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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The ex ante evaluation was carried out in order to support the programming process of the Hungary-Slovakia Cross-Border Cooperation Programme and improve the quality of the Programme by justifying its adequacy, the coherence of its objectives, indicators, budgetary allocation, as well as its monitoring and evaluation system. The evaluation fulfils the requirements of the Common Provisions Regulation (CPR) which describes that an ex ante evaluation should be in place for each programme co-financed from the European Structural and Investment Funds. Furthermore, the elaboration of a Strategic Environmental Assessment is also mandatory for those programmes.

In line with the regulations, the evaluation engagement was awarded for independent parties, the Consortium consisting of Equinox Consulting Ltd., ICG Ex Ante Ltd. and D&D Consulting s.r.o.

According to the CPR, the ex ante evaluation and the SEA is required to appraise

- the programme’s contribution to the Europe 2020 strategy i.e. smart, sustainable and inclusive growth,
- the internal coherence of the programme and its activities,
- the consistency of the selected thematic objectives and priority axes with the relevant EU regulations, partnership agreements and the relevant country-specific recommendations and national reform programmes,
- the relevance and the adequacy of the indicators and milestones selected for the performance framework,
- the consistency of the financial allocation,
- how the outputs will contribute to the achievements of the results,
- the rationale of the forms of support,
- the adequacy of the proposed management system including the monitoring and evaluation, and
- the adequacy of the planned measures to promote horizontal issues.

The objective of the SEA is to integrate environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption process of the programme with a view to promote sustainable development.

The HU-SK CBC Programme has been prepared in parallel with the ex ante evaluation and SEA and its final version was submitted on 16th of October 2014. The final Programme consists of five priority axes, five selected investment priorities and eight specific objectives.

Our evaluation method and progress of the evaluation

A mixture of quantitative and qualitative research techniques and several methods have been applied over the evaluation process. Since the Programme should be consistent with all relevant European and national documents, the evaluation was commenced with a comprehensive document review. Moreover, interviews were carried out and co-creation workshops were organised in order to bring together different stakeholders’ opinion. In order to represent the ex ante and the SEA aspects, we took part in Programming Group meetings and discussions with the involvement of the programming team, the Joint Technical Secretariat, the Managing and National Authorities. Furthermore, continuous consultations were organised with the programming team and between the ex ante evaluation consortium members.
KEY FINDINGS

As a general remark of the ex ante evaluators, we can state that the overall assessment of the programming work done so far is undoubtedly positive. The programming process follows an intensively participative approach, while the necessary background research is carried out in decent quality.

Contribution to the Europe 2020

The Programme has many direct and indirect links with the relevant EU2020 targets (e.g. employment, R&D, climate and energy, social inclusion). Although, the flagship initiatives do not include recommendations with direct implications on ETC programmes or specific regions, a number of overlaps can be detected among the targeted policy areas.

Consistency and coherence

The OP proposal is generally compliant with the major national and European strategic priorities. The selected thematic objectives and investment priorities fully reflect the priorities set out in the latest version of both the Slovak and the Hungarian Partnership Agreement in relation to the cross border cooperation initiatives. The country-specific recommendations are only marginally related to the Programme’s strategy. Furthermore, the OP strategy is compliant with the Common Strategic Framework and is aligned with the priorities of the Danube Strategy and National Strategy for Social Inclusion (deep poverty, child poverty and Roma’s).

With regard to the internal coherence, the overall structure of the Programme is simplified and responds to the identified needs. The Programme refers to all relevant strategic documents and provides a basic frame for its operations.

Relevance and adequacy of indicators

The indicators did not change much, compared to the previous version of the OP, so the majority of our previous findings still hold.

Consistency of the financial allocation

The financial allocations of the priority axis are consistent. The basis for the calculation of the union support will be the public eligible cost. This means, that the national budgets have to put more money in the programme.

Horizontal issues

The elaboration of horizontal issues is not sufficiently detailed in the draft version of the Programme. Slight links can be detected with the promotion of equal opportunities between men and women in PA3 and also a project selection criterion refers to this requirement. The territorial analysis draws the attention to the importance of social inclusion and some direct actions promote the provision of equal opportunities and non-discrimination.

Implementation system

The implementation mechanism described is in line with the implementation regulations.

The MA and JTS will be placed in different countries which is a new solution but could work appropriately. The relevant Hungarian and Slovakian authorities have already started to discuss setting up the joint secretariat for the programming period 2014-2020, which is the key factor of the successful implementation. JTS should work as efficiently as in implementation phase of the previous OP when absorption and human capacities have been strengthened.

Presently we cannot judge the administrative capacities. Probably experiences of the running system will help to organize capacities efficiently and new system will be established in order to operate appropriately and effectively. However, regional info points might improve the efficiency.
**Partnership principle**

The public consultation of the Programme and the SEA has been successfully finished. In addition, a diverse range of partners were involved in the programming procedure through workshops, interviews and also the membership of the Task Force was extended. In terms of the partnership principle we consider that the involvement of relevant parties has not fully met the requirements of the Code of Conduct on Partnership during the programming process. In spite of that, as the programme designers and the authorities concerned have definitely taken all necessary steps to involve the relevant stakeholders into the programming phase and since these partners have been participated in the public consultation of the Programme, the evaluators consider the partnership principle as fulfilled.

**KEY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Consistency and coherence**

The specific objectives are better aligned and more appropriate. The structure of the Programme was changed following the decision of the Task Force. Nevertheless, the distribution of funds for individual measures is not always fully justified due to the political commitments.

The result oriented approach raises several questions concerning the future set up of the implementation rules. Further details in this respect can be determined later, however, the fundamental rules and structure need to be specified in the Programme strategy.

**Indicators and monitoring system**

The indicators did not change much, compared to the previous version of the OP, so the majority of our previous comments still hold. The exact definition and the sources of the indicators are not always clear. We recommend preparing indicator sheets for all the indicators, with all the relevant characteristics. The performance framework of the priority axes still need some minor improvements. The target values for the financial indicator in the performance framework seems overestimated.

