbeit: Vernetzungstreffen, gemeinsame Arbeit an der Homepage, laufende gemeinsame "Befüllung" und Aktualisierung der Inhalte

Auf der Slowenischen Seite wurde ein Spiegelprojekt umgesetzt.
REGIO ART - Sinergije Regijskih Mladinskih Kulturnih Identitet / Synergie der Regionalen Jugendkulturidentitäten

Nosilec projekta / Projektträger:
Mladinski Kulturni Center Maribor
Ljubljanska Ulica 4, 2000 Maribor
Aleš Novak

Projektni partner v sodnem državi / Projektpartner im Nachbarland:
Jug House Mureck, Jugend-und Kulturverein Mureck, Roland Aihard

Nadaljnji projektni partnerji / Weitere Projektpartner:
Nadaljnji projektni partnerji

Povezava do projektne spletni strani / Link zur Projektwebsite:
www.regioart.eu

Obdobje uresničevanja / Realisierungszeitraum

Obračunani celotni stroški / abgerechnete Gesamtkosten: 51.440,21 €
od tega delež ERDF / EFRE, Anteil: 26.520,14 €
nacionalni viri sofinanciranja / nationale Kofinanzierung: SLVR / GOSP

Rezultati / Ergebnisse:

Kulturni inkubator: vzpostavitev regijskega kulturnega, informacijsko-izobraževalnega inkubatorja za področje mladinske kulture: Koroška cesta 18, 2000 Maribor, tel.: +386 2 2500322

izvedba modula reforalnega izobraževanja za mlade s področja računalniškega opismenovanja in umetniškega ustvarjanja z uporabo sedožne računalniške in video tehnologije

izvedba javnega natečaja za najboljše fotografije s področja romske kulture v čezmejnem območju: potujoča razstava v partnerskih mestih: Murska Sobota, Ptuj, Celovec, Mureck, Ljubljana, Gradec in Maribor, virtualna razstava na spletni strani

izdelava slovenščinsko-nemške zloženke o razstavi.

izvedba manjše raziskave o mladinski kulturi, mladinskih prostorih v mestih: Maribor, Gradec, Murska Sobota, Bad Radkersburg, Cmurek, Celovec in Ptuj. Rezultati so zbornik Toposi mestnih organizmov, virtualna razstava na spletni strani in video film na CD zapisu, ki je priložen v zborniku.

Kulturo imenjave

Skizo projekt je bil dosežen osnovni cilj, to je intenzivirati kulturni razvoj in dejavnosti kulturnega življenja regije z usmerjanjem čim večjega števila mladih kulturnih strokovnjakov, umetnikov in ustvarjalcev v kulturne aktivnosti v čezmejnem območju na regionalni, državni in mednarodni ravni ter razvijati medsebojno razumevanje in zaupanje v duh izboljšanja sodobnega območja in izboljšane komunikacije ter vzpostavitve kulturne identitete skozi prireditve za spodbujanje čezmejnijih vezi.

Prav tako je bil dosežen osrednji cilj projekta dodane vrednosti s pozitivnimi vplivi in sinergijskimi učinki, tako, da smo skupaj s partnerji in z drugimi programi in ustvarili pogoje, ki služijo k spodbudi za nadaljnje projekte na kulturnem področju, ki ustrezajo posameznim programskim ciljem čezmejnega območja. Dosežen bil je tudi cilj, ki je zajemal posebni vpliv na izvajanje EU politik, s pozitivnimi vplivi na trajnostni okoljski in kulturni razvoj, vključujoč socialno pravičnost in enakost smo omogočali tudi integracijo načela enakosti med spoloma.
Measure 3.1.

LOPTREG - Povečanje učinkovitosti obrambe pred točo z vzpostavitvijo skupnega čezmejnega sistema obrambe pred točo z letali / Erhöhung der Effizienz der Hagelabwehr durch Einführung eines gemeinsamen grenzüberschreitenden Systems der Hagelabwehr mit Flugzeugen

Nosilec projekta / Projektträger:
Letalski center Maribor, Športno društvo Ljubljanska 4/f, SI-2000 Maribor
Gregor Andrej, Tomaz Pilbertek (vodja projekta): lsmaribor@spi.net

Projektni partner v sosednji državi / Projektpartner im Nachbarland:
Steirische Hagelabwehr genossenschaft reg. Gen.m.b.H., Hans - Suchgasse 5, A-8010 Graz
Karl Domintheuer

Nadaljnj projektni partnerji / Weitere Projektpartner:
Univerza v Mariboru, Fakulteta za gradbeništvo, Center za gradbeno informatiko

Povezava do projektne spletne strani / Link zur Projektwebsite:
gallery balancercenter.com, www.lcm.si

Obdobje uresničevanja / Realisierungszeitraum:

Obračunani celotni stroški / abgerechnete Gesamtkosten: 115.187,95 €
odd tega delež LRDF / EFRE Anteil: 86.390,93 €
nacionalni viri sofinanciranja / nationale Kofinanzierung: SLVR

Rezultati / Ergebnisse:

Cilji projekta so bili vzpostavitev čezmejnega sodelovanja na področju obrambe pred točo z letali in vzpostavitev čezmejne podatkovne baze ter informacijskega sistema za razvoj skupnega sistema obrambe pred točo, povezati nosilce razvoja in izvajalce dejavnosti obrambe pred točo z letali ter izkoriščati in optimizirati obstoječo infrastrukturo in sodobne elektronske naprave za izboljšanje učinkovitosti obrambe pred točo na čezmejnem območju. Vzpostavljen je bil sistem koordinacije izvajanja obrambe proti toči na skupnem čezmejnem območju ter izdelek model, ki omogoča prenos sistema obrambe pred točo z letali na druga potencialna območja, kjer se obramba pred točo še ne izvaja.

Ustavljena je bila projektna pisarna za pripravo delavnih gradiv in učinkovito spremljanje projekta, pomenoto čezmejno spremljanje in znesanje podatkov ter vzpostavitev skupne baze podatkov kot platformo za analizo in skupno načrtovanje obrambe proti toči. Izdelana je bila študija kompatibilnosti obstoječih podatkov, računalniška platforma za bazo podatkov, orodij in vmesniki za kontinuirano zbiranje in obdelavo podatkov, programska oprema za pripravo predhodno definiranih poročil in analiz, načrtovanje in implementacija komponent sistema, vzpostavitev sistema sledljivosti letala, delavnice za pripravo programa ter izobraževanje za izvajalce obrambe proti toči. Izveden je bil tudi mednarodni simpozij za strokovno javnost, novinarske konference in “dan odprtih vrat” v LC Maribor ter izdelana in vzpostavljena spletna stran.
Measure 3.2.