**Financial allocation**

The basis for the calculation of the union support should be justified.

**Horizontal issues**

Although the draft Programme addresses the horizontal elements in case of all priority axis. We recommend to amend the relevant parts and include horizontal aspects in a more detailed way, especially in the selection criteria.

**Implementation system**

The implementation system of the Programme needs to be set up as soon as possible. In order to set up an efficient programme structure, lessons learned from the previous programming period should be taken into account. As far as the implementation mechanisms are concerned, different types of funding schemes could be applied besides open calls as recommended by the evaluators. Several simplification possibilities were revealed in the evaluation that can be used at programme level.

Regarding the SME support, a simplified procedure is provided for the effective involvement of SMEs. For this purpose, a well-designed system has been developed recently (PP Light Scheme) under the aegis of the Hungary-Croatia CBC Programme, which is adopted also in the current Programme in a similar way (but not entirely the same concept).

**Partnership principle**
In order to involve all relevant partners in the programming and later in the implementation and monitoring, their clear identification was necessary. According to the regulations, bodies representing the civil society and those which contribute to apply horizontal principles, NGOs, chambers should have been represented in the programming and the implementation process as well. Although the programme designers and the authorities concerned have definitely taken all necessary steps to involve the relevant stakeholders into the programming phase, the involvement of relevant parties has not fully met the requirements of the Code of Conduct on Partnership during the programming process. Nevertheless, these partners have been participated in the public consultation of the Programme; therefore, the evaluators consider the partnership principle as fulfilled.

**STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

The SEA of the HU-SK CBC Programme is planned and carried out in line with the 2001/42/EC Directive and its respective national adaptations. After examining advantages and disadvantages, the Task Force and the relevant authorities decided to carry out SEA process separately. This means that a joint Environmental Report is elaborated in the framework of two separate processes in accordance with the national regulations and the consultation processes are also carried out separately. The scope of the SEA was approved by environmental authorities in both countries as legal start of the SEA process. It consists of all required information based on legislation. SEA is a useful tool to highlight potential positive environmental impacts of a Program and hinder measures that might be harmful for the environment. Based on current information intended objectives and planned activities will not have significant adverse transboundary environmental impact.

The potential impacts are referring to partly environmental purposes and partly to sustainable development. Important to pay attention to avoid high pressure on environment and to take into account sustainable principles in order to moderate adverse effects. The entire Programme strategy is built around the concept of a sustainable development, some objectives, priorities and individual interventions are directly focused on the promotion of technology development and infrastructural developments for the low carbon economy, resource efficient and environmental friendly developments. However, some objectives are clearly associated with negative impacts.

Requirements of sustainable development are reflected not just in planning specific objectives, but also they are integrated to the Programme as horizontal principles, which ensure to shift the Programme area towards the quality prevention of environmental resources. The clear contribution to sustainable development will be an eligibility criterion in the selection procedure for all actions. The principle of equal opportunities is also reflected in the design of the indicators for monitoring and evaluation, and in the eligibility and project selection criteria to be applied under various measures.

All in all, due to the synergistic and also cumulative positive impacts a more favourable state of the environment could be developed by the Programme, especially for the future (medium and long term).
VÉZETŐI ÖSSZEFÓGLALÓ

Az ex ante értékelés célja, hogy támogassa Magyarország-Szlovákia Határon Átnyúló Együttműködési Program tervezési folyamatát, növelve annak minőségi megfelelőségét a kitűzött célok, indikátorok, a pénzügyi terv, valamint a monitoring- és értékelési rendszer kialakítása tekintetében.

Az értékelés kidolgozása eleget tesz az Európai Unió Közös Rendelkezésekről szóló rendeletének, amely kimondja, hogy minden európai uniós forrásból finanszírozott program esetén előzetes („ex ante”) értékelését szükséges készíteni. Továbbá, az ex ante értékeléssel párhuzamosan, Stratégiai Környezeti Vizsgálat lefolytatása is kötelező.

Az előírásoknak megfelelően az értékelésre szóló megbízást az Equinox Consulting Kft., ICG Ex Ante Kft. és a D&D Consulting s.r.o. által alkotott, független konzorcium nyerte el.

A megbízás célja az HU-SK CBC program ex ante értékelésének, valamint Stratégiai Környezeti Vizsgálatának (továbbiakban: SKV) elkészítése. Továbbá cél, hogy az értékelés érdemi választ adjon a feladat-meghatározás során feltett értékelési kérdésekre is. Az előbbieknek megfelelően az értékelési kérdések összhangban vannak a közösségi előírásokkal (mind az ex ante értékelés, mind az SKV esetében), így megkövetelik, hogy az értékelés az alábbi szempontok szerint vizsgálja a Programot:

- az Európa 2020 Stratégiához, az intelligens, fenntartható és inkluzív növekedéshez való hozzájárulás;
- a Program és annak intézkedései megfelelő belső koherenciája;
- a kiválasztott tematikus célok és prioritási tengelyek a releváns közösségi szabályozással, a Partnerségi Megállapodással és a releváns országspecifikus ajánlásokkal, valamint a Nemzeti Reform Programokkal való összhangba;
- a teljesítménykeretből kiválasztott indikátorok és mérföldkövek relevanciája és megfelelősége;
- a forrásallokáció konzisztenciája
- az outputok hozzájárulása az eredmények eléréséhez;
- a támogatási forma indokoltága;
- a monitoringot és az értékelést magába foglaló, javasolt intézményrendszer megfelelősége;
- a horizontális kérdéseket támogató, tervezett intézkedések alkalmassága.

Az SKV célja, hogy olyan környezeti szempontokat integráljon a programtervezés és -megvalósítás folyamatába, amelyek a fenntartható fejlődést hivatott támogatni.


A programjavaslat őt prioritási tengelyt, őt beruházási prioritást és nyolc specifikus célt fogalmaz meg.

Az értékelés módszere és folyama 

Az értékelés eszközkészlete kvalitatív és kvantitatív módszerekből áll. Az értékelés első szakaszában mindkét módszer egyaránt alkalmazásra került. Annak érdekében, hogy a Program konzisztenciáját vizsgálni tudjuk, elemeztük a releváns közösségi és nemzeti dokumentumokat. Az érintettek véleményeinek felmérése és összehangolása érdekében mélyinterjúkat készítettünk, valamint műhelymunkákat szerveztünk. Az értékelői és SKV-
FŐBB MEGÁLLAPÍTÁSOK

A tervezési folyamat összességében pozitívan értékelhető. Amellett, hogy a tervezési folyamat aktív együttműködésen alapult, a szükséges háttérelmések is kifogástalan minőségben készültek el.

Az Európa 2020 stratégiához való hozzáférés

Az Európa 2020 és a Program céljai között számos közvetlen és közvetett kapcsolódási pontot lehet azonosítani (pl. foglalkoztatás, K+F+I, klímaváltozás és energia, társadalmi felzárkóztatás). Bár a kiemelt zászlóhajó kezdeményezése nem tartalmaznak közvetlenül felhasználható javaslatokat az Európai Területi Együttműködés vagy az egyes régiók tekintetében, több átfedés található a megcélzott szakpolitikai területek között.

Konzisztencia és koherencia

Az OP tervezete általánosságban megfelel a főbb nemzeti és európai stratégiai prioritásoknak. Az OP legutolsó verziójában kidolgozott tematikus célok és beruházási prioritások teljes mértékben reflektálnak mind Magyarország, mind Szlovákia Partnerségi Megállapodásában, a hatámentes együttműködési kezdeményezések vonatkozásában rögzített prioritásokra. Az Európai Bizottság országspecifikus ajánlásai csupán kismértékben érintik a programstratégiát. Ugyanakkor az OP stratégiája megfelel a Közös Stratégiai Keretnek, Duna Stratégiában kitöltött prioritásoknak, valamint a Nemzeti Felzárkóztatási Stratégiának is (mélységzegénység, gyermekeksegénység, romák).

A belső koherencia tekintetében a Program struktúrája némileg egyszerűsödött, illetve jobban megfelel az azonosított igényeknek. A Magyarország-Szlovákia Határon Átnyúló Együttműködési Program az összes vonatkozó stratégiai dokumentumra reflektál és biztosítja a működtetéséhez szükséges alapkereteket.

Indikátorok és monitoringrendszer

A Program indikátorrendszere nem sokat fejlődött az előző verzióhoz képest, ezért az előző jelentésben megfogalmazott megállapítások többsége még mindig érvényes.

Pénzügyi allokáció

A prioritási tengelyes pénzügyi allokáció konzisztens. Az Uniós támogatások elszámolásának alapját a közkiadás nagysága fogja képezni. Ez azt jelenti, hogy a nemzeti költségvetések nagyobb mértékben kell, hozzájáruljanak a program költségvetéséhez.

Horizontális szempontok

A horizontális szempontok a program előző munkaváloztatásban rözsletesen bemutatásra kerültek. A 3. prioritási tengely, valamint a nők és férfiak közötti esélyegyenlőség irányelv között gyenge kapcsolódás fedezhető fel és a kiválasztási kritériumok között is szerepel ez a szempont. A területi elemzés eredményei alapján kiemelt jelentőségű a társadalmi befogadás elősegítésének kérdése a programterületen. A programban vannak olyan tevékenységek, amelyek hozzájárulnak az egyenlő esélyek érvényesüléséhez és az antidiszkriminációs törekvésekhez.

Végrehajtási intézményrendszer

A végrehajtási mechanizmus megfelel a végrehajtásra vonatkozó szabályoknak.
Az IH és a Közös Technikai Titkárság (JTS) külön országban fog működni, ami egy újszerű megoldás, azonban képes lehet a megfelelő működésre. Az érintett magyar és szlovák hatóságok között megkezdődtek a tárgyalások a közös titkárság 2014-20-as időszakra való létrehozásának érdekében, amely kulcsfontosságú a jövő program végrehajtásának. A JTS legalább olyan hatékonysággal kell működjön, mint az előző OP megerősítette humán kapacitás és stabil abszorció időszakában.

Jelen állapotban még kialakítás alatt áll, ezért nem lehetséges az adminisztratív kapacitások értékelése. Az előző időszak tapasztalatait érdemes felhasználni a jelen időszak kapacitásainak hatékony megtervezéséhez, ezáltal az újonnan induló rendszer a megfelelő működési és a hatékonyság elvei alapján kerül kialakításra. A regionális információs pontok felállítása további hatékonyságjavítást eredményezhet.

**Partnerség**


**KÖVETKEZTETÉSEK ÉS JAVASLATOK**

**Konzisztencia és koherencia**

A Program előző verziójához képest a specifikus célok jobban illeszkednek egymáshoz és koherensebbek. A program struktúrája a Task Force döntésének megfelelően módosult. Azonban a források allokációja helyenként nem tekinthető teljes mértékben indokolt, a politikai elkötelezódés alapján.

Az eredményorientált megközelítés számos kérdést felvet a végrehajtási szabályokhoz kapcsolódóan. Ennek részletei majd a jövőben kerülnek kidolgozásra, azonban a szabályokat és a struktúrát a Program stratégiában le kell fektetni.

**Indikátorok és monitoringrendszer**


**Pénzügyi allokáció**

Az Uniós támogatások elszámolásának alapját a közkiadás nagysága fogja képezni, ezt a döntést javasolt indokolni.