Gozd in voda / Wald und Wasser

Nosilec projekta / Projektrager:
Zavod za gozdove Slovenije
Centralna enota Ljubljana, Območna enota Bled
Ljubljanaska cesta 19, 4260 Bled
Andrej Gartner, phone: +386 041 657 101

Projektni partner v sosednji državi / Projektpartner im Nachbarland:
Amt der Kärntner Landesregierung
Abteilung 10F – Landesforsdirektion
Bahnhotplatz 5, A-9021 Klagenfurt
Gerold Baumgartner

Nadaljnji projektni partnerji / Weitere Projektpartner:
Gozdarski inštitut Slovenije

Povezava do projektna spletna strani / Link zur Projektwebsite:
www.zgs.gov.si

Obdobje ureditev / Realisierungszeitraum:
03/2005 - 12/2007

Obračunani celotni stroški / abgerechnete Gesamtkosten: 138.489,54 €
od tega delež ERDF / EFRE-Anteil 103.887,14 €
nacionalni viri sponzoriranja / nationale Kofinanzierung: SLVR

Rezultati / Ergebnisse:

Projektni cilji so bili naslednji:

- analiza stanja gozdov z vidika opravljanja hidrološke vloge
- metodološka analiza ter primerjava gozdarske politike in gojitev ukrepov na obeh straneh meje
- priprava osnov za meddržavno sodelovanje pri harmonizaciji ukrepov potrebnih za zagotavljanje optimalne sposobnosti gozdov za opravljanje hidrološke vloge ter
- proučitev trajnosti gozdov v slovenskem delu pružačnega območja (z vidika okoljskih, socialnih in ekonomskih kazalcev)

V projektu so uključili geografski gozdarski informacijski sistem za potrebe obeh gozdarskih in drugih okoljskih služb (sestojni tipi gozdov, varovalna in hidrološka funkcija gozda itn.). Metoda za vrednotenje varovalne in hidrološke vloge gozda je bila poenotena. In uključene in primernije usmerene za gospodarjenje z gozdovi za hidrološko in varovalno vlogo gozdov na obeh straneh meje so bile predlagane. Presodili so dosedanj razvoj gozdov z vidika trajnost in prenesli dosegke v gozdarski praksi obeh držav in v evropsko prakso (izobraževanje strokovnega gozdarstva cadru za krepitev hidrološke in varovalne vloge). Na tej podlagi je planirano večje sodelovanje v prihodnje. Ne zlasti je bila promocija obmejne gozdnate regije in gozdarskih strokov in navajava tesnejših stikov med obema gozdarstvima strokovom pomemben del aktivnosti.

Zralni projekt v Avstriji
Measure 3.3.

Maßnahmen Lebensraum Unteres Murtal - Umsetzungsmaßnahmen zur Ressourcen- und Lebensraumsicherung / Življenjski prostor Spodnja dolina Mure – uresničevalni ukrepi za zagotavljanje virov in življenjskega prostora


- die Mur auf einer Länge von insgesamt 1.800m aufgeweitet
- 220.000m³ Schiefliefer wurden zur Verhinderung einer weiteren Eintiefung der Mursohle beigegeben
- 3½ha dynamischer Mur- und Au-Lebensraum geschaffen sowie
- insgesamt 45.000m² Neubaunachbarschaft reaktiviert und/oder verlängert
- 12 sogenannte SchAlPlätze, die an allen wichtigen Maßnahmen errichtet wurden, bieten Informationen zum Projekt
- Die Ausstellung „Leben an der Mur“ sowie die zum „Museum im Alten Zeughaus“ Bad Radkersburg gehörenden 10 Antennen
- Flusslandschaft Stationen zeigen die Wechselbeziehungen zwischen den Menschen, ihrem Lebens- und Kulturraum und der Umwelt aus historischer und zeitgenössischer Sicht.
Annex 3
Total expenditure broken down by fields of intervention at measure level
(according to closure guidelines Annex 1, 5c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spalte</th>
<th>Total allocation 1</th>
<th>Total eligible actually paid and certified expenditure 2</th>
<th>% of eligible cost 3</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>field of intervention</th>
<th>field of intervention (in %) 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P 1 Economic Co-operation</td>
<td>26,087,511.00</td>
<td>24,922,089.00</td>
<td>95.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.1 Economic Development</td>
<td>9,187,128.00</td>
<td>8,954,169.00</td>
<td>94.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.2 Tourism</td>
<td>10,300,007.00</td>
<td>10,024,119.00</td>
<td>97.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.3 Rural Development</td>
<td>5,510,376.00</td>
<td>5,243,783.00</td>
<td>95.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 2 Human Resources and Regional Development</td>
<td>15,712,492.00</td>
<td>15,448,708.00</td>
<td>98.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2.1 Human Resources Development - Labour Market</td>
<td>3,865,502.00</td>
<td>3,411,080.00</td>
<td>93.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2.2 Regional Co-operation</td>
<td>7,746,971.00</td>
<td>7,622,052.00</td>
<td>98.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2.3 Co-operation in Education and Cultural Affairs</td>
<td>4,107,019.00</td>
<td>4,114,638.00</td>
<td>102.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interreg IIIA Austria - Slovenia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P 3</td>
<td>Sustainable Spatial Development</td>
<td>18,417,073</td>
<td>19,637,523</td>
<td>106,68</td>
<td>103,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3.1</td>
<td>Spatial Development and Transport</td>
<td>7,317,542</td>
<td>8,294,027</td>
<td>112,95</td>
<td>128,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3.2</td>
<td>Sustainable Spatial and Environmental Development</td>
<td>4,165,129</td>
<td>4,329,162</td>
<td>103,44</td>
<td>124,90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3.3</td>
<td>Environmental and Energy Management</td>
<td>6,914,809</td>
<td>6,843,764</td>
<td>100,42</td>
<td>123,81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 4</td>
<td>Special Support for Border Regions</td>
<td>1,706,010</td>
<td>2,176,414</td>
<td>128,62</td>
<td>148,62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4.1</td>
<td>Special Support for Border Regions</td>
<td>1,706,010</td>
<td>2,176,414</td>
<td>128,62</td>
<td>148,62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 5</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td>2,776,440</td>
<td>2,701,936</td>
<td>97,21</td>
<td>99,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 5.1</td>
<td>Technical Assistance - TA in general</td>
<td>2,166,315</td>
<td>2,113,782</td>
<td>98,73</td>
<td>101,34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 5.2</td>
<td>Technical Assistance II - TA further measures</td>
<td>594,125</td>
<td>588,141</td>
<td>98,99</td>
<td>100,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total INTERREG III A</td>
<td>63,686,631</td>
<td>63,886,649</td>
<td>106,36</td>
<td>109,71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4 List of projects implemented within Priority Technical Assistance