**Horizontális szempontok**

Bár a Program foglalkozik a horizontális szempontokkal, azonban minden prioritási tengelynél javasolnánk az érintett részek kiegészítését és a horizontális szempontok részletesebb megjelenítését különösen a kiválasztási kritériumok esetében.
Végrehajtási intézményrendszer

A Program végrehajtását szolgáló intézményrendszert minél hamarabb fel kell állítani. A hatékony programstruktúra kialakítása érdekében az előző programozási időszak tapasztalatait célzról figyelembe venni. A végrehajtási mechanizmus a nyílt eljárásokon túl egyéb, különböző típusú támogatási rendszerek alkalmazását kell lehetővé tegye, különösen a Kis Projekt Alap esetében. Az értékelés számos, programszinten hasznosítható egyszerűsítési lehetőséget tart fel.

Az KKV támogatások esetében, csakis egy egyszerűsített eljárás képes biztosítani a KKV-k tényleges bevonását. A közelmúltban ilyen céllal egy megfelelően megtervezett rendszer került kialakításra a Magyarország-Horvátország CBC Program keretében, amelynek egy módosított változatát vette át a HU-SK Program.

Partnerség

Annak érdekében, hogy a megfelelő partnerek a programozás ideje és a végrehajtás során bevonásra kerüljenek, szükséges volt feltérképezni az érintett szereplők körét. A szabályozás alapján a horizontális elvek érvényesítéséért felelős civil szervezeteket, nonprofit szervezeteket és kamarákat is szükséges volt bevonni a programozási és végrehajtási folyamatba. Annak ellenére, hogy a programtervezés ideje alatt a programtervezők és a hatóságok minden szükséges lépést megtettek az érintett partnerek bevonására, a partnériumi elv alapján a „Code of Conduct on Partnership” előírásai megfelelnek teljes mértékben. Mivel azonban az érintett partnerek számára adott a lehetőség, hogy részt veszek a Program társadalmi egyeztetésében, és azáltal kifejtsék észrevételeiket azzal kapcsolatban, ezért az értékelők a partnerség elvét teljesítettnek minősítik.

STRATÉGIAI KÖRNYEZET VIZSGÁLAT (SKV)


A potenciális hatások hozzájárulnak részben környezeti és részben fenntartható fejlődéshez kapcsolódó célok eléréséhez. Fontos figyelmet fordítani a környezet nagyfokú kitettségének elkerülésére és fenntartható fejlődés alapelveit figyelembe véve mérsékelné a káros hatásokat. A teljes program stratégiája a fenntartható fejlődés koncepciójának megfelelően került kialakításra. Egyes prioritások, célok és intézkedések közvetlenül szorgalmazzák az alacsony szén-dioxid kibocsátású, erőforrás hatékony és környezetbarát technológiai és infrastrukturális fejlesztések elterjedését, azonban találhatók olyan célok is, amelyek egyértelműen beazonosítható negatív hatással rendelkeznek.

A fenntartható fejlődés követelményeit nem csak a specifikus célok tervezésénél kellett figyelembe venni, hiszen integráltan a teljes programban megjelenik, mint horizontális alapelve, amely biztosítja a programterületen lévő természeti értékek megőrzését. A fenntartható fejlődéshez való egyértelmű hozzájárulás egyben, megfelelési kritériumot is jelentett a tevékenységek kiválasztásánál. Az esélyegyenlőség alapelvei összhangban kerültek kialakításra a projektek kiválasztásának kritériumai, az indikátorok, valamint a monitoring és értékelési rendszer is.
Mindent összevetve a program hatására létrejött szinergikus és egymásra épülő hatások a környezet kedvezőbb állapotának elérését eredményezhetik különösen közép és hosszútávon.
Ex ante hodnotenie bolo realizované s cieľom podporiť programovací proces programu cezhraničnej spolupráce Maďarsko – Slovensko a zlepšiť jeho kvalitu nastavením primeranosti príslušných cieľov, ukazovateľov, rozpočtu ako aj jeho monitorovacieho a hodnotiaceho systému. Vypracovanie hodnotenia splňa požiadavky nariadení o spoločných ustanoveniach, ktoré uvádza, že ex ante hodnotenie je súčasťou každého programu spolufinancovaného z EÚ fondov. Ex ante hodnotenia by sa mali byť vykonávané paralelne so strategickým environmentálnym hodnotením, ktoré je povinné pre všetky programy spolufinancované z EÚ fondov.

V súlade s nariadením, bolo hodnotenie zadané nezávislému subjektu: konzorciu pozostávajúcemu z firiem Equinox Consulting s.r.o., ICG Ex Ante s.r.o., a D&D Consulting s.r.o.

Podľa nariadenia Komisie má ex ante a strategické environmentálne hodnotenie (SEA) posúdiť prispevok programu k

- strategii Európa 2020 t.j. inteligentnému, udržateľnému a inkluzívnomu rastu,
- vnútornej koherencii programu a jeho aktivít,
- súlade vybraných tematických cieľov a priorít s relevantnými usmerneniami EÚ, Partnerskými dohodami, relevantnými špecifickými odporúčaniami pre krajiny a Národnými programami reforiem,
- relevantnosti a primeranosti ukazovateľov a mifníkov výkonneho plánovania, výkonneho rámca, súlade s finančnou alokáciou, tomu ako výstupy prispejú k výsledkom
- odôvodneniu formy podpory
- primeranosti navrhaného systému riadenia vrátane monitorovania a hodnotenia a primeranosti plánovaných opatrení na podporu horizontálnych priorit.

Cieľom SEA je integrovať environmentálne aspekty do prípravy a schvaľovania programu so zámerom podporiť udržateľný rozvoj.

Program cezhraničnej spolupráce Maďarsko – Slovensko bol pripravený paralelne s ex ante hodnotením a SEA a jeho konečný návrh bol predložený 16 októbra 2014. Návrh programu pozostáva zo 5 prioritných osí, 5 vybraných investičných priorit a 8 špecifických cieľov.