**CMS Report - Individual Projects (for a Certain Measure)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>project code:</th>
<th>project owner:</th>
<th>project title:</th>
<th>approved ERDF-cofinanced project costs:</th>
<th>approved project financing:</th>
<th>verified ERDF-cofinanced project costs:</th>
<th>expenditure: public funds totals</th>
<th>national</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>status</td>
<td>public funds totals</td>
<td>ERDF</td>
<td>national</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3TAA_0001</td>
<td>Amt der Stmk. Landesregierung, Abteilung 16, TH 1 - STMK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52,000,00</td>
<td>26,000,00</td>
<td>52,000,00</td>
<td>26,000,00</td>
<td>26,000,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3TBB_0001</td>
<td>Amt der Kärntner Landesregierung; Abt. 20 Projektbegleitung und Monitoring</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>301,159,09</td>
<td>100,579,52</td>
<td>301,159,09</td>
<td>100,579,57</td>
<td>301,159,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3TBB_0002</td>
<td>Amt der Kärntner Landesregierung, Abteilung 20 - Grenzüberschreitende Kooperationen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>272,493,17</td>
<td>136,246,57</td>
<td>272,493,17</td>
<td>136,246,80</td>
<td>272,493,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3TCA_0001</td>
<td>Bundeskanzleramt, Abt. IV/4 Gemeinsames Technisches Sekretariat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>962,578,36</td>
<td>481,289,19</td>
<td>962,578,36</td>
<td>481,289,19</td>
<td>962,578,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3TCA_0002</td>
<td>Bundeskanzleramt, Abt. IV/4 EFRE-Zahlstelle und Monitoring</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>150,559,95</td>
<td>75,279,97</td>
<td>150,559,95</td>
<td>75,279,98</td>
<td>150,559,95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3TDA_0001</td>
<td>Služba Vlade RS za lokalno samoupravo in TP1 IIIA SI-AT - STS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>315,004,74</td>
<td>236,252,13</td>
<td>315,004,73</td>
<td>236,252,13</td>
<td>315,004,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>totals M 5.1:</strong></td>
<td>Technical assistance in general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3TAA_0001</strong></td>
<td>2,113,795,31</td>
<td>2,113,795,31</td>
<td>1,135,647,36</td>
<td>978,147,95</td>
<td>2,113,795,30</td>
<td>1,135,647,36</td>
<td>978,147,94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CMS Report - Individual Projects (for a Certain Measure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>project code:</th>
<th>project owner:</th>
<th>project title:</th>
<th>approved ERDF-subsidized project status</th>
<th>approved ERDF-subsidized project costs:</th>
<th>approved project financing:</th>
<th>verified ERDF-subsidized project status</th>
<th>verified ERDF-subsidized project costs:</th>
<th>expenditure:</th>
<th>national:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 5.2: Technical assistance, further measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3TEBB_0001</td>
<td>Amt der Kärntner Landesregierung; Abt. 20 Offentn kasheitsarbeit Kärnten</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>160.879,50</td>
<td>160.879,50</td>
<td>80.439,75</td>
<td>80.439,75</td>
<td>171.881,12</td>
<td>171.881,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3TSCA_0001</td>
<td>Bundeskanzleramt, Abt. IV4 Öffentlichkeitsarbeit der Verwaltungsbehörde</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>02.411,16</td>
<td>02.411,16</td>
<td>48.206,56</td>
<td>48.206,56</td>
<td>02.411,16</td>
<td>48.206,56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3TSCA_0002</td>
<td>Bundeskanzleramt, Abt. IV4 Evaluierung des Programms</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74.089,10</td>
<td>74.089,10</td>
<td>37.044,55</td>
<td>37.044,55</td>
<td>74.089,10</td>
<td>37.044,55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3TSCA_0003</td>
<td>Bundeskanzleramt, Abt. IV4 Vorbereitung OP Ziel 3 AT-SI</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35.700,00</td>
<td>35.700,00</td>
<td>17.850,00</td>
<td>17.850,00</td>
<td>35.700,00</td>
<td>17.850,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3TSCA_0004</td>
<td>Bundeskanzleramt, Abt. IV4 Ex-ante Evaluierung und StLP Ziel 3 AT-SI</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47.520,00</td>
<td>47.520,00</td>
<td>23.760,00</td>
<td>23.760,00</td>
<td>47.520,00</td>
<td>23.760,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3TEDA_0001</td>
<td>Služba Vlade RS za lokalno samoupravo in TP2 13A SI-AT - Inf</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>125.967,66</td>
<td>125.967,66</td>
<td>94.475,73</td>
<td>94.475,73</td>
<td>125.967,66</td>
<td>94.475,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>totals M 5.2:</strong> Technical assistance, further measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5
Total expenditure broken down by fields of intervention at measure level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority / Measure</th>
<th>Total allocation 1)</th>
<th>Total eligible actually paid and certified expenditure 2)</th>
<th>% of eligible cost 3)</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>field of intervention</th>
<th>field of intervention (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3=2/1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Programme: Priorities (P) / Measures (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 1 Economic Co-operation</td>
<td>25,087,511</td>
<td>2,850,903</td>
<td>11,36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.1: Economic Development</td>
<td>9,187,123</td>
<td>1,918,871</td>
<td>11,27</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>643,13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.2: Tourism</td>
<td>10,350,007</td>
<td>210,920</td>
<td>8,85</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>210,920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 1.3: Rural Development</td>
<td>5,510,378</td>
<td>914,142</td>
<td>16,59</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>39,22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 2 Human Resources and Regional Development</td>
<td>15,712,492</td>
<td>2,050,514</td>
<td>13,11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2.1: Human Resources Development - Labour Market</td>
<td>3,065,692</td>
<td>127,469</td>
<td>3,76</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2.2: Regional Co-operation</td>
<td>7,749,971</td>
<td>1,242,589</td>
<td>16,04</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>15,04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2.3: Co-operation in Education and Cultural Affairs</td>
<td>4,267,619</td>
<td>878,147</td>
<td>15,61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### P.3 Sustainable Spatial Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3.1: Spatial Development and Transport</th>
<th>18.417.076</th>
<th>6.431.524</th>
<th>34,92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>311</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
<td>301.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>314</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3.2: Sustainable Spatial and Environmental Development</th>
<th>4.185.128</th>
<th>1.346.061</th>
<th>29.75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>69.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>52.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>553</td>
<td>574.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 3.3: Environmental and Energy Management</th>
<th>6.014.000</th>
<th>3.002.759</th>
<th>52.69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>45.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>109.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>353</td>
<td>49.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### P.4 Special Support for Border Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 4.1: Special Support for Border Regions</th>
<th>1.700.010</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>311</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3122</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>313</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>314</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>315</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### P.5 Technical Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5.1: Technical Assistance I - TA in general</th>
<th>2.779.440</th>
<th>585.136</th>
<th>21.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>410</td>
<td>18.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 5.2: Technical Assistance II - TA further measures</th>
<th>594.125</th>
<th>176.765</th>
<th>29.58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>412</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>413</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>418</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>419</td>
<td>59.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1) plan (total per measure) according to PC  
2) eligible certified BRRR/BSP/IA/99/PL co-financed project cost (ex-actually paid expenditure)  
3) relation of actually paid expenditure and plan figures according to PC  
4) data refer to the total actually paid, eligible and certified expenditure
Annex 6 Results of the Seminar CBC SO FAR - “food for thought”