**Evaluačné metódy a postup hodnotenia**

Na hodnotenie boli použité kvantitatívne a kvalitatívne nástroje a metódy. Vzhľadom k tomu, že program by mal byť v súlade so všetkými európskymi i národnými dokumentmi hodnotenie začalo dôkladným štúdiom dokumentov. Okrem toho, boli zrealizované rozhovory a uskutočnili sa semináre, ktorých účelom bolo získať názory rôznych účastníkov. Ako zástupcovia SEA a ex ante hodnotenia sme sa zúčastnili stretnútí a diskusí s programovým tímom, so Spoločným
technickým sekretariátom, riadiacim orgánom a národnými inštitúciami. Okrem toho sa realizovali priebežné konzultácie s plánovacím tímom a medzi členmi ex ante konzorcia.

**KľúčOVÉ ZISTENIA**

Vo všeobecnosti ex ante hodnotitelia konštatovali, že hodnotenie programovania je doposiaľ nepochybné pozitívne. Programovací proces prebieha intenzívnym participatívnym spôsobom a analýza je zrealizovaná v dobrej kvalite. Avšak, analyzujúc programovací proces a návrh OP, hodnotitelia na základe zistení formulovali niekoľko odporúčaní ako zlepšiť kvalitu programu. Tieto by mali byť zohľadnené pri priprave OP s požadovanou kvalitou.

**Príspevok k stratégi Európa 2020**

Existuje mnoho priamych a nepriamych väzbi s cieľmi stratégie Európa 2020 (napr. rozvoj malých a stredných podnikov, zamestnanosť, výskum a vývoj, klíma a energetika, sociálne začlenenie). Aj keď hlavné iniciatívy neobsahujú odporúčania s priamym dopadom na európsku územnú spoluprácu alebo špecifické regióny, existuje mnoho prekryvov medzi cieľovými oblasťami politiky.

**Konzistentnosť a súlad**

Návrh OP je vo všeobecnosti s hlavnými národnými a európskymi strategickými prioritami. Vybrané tematické ciele a investičné priority plne odrážajú priority stanovené v najnovších verziách slovenskej a maďarskej Partnerskej dohody vo vzťahu k iniciatívam európskej spolupráce. Konkrétna odporúčaná Európske komisia pre jednotlivé krajiny súvisia so strategickým programom len okrajovo. Stratégia OP je v súlade so spoločným strategickým rámcom aj v súlade s prioritami Dunajského výboru a národné stratégie pre sociálnu inklúziu (chudoba a Rómovia).

Pokiaľ ide o ucelenosť štruktúry programu, tá je zjednodušená a zodpovedá identifikovaným potrebám. Program sa odvoláva na všetky relevantné strategické dokumenty a popisuje základný rámec jeho fungovania.

**Vhodnosť a primeranosť ukazovateľov**

Ukazovatele sa v porovnaní s predchádzajúcou verzíou podstatnejšie nemenili, takže väčšina predosších zistení je naďalej aktuálna.

**Konzistentnosť finančných alokácií**

Finančné alokácie prioritných osí sú konzistentné. Základom pre výpočet podpory únie budú celkové verejné oprávnené náklady. Znamená to, že národné rozpočty musia program spolufinancovať vo väčšom rozsahu.

**Horizontálne princípy**

Vypracovanie horizontálnych princípov v návrhu programu je pomerne detailné. V prioritnej osi 3 sa dájú nájsť väzby súvisiace s podporou rovnakých príležitostí a rovnako aj výberové kritériá projektov uvádzajú túto požiadavku. Územná analýza zvýraznila dôležitosť sociálnej inklúzie a niektoré aktivity priamo podporujú rovnosť príležitostí a nediskrimináciu.

**Systém implementácie**

Mechanizmus implementácie je popísaný v súlade s implementačnými usmerneniami. RO a STS budú fungovať každý v inej krajine, čo je novinkou, ale malo by to fungovať bez
 problémov. Relevantné inštitúcie na maďarskej a slovenskej strane začali diskutovať nastavenie spoločného sekretariátu na programové obdobie 2014 – 2020, čo je klúčovým faktorom úspešnej realizácie programu. STS by mal fungovať rovnako efektívne ako počas predchádzajúceho programu kedy boli jeho absorpčné a ľudské kapacity posílené.

V súčasnosti nevieme posúdiť administratívne kapacity. Skúsenosti zo súčasného systému pravdepodobne pomôžu zorganizovať kapacity efektívne a nový systém bude vytvorený tak, aby fungoval dobre a efektívne. Regionálne informačné body zrejme účinnosť fungovania vylepšia.

**Princíp partnerstva**


**HLAVNÉ ZÁVERY A ODPORÚČANIA**

**Konzistentnosť a súlad**

Špecifické ciele sú lepšie zladené a vhodnejšie. Štruktúra programu bola pozmenená v súlade s rozhodnutím Riadiaceho výboru. Napriek tomu, prerozdele nie finančných prostriedkov na jednotlivé opatrenia nie je kvôli politickým záväzkom vždy úplne odôvodnené.

Výsledkovo orientovaný prístup vedie k niekoľkým otázkam, ktoré sa týkajú nastavenia budúcich vykonávacích pravidiel. Ďalšie podrobnosti v tomto ohľade miesto finančného kapacity, ale zložité pravidiel a štruktúry by mali byť špecifikované v strategickom programu.

**Ukazovatele a monitorovací systém**

V porovnaní s predchádzajúcou verzíou OP sa ukazovatele podstatne nemenili, takže sa týkajú nastavenia budúcich vykonávacích pravidiel. Ďalšie podrobnosti v tomto ohľade miesto finančného kapacity, ale zložité pravidiel a štruktúry by mali byť špecifikované v strategickom programu.