Food for Thoughts | CBC SO FAR - 16 October 2008

The main purpose of this seminar was to exchange experience made in CBC projects in the programme period 2000-06 and to discuss how future programme partners can best build on this knowledge base. The following guidelines and inputs as results of the seminar should help implementing good programmes and projects.

1. POLITICAL STATEMENTS

In their inputs the political level highlighted the following items:

Hans Niessl, Governor of Burgenland
  • Cross-border cooperation has long tradition in Burgenland. Cooperation takes place with Slovakia, Hungary and Slovenia. It is the basis for regional development in Burgenland.
  • Topics of particular importance are renewable energies (keyword: climate change), transport, nature parks and institutional co-operations for instance between trade unions, fire brigades, schools and kindergartens.
  • The lead partner principle will enhance the quality of cross-border cooperation. However, it will also be a challenge in future.

Danuta Hübner, Commissioner for Regional Policy
  • The implementation of the principle of free movement of goods, knowledge and people can be a challenge. Cross-border cooperation is faced with gaps and bottlenecks which have to be overcome.
  • To overcome these difficulties project partners need good transport link across borders, a high commitment to CBC and enthusiasm for their projects.
  • The role of CBC in EU integration is getting more important. There is a need to find new partners in strong partnerships and to facilitate cooperation under different administrative conditions, for instance in European Grouping for Territorial Cooperation.

2. WHAT MAKES A GOOD PROJECT?

A variety of approaches to define a good project is possible depending on the concerned player:

What makes a good project?

→ Keep in mind that the point of view is different for project holders and programmes!
Good projects are usually determined by some or most of the following characteristics:

- Long history of co-operation
- Physical cross border contact (e.g. national and nature parks, joint sewage treatment, etc.)
- Joint/parallel implementation
- Professional support by experienced consultants
- High level of enthusiasm
- Reflection of the needs of all partners involved
- Strong wish for implementing CBC projects at all levels (people, administrative and political level)

3. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE TO IMPLEMENT GOOD PROJECTS?

- Draft and implement real CBC projects based on the Lead Partner Principle with high sustainability and an innovative character
- Know and respect what others expect of the programme/projects (project holders/programme bodies/two sides of the border/European Commission)
- Clarify misunderstandings, eliminate bad practices and learn from the more experienced ones
- Make joint efforts for efficient implementation e.g. get national authorities involved to CBC-projects and bring together the real stakeholders
- Obey rules, but find a good balance between formalities and flexibility
- Think strategically and focus on the content, not only on financial matters
- Demonstrating effectiveness on a European level is to the direct benefit of all cooperation programmes and actors. This process involves the establishment and maintenance of a common Knowledge Base, which is presently one of the most important steps towards the initiation and running of good future projects. So keep the database established by INTERACT up to date (http://www.interact-eu.net)
- Projects should improve their presentation skills and provide results. A given format with clear requirements by the programme could help projects to provide information.
- Enthusiasm is important for good programme and project work, but sometimes political enthusiasm and support are lacking.
- Be realistic and do not set too many objectives
- Have visions for the institutional level (not focusing on single persons)
- A balanced partnership is needed with strong willingness, clearly defined objectives and targets and good financing.
- Consult collected information and experiences provided by INTERACT (http://www.interact-eu.net) e.g. concerning the application package, programme management etc.
- For the decision making:
  - More consultation beforehand for mutual understanding
  - Forget „my project“ - „your project“ approach
  - Projects with high strategic relevance
  - Transparent project selection, high level documentation

- Keep in mind the five V’s!
The five V's

26.10.2008 - v3

Visibility
- Raise awareness in the region
- Sell results to the wider audience

Vigilance
- Programmes must be extra-vigilant and extra-virtuous
- Control and audit procedures must be clear, rapid and unambiguous

Relevance
- Link co-operation projects with the wider picture
- Build better links to national and EU policy
- Demonstrate links to Lisbon and Gothenburg in particular

A sense of adventure
- Introduce new elements into the co-operation programmes
- Involve new types of projects, new content and new approaches to planning and calls

A programme vision
- Are you clear about where your programme is going?
- Do all partners have the same vision?
- Where do you want to be by 2013?
- Where do you want to be after 2013?
- Has your Monitoring Committee discussed this? Is it going to?
4. HOW TO SELL GOOD PROJECTS?

It is crucial to make the results of CBC projects visible. The press is therefore an important player for spreading the results. Building up cross-border media structures could help to sell more success stories.

What should you do?

- Systematic communication with specialised journalists
- Mention loud and again that a project was funded by the EU because financial information is not very interesting for journalists
- Many story-proposals lead to a few stories → try again and be insistent
- Long-term cooperation with journalists from local newspapers, radio and broadcasting stations
- Cross-border matters are often matters of local interest - contact local media
- Providing information within a realistic timescale and be aware that your partners should be available, too, for giving information within the next days
- Make sure that the journalist and his informant have a common language - English
- Give direct information to the journalist, without delegations especially to people with a higher rank

What makes a good story?

- The man-bites-dog-formula:
  When a dog bites a man, it is not news - but if a man bites a dog, that is news. The unusual, uncommon information makes the difference.
5. MAIN RESULTS FROM THE CBC CAFÉ

Which were the most spectacular results and which the most sustainable results of CBC projects in the thematic field of your table?

Environment
- New topics: climate change
- Additional topics for new periods: transport, accessibility, biodiversity, etc.

Accessibility
- Main focus of the new period: public transport, soft projects for creating timetables, etc.
- Consider the lack of skilled workers
- Austria has to learn in higher and postgraduate education

Labour market & qualification
- For politicians: photos, good PR
- For project holders: not much work, but much money
- For first-level controllers: not much work
- Answer depends on who you ask

Tourism & marketing
- Important: balanced partnership, willingness, defined objectives and targets, good financing
- The wish to implement a CBC project, rather than the wish for money
- Overcoming different systems (regional/local)

Governance & structures
- Having visions for the institutional level, not for persons
- Support is needed, because sometimes approaches are虽然
- A good Lead Partner and good partners ⇒ a good partnership
- Bring together the real stakeholders, be realistic and do not set too many objectives
- Projects should be useful, sustainable and flexible
- Midterm needs of all partners involved

Sustainable and spectacular results - often two categories of projects
- Sustainable results: know-how transfer, protection, dissemination, etc.
- Spectacular results: cooperation of national nature parks, projects with higher involvement of people
- For projects providing sustainable and spectacular results one has to combine all kinds of measures (qualification, infrastructure, etc.)
- Results must be more published and distributed!
- Sustainability is problematic in this region, because the labour market is changing very fast
- Not many spectacular results
- Sustainable results money in projects on local basis, cooperation of nature parks etc.

CBC Café
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1 Summary and recommendations

The evaluators have drawn the following main conclusions in relation to the issues contained in Working Paper 8e of the EC (Mid-term evaluation of INTERREG III). Where appropriate, recommendations have been put forth by the evaluators in relation to these conclusions or specific weaknesses identified in the mid-term evaluation. This summary is also available in a German version.

1.1 Appropriateness of Programme Strategy

- Recent developments in the programme context only revealed minor differences in relation to the initial situation upon which the programme is based (see chapter 4). The update of context indicators shows that only marginal changes have taken place in the socio-economic situation. And the changes in the institutional context have had a positive influence on cross-border contacts and co-ordination of activities. Thus modifications of the original SWOT analysis are not required, but some improvements of previous weaknesses can be noted.

- The experience gained so far in implementation (see chapters 7 and 8) did not show shortcomings which would require a change at the level of objectives. And the recommendations of the ex-ante evaluation were either already incorporated in the final versions of the programme documents or they have been taken into account during implementation.

- In the light of these findings the assessment of the ex-ante evaluation (high degree of internal and external coherence of programme objectives) can be maintained. The decision of the programme authorities to maintain the programmes objectives and structure (priorities, measures) is considered to be still valid and the Draft CIP is in line with the findings of the mid-term evaluation.

- For the same reasons as quoted above, the strategy as defined in the JPD remains valid and has rightly been maintained in the Draft CIP. Moreover, the initial strategy has meanwhile been refined and specified in various aspects, but the majority of this strategy work has been carried out unilaterally. Cross-border strategies seem to be most advanced in the field of agriculture/rural development and at the level of the Carinthian border region (see chapter 5).

- Efforts by the programme partners to improve the cross-border institutional framework and to jointly prepare projects have lead to a significant increase in the cross-border quality of projects (see chapter 7) and to more coherence in project selection. But the two major risks and obstacles for coherence already identified in the ex-ante evaluation could not be overcome: The differences in procedures between INTERREG and PHARE CBC and the profound imbalance of EU-funding between Austria and Slovenia.

- These factors had significant influence on the emerging project pattern. There is now a “mosaic” of approved projects and although many of them have been prepared jointly, their coherence is sometimes doubtful. And until now not all of the programmes objectives and strategies seem to have been addressed by the projects approved until now.


Recommendations:

⇒ Improve coherence in implementation during the remaining programme period within the new INTERREG implementing framework, namely by
  – analysing the links (and eventually overlap) between existing projects
  – assessing potential for corresponding activities to already approved projects
  – assessing the links between projects, programme objectives and strategies
  – identifying objectives which are not yet (adequately) covered by projects, and
  – intensifying joint project development in those areas.

This detailed analysis at the level of projects should be carried out during the forthcoming on-going evaluation, priority should be given to M 1.1 and M 1.2.

⇒ Place emphasis on the formulation of cross-border development strategies in key co-operation sectors. Core institutions on both sides of the border, which have institutional power and access to (national, regional) resources, should be involved in this process. Use should also be made of the Bilateral Working Groups which have been established on the Styrian and Carinthian sub-regions.

1.2 Implementation to date

Quantification of Objectives and relevance of indicators

- The indicator system used for the INTERREG part of the programme is still valid, besides most of indicators are part of the Austrian Central Monitoring System (ERDF) and this data structure has to be maintained throughout the programme period. But the analysis of the indicator system has revealed some shortcomings in relation to data input and standardisation, which merit to be improved (a detailed proposal is included in chapter 10).

- The Austrian Central Monitoring System (CMS) is a very refined and sophisticated system which is used for almost all Structural Fund Programmes in Austria. Data collection is very timely and reliable, thus the CMS allows an accurate overview on programme implementation, which is very much appreciated by the programme partners (MA, OAAs, JTS).

- However, major differences exist between INTERREG and PHARE monitoring and the indicators used for this purpose. Central monitoring of PHARE CBC projects is done via periodic reports and in relation to input only (e.g. funds contracted, funds used), other indicators are foreseen for monitoring at project level.

- Thus the current indicator system cannot provide an accurate and timely picture of programme implementation on both sides of the border (apart from financial implementation). But discussions are well advanced among key staff from both countries for the preparation of a joint monitoring system, including harmonisation of indicators.
Financial implementation, outputs and results

- The INTERREG part of the programme shows a relatively high level of commitments (59.0%) and a comparatively low level of disbursements (8.5%). But due to the deduction of the advance payment and considerable efforts in the past months, the n+2 rule has been accomplished for 2003. The corresponding PHARE CBC Programmes generally also show moderate differences between commitments and disbursements, but the disbursement rate for the 2000 Programme has already reached 76%.