**Horizontálne aspekty**

Aj keď programový dokument berie do úvahy horizontálne aspekty, v prípade všetkých prioritných osí odporúčame upraviť ich relevantné časti a doplniť horizontálne aspekty detailnejšie, hlavne pri kritériách výberu.

**Systém implementácie**

Implementačný systém programu musí byť nastavený čo najsúčasný. Na vytvorenie efektívnych štruktúr programu je nutné vziať do úvahy potenciál zjednodušenia a efektívnejšieho fungovania ako bolo odporúčané evaluátorom. Hodnotenie ponúka niekoľko možností zjednodušenia, ktoré sa dajú použiť na úrovni programu.

Ohľadne podpory SMP v rámci prioritnej osi 1, len zjednodušená procedúra môže zabezpečiť efektívne zapojenie SMP. Za týmto účelom bol nedávno v rámci programu cezhraničnej
spolupráce Maďarsko - Chorvátsko navrhnutý nový systém (PP Light schéma), ktorý je adaptovaný na tento program podobným spôsobom (nie je to úplne rovnaký koncept.)

**Princíp partnerstva**


**Stratégické posuzovanie vplyfov na životné prostredie (SEA)**

Stratégické posudzovanie vplyvov na životné prostredie Programu cezhraničnej spolupráce Maďarsko – Slovensko je plánované a vykonávané v súlade so smernicou 2001/42/EK a jej príslušnými národnými úpravami. Po posúdení výhod a nevýhod, sa Riadiaci výbor a príslušné orgány rozhodli vykonať SEA proces oddelene. To znamená, že spolôčná Práva o životnom prostredí spočíva v rámci dvoch samostatných procesov v súlade s vnútroštátnymi predpismi a konzultačné procesy prebiehajú v obch štátoch separatne. Oficiálnym začiatkom procesu SEA bol švážielenie rozsahu SEA orgánmi ochrany životného prostredia v oboch krajinách. Pozostáva z všetkých požadovaných informácií v súlade s právnymi predpisom. SEA je užitočným nástrojom pre zvýraznenie potenciálnych pozitívnych vplyvov programu na životné prostredie a bráni opatreniam, ktoré by mohli škodiť životnému prostrediu. Na základe súčasných informácií, ciele a plánované činnosti programu nebudú mať významný negatívny cezhraničný vplyv na životné prostredie.

Potenciálne vplyvy sa čiastočne týkajú životného prostredia a čiastočne trvalo udržateľného rozvoja. Je preto dôležité vyhniť sa nepriaznivým vplyvom na životné prostredie a brať do úvahy principy udržateľného rozvoja s cieľom zmierniť prípadné nepriaznivé účinky. Celá strategia programu je postavená na koncepte trvalo udržateľného rozvoja, niektoré ciele, priority a jednotlivé intervencie sú priamo zamerané na podporu technologického rozvoja a rozvoja infraštruktúry na ekologické, nízkohľadové hospodárstvo, s účinným využitím zdrojov. Niektoré ciele sú však jasne spojené s nepriaznivými vplyvmi.

Požiadavky udržateľného rozvoja sa odražajú nielen v plánovaní špecifických cieľov, ale sú integrované do programu aj ako horizontálne principy, ktoré zaistujú posun programu k prevencii kvality prírodných zdrojov. Jednoznačný prínos k trvalo udržateľnému rozvoji bude kritériom spôsobitosti v rámci výberového konania pri všetkých projektových návrhoch. Principy rovnakých príležitostí sa odražajú aj v konštrukciu indikátorov pre monitoring a evaluáciu a v kritériách oprávnenosti a výberu projektov, ktoré budú použité v rámci rôznych opatrení.

Celkovo, vzhľadom k synergickým a kumulatívnym pozitívnym vplyvom program môže priniesť k dosiahnutiu priazniviejsého stavu životného prostredia a to hlavne do budúcnosť (v strednej a dlhodobom horizonte).
1. INTRODUCTION

According to the Common Provisions Regulations Member States all programmes co-financed from EU funds shall be accompanied by ex ante evaluations. The role of the ex ante evaluation is to improve the quality and the design of the Programme and to verify whether the objectives and the targets can be reached. In accordance to the Regulation the evaluation should address in particular, the adequacy of the programme strategy, the corresponding objectives, indicators, targets and the allocation of budgetary resources. The evaluation is to be submitted together with the Programme and the Member States should take care that the evaluation is carried out by independent experts.


This report is the final ex ante evaluation of the Programme’s final version which was submitted on 16th of October 2014. The results of the SEA are presented in a different document attached to this report.

1.1. CONTENT OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

The structure of this Report is as follows:

- Chapter 1 is an Introduction which provides a brief description on the ex ante evaluation in general and particularly this engagement;
- Chapter 2 introduces the scope and objective of our engagement, the limitations to scope and our evaluation method;
- Chapter 3 introduces the activities we carried out which serves as the evidence to our findings and conclusions;
- Chapter 4 sets out our findings related to the Programme submitted in the beginning of April 2014;
- Chapter 5 outlines our conclusions and recommendations

Annex 1 HU-SK Programme interventions
Annex 2 Framework of indicators
Annex 3 List of reviewed documents
Annex 4 SWOT and Strategy workshop report
Annex 5 Implementation workshop report
Annex 6 Indicator workshop report
Annex 7 Evaluation Questions

---

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE

2.1.1. OBJECTIVES OF THE EX ANTE EVALUATION

According to Article 55 of the regulation EC/1303/2013\(^2\), the ex ante evaluation shall be implemented to improve the quality of the design of each programme. It shall be submitted to the European Commission at the same time as the Programme together with an executive summary. Furthermore, the ex ante evaluation shall incorporate the requirements for the Strategic Environmental Assessment set out in Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment.

The ex ante evaluation shall appraise:

- The contribution to the Union strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, having regard to the selected thematic objectives and priorities, taking into account national and regional needs and potential for development as well as lessons drawn from previous programming periods;
- The internal coherence of the proposed programme or activity and its relationship with other relevant instruments;
- The consistency of the allocation of budgetary resources with the objectives of the programme;
- The consistency of the selected thematic objectives, the priorities and corresponding objectives of the programmes with the CSF, partnership agreements and the relevant country specific recommendations adopted in accordance with Article 121(2) TFEU and where appropriate at national level, the National Reform Programme;
- The relevance and clarity of the proposed programme indicators;
- How the expected outputs will contribute to results;
- Whether the quantified target values for indicators are realistic, having regard to the support envisaged from the ESI Funds;
- The rationale for the form of support proposed;
- The adequacy of human resources and administrative capacity for management of the programme;
- The suitability of the procedures for monitoring the programme and for collecting the data necessary to carry out evaluations;
- The suitability of the milestones selected for the performance framework;
- The adequacy of planned measures to promote equal opportunities between men and women and to prevent any discrimination, in particular as regards accessibility for persons with disabilities;

\(^2\) Regulation (EU) No. 1303/2013 of the European Parliament and of the council of 17 December 2013 laying down common provisions on the ERDF, the ESF, the CF, the EAFRD and the EMFF and laying down general provisions on the ERDF, the ESF, the CF and EMFF and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No. 1083/2006
The adequacy of planned measures to promote sustainable development;
- The measures planned to reduce the administrative burden on beneficiaries.

### 2.1.2. Objectives of the SEA

The objective of the SEA is to integrate environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of the programme with a view to promoting sustainable development, according to Directive 2001/42/EC, and the respective national legislation. The purposes of this contract regarding SEA are as follows:

- To identify the existing environmental problems relevant to the programme (including in particular those problems which relate to the Natura 2000 network), assessing the environmental effects of the programme, by giving an overview of the possible favourable and unfavourable environmental impacts,
- To enhance the contribution of the programme to sustainable development,
- To set the relevant environmental protection objectives that should be considered within the programme and the SEA process, examining the coherence with the environmental and sustainable development policies at community, national and regional level.

### 2.1.3. Scope of the Report

The ex ante evaluation has been prepared according to the final draft version of the HU-SK CBC Programme (2014-2020) which was provided by the programming team on 7 July 2014. The aim of the evaluation is to provide a sound assessment on the content of the proposed final HU-SK CBC Programme (2014-2020).

The ex ante report introduces the evaluation process by clearly showing our supportive approach during the whole programming process.

### 2.2. Limitations and Constraints

The accuracy of this Report has been constrained by numerous factors. The primary limitation is that the programming is carried out parallel with the ex ante evaluation. This means the following:

- The PA level financial allocation was not yet approved by the Programming Task Force at the time of former ex ante evaluations. By the time of this ex ante evaluation the financial allocation was approved by the Task Force and the evaluation became completed.
- At the time of the preparation of this evaluation report the Partnership Agreements of the OPs both in case of Hungary and Slovakia were submitted but not yet approved. This means that in case of the consistency and the coherence assessment we used the draft public versions of the mentioned documents. The coherence assessment could be carried out for Hungarian OPs that were available at the time of the preparation of this document.
- The coherence assessment could be carried out for Hungarian OPs that were available at the time of the preparation of this document. Since these mainstream OPs not have been approved by the European Commission.
The evaluation can be carried out in following parts of the Programme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HU-SK Programme chapters</th>
<th>Elaboration</th>
<th>Evaluability</th>
<th>Related EQs 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme strategy</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>a), b); c); d); f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the PAs</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>g); h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention logic</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing plan</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>e); i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>l); n); o); p); q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal issues</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>j); k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>x); y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation system</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>r); s); t); u); v); w); z)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3. **APPLIED EVALUATION METHOD**

The applied evaluation methods and data collection techniques were structured according to the evaluation questions set by the ToR as follows:

- **Review of documents** which are related to this engagement, including:
  - Review of Cohesion Policy papers that were drafted to the new programming period
  - Review of key EU regulations relevant for the CBC programmes
  - Relevant regulations and guidelines related to ex ante evaluation
  - Directives that regulate the SEA process
  - Former evaluations

  List of relevant documents can be found in Annex 3.

- **Co-creation workshops** where we facilitated the adoption of independent standpoints of stakeholders within the framework of a workshops

- **In-depth interviews** have been carried out with stakeholders involved in the implementation.

- **Ethnographic observations** were made in programming and decision making events such as Task Force meetings and consultations or other events organised by the programming team and the JTS.

- **Indicator analysis** was carried out according to the rules set by the general regulation on ex ante evaluation

- The **SEA** of the HU–SK CBC Programme is planned and carried out in line with the 2001/42/EC Directive (that defines strategic environmental assessment and introduces it into the planning process of programmes supported by EU funds). SEA is a useful tool to highlight potential positive environmental impacts of a program and hinder measures that might be harmful for the environment. Moreover, this Directive requires: “In order to contribute to more transparent decision making and with the aim of ensuring that the information supplied for the assessment is comprehensive and reliable, it is necessary to provide that authorities with relevant environmental responsibilities and

3 Evaluation Questions can be found in Annex 5
the public are to be consulted during the assessment of plans and programmes, and that appropriate time frames are set, allowing sufficient time for consultations, including the expression of opinion."
3. PROGRESS REPORT

In the following sections we introduce the activities carried out by the ex ante evaluator and the SEA team during the programming period.

3.1. DOCUMENT REVIEW

As evaluators we reviewed all relevant EU regulations and national documents which could be linked to the HU-SK CBC Programme. Furthermore, we reviewed former evaluations and papers published by INTERACT related to the evolution of ETC issues.

The following strategic documents were reviewed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU documents</th>
<th>National documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Europa 2020 Strategy</td>
<td>• Partnership Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relevant EU regulations and directives</td>
<td>• National Reform Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Methodology guidelines on ex ante evaluation and programming</td>
<td>• Country specific recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interreg information papers</td>
<td>• Mainstream OPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Roma strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other relevant national strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A detailed list of EU and national documents reviewed can be found in Annex 3.