- The programme has an excellent performance in relation to the quality aim (85% AA projects), but these initial assessments remain to be checked during implementation.

- The targets defined at programme level concerning the size and quality of projects have been met until now. And the targets for priority - level indicators (INTERREG) seem achievable or have already been achieved, there are no equivalent targets for PHARE CBC.

- INTERREG has obtained a satisfactory outreach and funds are distributed among a large number of beneficiaries and project holders. However, the share of larger projects is much higher than foreseen in the JPD (due to the policy of „umbrella projects“ applied by Styria in particular). The size - distribution of funding in Slovenia is exactly in line with the PHARE Financial Memorandum (20% SPF).

- Concerning the geographic distribution, there is a clear east-west divide in INTERREG projects, with most projects focused at the level of Länder and very few projects covering the entire border region. In Slovenia the projects generally cover a much larger area and - apart from larger projects identified in 2000 - address all NUTS III regions in the eligible area.

Programme administration and procedures

- Joint structures (JMC, JSC and JTS) have been installed swiftly and function well. The JMC involves a broad range of partners, but some improvements are needed to ensure effective participation of all partners (i.e. regions, social partners). The JSC has approved 131 projects to date, many of them with specific conditions. The JSC intends to act increasingly as a platform for on-going project development and to follow-up on approved (key) projects.

- The MA is assuming its tasks in a very pro-active and dedicated manner, which is highly appreciated by all of the other operators. The same holds true for the National Authority in Slovenia. Jointly, both authorities have succeeded in establishing a good climate of collaboration and achieving a rather intense level of co-operation (especially when considering the difficult implementing context imposed by the differences of INTERREG and PHARE (see chapter 3.1). And they have collaborated well to lead the “managing transition” process, which has been carried out very efficiently by the appointed Task Force.

- A new and effective division of labour has been installed between Federal and Länder level for the implementation of INTERREG programmes. Implementation has been concentrated at Länder level, whereby OAAs are carrying out project level implementation and act as one-stop shops for project holders (which is highly appreciated by them).
• The JTS was installed right at the start of programme implementation and carried out the activities as foreseen in the JPD. It notably assures effective support of the MA and the joint committees, the assessment of applications in collaboration with the OAs. Moreover, it carried out most of the work for the revision of programme documents in the framework of the “managing transition” process, in close collaboration with the National Authority in Slovenia.

• Programme management is largely satisfactory, also from the point of view of project holders. However, contracting procedures are considered too long in Austria (mainly for projects involving co-funding from two ministerial departments) and there is a mixed performance by the two Länder concerning the swiftness of contracting procedures.

• Major efforts have been undertaken by the programme partners in both countries with regard to information and publicity at national and regional/Länder level. The joint website and material produced by MA and OAs have made information on programme and projects available to a wider public. Nevertheless, access to information continues to be a problem in both countries and there is interest in more exchanges at project level.

• Some imbalances exist with regard to support for project holders. In Austria this has been increased substantially and is highly satisfactory, whereas in Slovenia this support merits to be raised – at least in qualitative terms – and application forms are considered too voluminous or demanding (which is due to PRAG requirements).

• There are quite different approaches employed in identifying (annual priorities vs. continuous project development) and selecting projects (calls with selection based on expert assessments vs. continuous project development in partnership with OAs). Project holders have stressed the need for a more transparent project assessment and selection process.

• The Lead partner principle has not been applicable under the past framework conditions and will continue to be difficult, at least in the short term (many practical problems concerning e.g. eligible costs, control procedures, sharing of costs, Slovene legislation). But programme partners agree to increase the share of genuine joint projects and the lead partner principle is seen as an instrument in this direction (but not an end in itself!).

**Monitoring and Control**

• Monitoring of the INTERREG programme is done within the Austrian Central Monitoring System (ERDF). This is a very refined, sophisticated system which is used for almost all Structural Fund Programmes in Austria. It functions very effectively and is highly appreciated by programme operators. Data input is done at Länder level and regular checks on plausibility of data are carried out by the Central Monitoring Authority (ERP Fonds).

• However, major differences exist between INTERREG and PHARE monitoring systems and also the indicators used differ substantially (see chapter 6.1). Thus - apart from financial implementation - the current monitoring system cannot provide an accurate and timely picture of programme implementation on both sides of the border.

• But a joint monitoring system will be established when Slovenia accesses the EU, which allows input of identical data sets on projects the same quality level. But parallel monitoring procedures for INTERREG and PHARE CBC might lead to a heavy administrative burden – and potential complications - over the next years.
• Annual reports have been produced by the national financial control authority for the years 2000, 2001 and 2002. 2nd level Financial Control was initiated in the beginning of 2003 by verifying the effectiveness of the management and control system in place. This has notably concluded that the control systems foreseen in the JPD are in place and functioning, requirements of 1st level control are met and audit trails can be verified - but scope for further improvement has been identified. Sample checks on project level have recently been initiated at Länder level and will likely be concluded early next year.

• Recommendations:

⇒ In co-operation with the JTS, the evaluation team has prepared a proposal for improvements of data input and interpretation on INTERREG indicators (see chapter 10.3). This proposal has been discussed with the Evaluation Steering Group and will also be fed into the bilateral discussions on the joint monitoring system.

⇒ Reallocations of resources on the INTERREG side are recommended within Priorities 1 and 3: From M 1.1. towards 1.2 in order to provide sufficient funding for mirror projects in tourism development. From 3.1 (lack of funds at national level in Austria) towards M 3.2 and 3.3, as these already show rather high levels of commitment (see Annex 1).

⇒ Case studies and in-depth analysis at project level should be carried out in the framework of the on-going evaluation, in order to validate their performance with regard to specific indicators (e.g. quality of co-operation, horizontal priorities, outputs and results). Priority should be given to umbrella projects or key projects on the Austrian and large projects in Slovenia. This analysis could also be used to identify deficiencies and the scope for integrating additional “mirror” projects.

⇒ Programme partners should investigate ways to better integrate social partners and regions in the operation of the joint programme committees. And they should explore possibilities to curb administrative requirements and shorten procedures.

⇒ Present imbalances in support for project holders should be corrected as soon as possible by improving the quality of support in Slovenia (e.g. concerning knowledge of project development tools, information about partner projects in Austria or the attraction of additional funding for projects). Increased use should be made of Bilateral Working Groups, which have been established in the Styrian and Carinthian sub-regions, for identifying and preparing joint projects.

⇒ Practical solutions must be sought for the present differences in project identification and selection. As the approaches currently used are rooted in profound differences of administrative cultures and experience, fundamental changes are unlikely to be achieved in the short run. Short-term solutions include using joint selection criteria and carrying out joint pre-assessments and selection processes, which also take into account the results of some of the analysis suggested above for the on-going evaluation.

⇒ The programme should enable project applicants to go for the lead partner principle, but the framework of already approved projects and the conditions of programme management have to be taken into account. During the remaining programme period other options to achieve the aim of more genuine joint projects should be favoured. This notably includes an increase in cross-border project development, elaboration of mirror and joint
projects (which foresee functional lead partners), joint pre-assessments and joint monitoring of project implementation.

⇒ Conditions for project management and requirements for project promoters should be harmonised as much as possible (at least between the two Länder). Information material should be produced which provides orientation for project holders on eligible costs and other aspects which are crucial for financial control or the submission of invoices (wherever feasible this should also be done in Slovenia).

A detailed proposal for the implementation of these recommendations has been prepared and discussed with the Task Force “Managing Transition”.
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7 Conclusions on efficiency, effectiveness and impact

The INTERREG part of the programme shows a high level of commitments (81.4%) and a comparatively low – but unproblematic - level of disbursements (33.9%). The n+2 rule has been accomplished for 2003 and 2004.

The programme continues to have an excellent performance in relation to the quality aim (85% AA projects). However, the Coherence Analysis showed that co-operation during implementation appears to be weaker than indicated in the applications. Besides, the criterion for achieving an AA rating is not very significant as it can apparently be reached quite easily.

The targets defined at programme level concerning the size and quality of projects have been met until now. And the targets for priority - level indicators have already largely been achieved or seem achievable until the end of the programme period.

INTERREG has obtained a satisfactory outreach and funds are distributed among a large number of beneficiaries and project holders. The share of larger projects is much higher than foreseen in the JPD (due to the policy of „umbrella projects“ applied by Styria in particular).

Concerning the geographic distribution, there is a clear east- west divide in INTERREG projects, with most projects focused at the level of Länder and very few projects covering the entire border region. In Slovenia the distribution pattern is quite different, as half of the projects (of the 1st INTERREG call for proposals) cover the entire border region.

The joint structures which have been established for programme implementation (JMC and JSC) continue to function well. The JSC held 11 meetings to date and has approved altogether 208 projects for co-funding under INTERREG IIIA. In order to better prepare JSC meetings, IBs and JTS agreed to establish a bilateral working group, which meets ahead of the JSC to hold preliminary discussions on project applications.

The division of labour on The Austrian side between Federal and Länder level, which has been established at the start of the programme, continues to be effective. Project level implementation is concentrated at Länder level, where IBs act as one-stop shops for project owners and organise co-financing from Federal and Länder sources.

The JTS continues to take part in the assessment of applications and oversees the implementation of funding conditions agreed by the JSC. In addition, the JTS facilitates learning and information exchange across programmes and organises meetings to address specific issues (e.g. application of the Lead Partner Principle).

A joint monitoring system was established after Slovenia's accession by amending the Austrian Central Monitoring System (CMS) to the new needs (set up of English surface and reports, inclusion of Slovene data). Thus the same set of INTERREG indicators is now applied on both sides. Data has successfully been transferred to the Austrian Central Monitoring Authority, which also enabled the processing of synthetic tables for the present report.

Programme management is largely satisfactory, but contracting procedures have not been significantly reduced and can thus still be considered too long in Austria (mainly for projects involving co-funding from federal level) and the mixed performance by the two Länders concerning the swiftness of contracting procedures remains. In addition, first figures for Slovenia show that the time span until approval is significantly shorter than in Austria (due to
the call system), but on the other side contracting takes much longer (although this was
certainly influenced by conditions at national level).

The project selection process is still handled in different ways: whereas on the Austrian side
the so-called “on-going” application is possible, on the Slovene side calls for proposals are
launched (due to Slovene national legislation). And the assessment of these projects is done
by NARD with the involvement of civilian servants of relevant ministries (per measure) and
external experts, whereas in Austria this is mainly carried out in line with the co-financing
systems in place and the involvement of key institutions (see MTE).

This situation has been made more difficult by the fact that cross-border information
exchange between IBs is particularly weak at the pre-assessment stage, the importance
placed on formal criteria in assessments on the Slovene side and the lack of sufficient co-
finance on the Austrian side for many measures. These different implementing regimes
apparently form a major obstacle to implement genuine cross-border projects: After the 1st
call for proposals, only 4 joint and 10 mirror projects have been approved.

This situation is only a rather modest progress in view of the intention of programme partners
(expressed in the MTE) to increase the share of joint projects as an important step towards a
more widespread application of the lead partner principle. And it is quite insufficient
compared to the low level of connectivity between projects shown in the Coherence Analysis.

The analysis was also used to identify the potential for corresponding activities to already
approved projects. Most of the Austrian projects have stated that they desire complimentary
activities on the Slovene side and have indicated concrete activities and actors, which to a
large extent can be regarded as mirror projects or a continuation of past activities. Given the
low number of mirror projects which have been approved since, this information was
apparently only used in a very limited manner in the project selection process.

Reporting not only differs considerably on both sides, it also has several shortcomings and
weaknesses on the Austrian side, as reports are rather heterogeneous and contain little
information needed to assess the quality of cross-border co-operation or impacts
produced/expected. And analysis of information flows revealed that there is no structured
exchange of information among IBs on projects during implementation (outside the JSC
Meetings). A standardised format which has been developed in collaboration with IBs has
gradually been introduced for reporting on the Austrian side, whereas in Slovenia other
reports formats and time frames prevail.

The case studies which have been carried out in the framework of the on-going evaluation
revealed that the quality of co-operation is highly satisfactory, apart from some problems
related to identifying or substituting partners. Projects have to a large extent achieved their
objectives - or are likely to achieve them until the end of the programme period. And in many
cases sustainable impacts can be demonstrated through follow-up activities or the joint use
of project outputs.

Cross-border co-operation structures have gained momentum and are increasingly playing a
proactive and supportive role in programme implementation. The Cross-border partnership
“Karavanke” has elaborated a clear strategy containing priorities and key projects and is
successfully co-ordinating cross-border activities (at least on a regional scale). The
EUREGIO Styria – Northeast Slovenia plays an increasing supportive role for the Styrian IB
and project owners.
However, the major obstacle for more effectiveness of these structures is the persistence of major imbalances between roles and resources of the partners on both sides of the border. Corresponding INTERREG projects on the Slovene side have been approved, but it remains to be seen whether this is sufficient to correct imbalances which are more structural in nature and to overcome the institutional double-bind of Slovene RDAs, which are involved in project preparation and rely on these very projects as part of their funding.

Feed-back from project owners on the Austrian side shows their discontent with project selection in Slovenia, because several expected mirror projects have either been screened out or were not approved. And they complain about the excessive administrative burden due to requirements imposed by financial control, notably for smaller projects.

A recent study prepared for NARD in September 2005 tried to assess early impacts of INTERREG projects and the likeliness of their contribution towards the achievement of programme objectives. This study contained the following observations:

- Stronger emphasis in the cross-border programme is on joint CBC projects which resulted in many more joint projects than in the past cross border programme. Although INTERREG is a joint instrument and joint programming documents were prepared and joint institutions were set up, the implementation remain to be followed by the national i.e. regional rules and regulations.

- Differences in co-financing remain since Slovene partners are participating smaller shares of own resources than Austrian. Priorities and measures are concentrated.

- Research and education sectors are insufficiently represented in the programme. Interlinking partnerships on Slovene side is still to be strengthened in order to achieve bigger impacts on a national, regional i.e. sector areas.
8 Recommendations

8.1 Recommendations for remaining years of the programme

Improve linkages and coherence during project implementation

- Strengthen and broaden cross-border partnerships:
  - Support applicants with the identification of suitable partners (via cross-border co-operation structures, regional organisations, IBs)
  - Raise awareness of project owners to maintain regular contact with partners and assist them in case of interrupted partnerships and in identifying suitable replacements (via cross-border co-operation structures, regional organisations)
  - Follow up on project implementation including quality of cross-border co-operation (via final reports, meetings with project holders, cross-border co-operation structures).

- Strengthen cross-border information flows:
  - Up-date information on project partnerships and their contact details in the data bank of the Central Monitoring System (by IBs)
  - Pro-actively signal problems or doubts on cross-border co-operation to the IB on the other side, requesting checks and/or assistance if appropriate
  - Aim for early cross-border exchanges of project information (e.g., informal exchanges between IBs, entry of projects into monitoring system already in idea phase).

- Use selection of new projects to improve coherence:
  - Give priority to projects which are elaborated as mirror projects to existing INTERREG and PHARE CBC projects
  - Provide support to pre-identified project partners in elaborating these mirror projects.

Improve joint decision-making and project selection

- Improve assessment procedures of tenders (e.g., allow improvement of applications concerning formal requirements, allow more time for assessments and counterchecks, focus on quality of projects - instead of quality of applications).

- Improve common assessment framework:
  - Strengthen mutual involvement of partners in pre-assessments (i.e. invite preliminary comments by IBs, continue bilateral working groups of IBs)
  - Ensure that information in applications is systematically counter-checked by JTS / IBs in partner countries (especially on joint planning, application and financing)
  - Require information by JTS/IB in partner country on foreseen project partners (experience, credibility and capacity).

- Speed up the duration of financing and contracting periods on the Slovene side (NARD system) by taking into account experiences from the first tendering procedure.
8.2 Recommendations for future programming

Maintain / improve attractiveness of INTERREG funding

- Simplify implementation process and minimize (but standardize) formal requirements for project applicants (e.g. application forms, contracting, reporting, financial control)
- Assure a clear and coherent framework for eligibility of actions on both sides
- Assure same level of support to project applicant on both sides of the border, also for project development
- Apply the principle of proportionality (less financial control requirements for smaller projects, reduce administrative burden by allowing bulk support)
- Introduce cross-border SPF with bilateral assessment procedure, possibly implemented only at regional level
- Replace present calls for proposals with an on-going, open procedure which allows the submission of applications all year round until funds are used up within a measure.

Assure wide-spread application of the Lead Partner Principle

- Prepare joint application forms (bilingual) for the new programme period, which also include partnership agreements and prepare templates for joint contracting
- Elaborate common guidelines for applicants by screening and / or merging existing guidelines and defining common eligibility rules for future INTERREG projects
- Organise joint training for project owners (e.g. on partnership development, project management)
- Clarify details for administering the LPP (contracting authority, legal basis, responsibilities and procedures for first level control, language issues)
- Clarify data entry to Monitoring System (level of detail, inclusion of partner projects).

Minimise potential negative consequences of the Lead Partner Principle

- Secure sufficient programme outreach (funding for smaller projects, inclusion of private actors)
- Minimize time lags in programme implementation (especially contracting procedures)
- Resolve potential conflict of interest of support structures (RDAs, cross-border cooperation structures).

Assure efficient programme management

- Maintain collaborative and decentralised management structures on both sides, with a clear distinction of the functions of MA, IB and JTS
- Foresee support roles for national level authorities or structures (e.g. facilitating cross-border relations, cross-programme exchange and learning)
- Clearly position IBs at the interface of regional / national co-funding authorities and partner regions and strengthen cross-border networking of IBs
• Assure same level of support to project applicant on both sides of the border (also for project development) and same level of information of applicants
• Organise joint, efficient project assessment with involvement of co-funding authorities and independent assessment of project quality (in case of calls)
• Facilitate trilateral co-operation by harmonising adjacent cross-border programmes (eligible actions, target groups, control requirements).

Differentiate mechanisms for project generation

• Introduce proactive “top - down” project development in jointly agreed strategic areas, with involvement of key actors from both sides (e.g. through specialist working groups)
• Facilitate bottom up participation through call for project ideas (mainly in selected areas) with subsequent screening and regrouping of ideas
• Establish cross-border SPF with joint call for proposals (but not necessarily applying the Lead Partner Principle).

Monitoring and reporting

• Operate Joint Monitoring Systems, based on existing data base and procedures
• Accompany the implementation of projects also in terms of contents
• Apply joint standards of reporting on both sides and assure regular exchange of reports across border
• Assure up-date of monitoring data (based on reports from project owners).