3.2. IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS

In-depth interviews were carried out with selected key actors in the topic of coherence and consistency assessment and the implementation system as well. The interviews contributed to outlining our findings, conclusions and recommendations. Due to personal issues we decided not to include the minutes of these meetings.

3.3. CO-CREATION WORKSHOPS

At the co-creation workshops participants work together in order to reach a common opinion in certain topics. Co-creation workshops are effective for supporting the planning process. Thus, stakeholders from both side of the border were involved in the co-creation workshops at certain points of the programming.

The following co-creation workshops were held in the past phases of the evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWOT and Strategy workshop</td>
<td>The workshop aimed to support the planning team to build an adequate SWOT analysis and draft strategy, based on the analysis of the current situation. The purpose of the workshop was to have a constructive understanding of the SWOT elements. Thanks to the workshop the selected TOs could be easily justified.</td>
<td>Programming TF members, planning team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Target group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation workshop</td>
<td>In the course of the workshop, a wide range of stakeholders were involved in the setting of the type of actions within all proposed PA. The workshop was facilitated by the planning team and the ex ante evaluators acted as rapporteurs.</td>
<td>Programming TF members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator workshop</td>
<td>The workshop supported the planning team to build an adequate indicator system for the programme. At the workshop the rules of defining and choosing indicators were introduced and the stakeholders could discuss the formulation of the indicators and the requirements of the performance framework.</td>
<td>JTS, MA, NA, Government Bodies representatives, DG Regio representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA workshop</td>
<td>The workshop aimed to provide forum for discussing the findings of the environmental assessment with the responsible authorities from Hungarian side. This workshop is part of the consultation of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) findings. The workshop was designed and facilitated by the ex-ante evaluators collaborating planners and JTS.</td>
<td>Local authorities defined by the SEA legislation, planners, JTS and TF members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshops were designed and facilitated by the ex ante evaluators. As a result, we experienced real collaboration between the stakeholders: they could express their opinion, had an opportunity to share their views with each other, and thus were able to reach a consensus in the end.

3.4. ETHNOGRAPHIC OBSERVATION

In the course of this engagement we took so called „ethnographic observations” since we think that it is easier to assess the planning process by being part of it. The aim of this qualitative technique is to take part in high-level consultations and make observations on the participants and the articulation of their opinion.

Accordingly we participated and observed all relevant planning events, Programming Group meetings and discussions related to SEA from gaining direct impressions of the adequacy and effectiveness of the programming progress. On one hand, ethnographic observations let us to observe meetings and consultations as independent parties. On the other hand, at certain stages of the discussions we were requested to share the ex ante point of views. As a result, we could draw the attention on important issues e.g. the need for an adequate intervention logic, indicators, partnership issues, the involvement in the SEA process and the scheduling of the programming.

Additionally, these meetings provided us opportunity to consult with the expert of the DG Regio and the responsibles of national stakeholders as well.

3.5. CONTINUOUS CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

During the evaluation continuous consultation work was carried out with the HU-SK JTS and the planning team members via personal meetings, email and phone. All phases of the programming process was supported via meetings and workshops.
In order to inform the HU-SK JTS about the progress of the evaluation and SEA process monthly Progress Reports have been submitted about the work done in each period, possible risks and rescheduling and the next steps.

Within the evaluation team continuous co-ordination was carried out: the project manager of the Consortium kept everyone in the loop and shared all information related to the engagement.
Timeline of our participative work:

- **17/07/2013**: 3rd Programming Group meeting
- **16/10/2013**: 4th Programming Group meeting
- **8/10/2013**: Pre-TF meeting
- **11/14/10/2013**: Planning focus groups
- **25/09/2013**: Kick-off meeting
- **26/11/2013**: SEA meeting
- **13/11/2013**: Technical meeting (between the planning team and the evaluators)
- **02/12/2013**: SWOT&Strategy workshop
- **05/02/2014**: Implementation workshop
- **18/02/2014**: Planning meeting at VÁTI
- **28/02/2014**: Pre-TF meeting
- **24-25/04/2014**: 7th Programming Group meeting
- **28/05/2014**: Planning meeting at VÁTI
- **13/11/2013**: Technical meeting (between the planning team and the evaluators)
- **06/02/2014**: Indicator workshop
- **31/03/2014**: Technical meeting (between the planning team and the evaluators)
- **02/07/2014**: SEA workshop
- **20/06/2014**: 8th Programming Group meeting

**Ethnographic observation**

- **July 2013**
- **Aug**
- **Sept**
- **Oct**
- **Nov**
- **Dec**

**Coordination and consultation**

- **Feb 2014**
- **Mar**
- **Apr**
- **May**
- **Jun**
- **July**
4. EX ANTE EVALUATION: FINDINGS

4.1. CONTRIBUTION OF THE PROGRAMME TO THE EUROPE 2020 STRATEGY

4.1.1. CONSISTENCY WITH EUROPE 2020 OBJECTIVES AND FLAGSHIP INITIATIVES

There are many indirect linkages with the relevant Europe 2020 targets (e.g. SME development, employment, R&D, climate and energy, social inclusion). Although, the flagship initiatives do not contain recommendations with direct implications on ETC or specific regions where there are many overlaps among the targeted policy areas.

The tables below show the relation between the Europe 2020 targets, the flagship initiatives and the HU-SK CBC Programme’s specific objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Europe 2020 targets</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>2.2_1</th>
<th>2.2_2</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>4.1_1</th>
<th>4.1_2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Employment</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. R&amp;D/innovation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Climate</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change/energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fighting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poverty/social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of relation: + contribution, 0 neutral, # contradiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Europe 2020 Flagship initiatives</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>2.2_1</th>
<th>2.2_2</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>4.1_1</th>
<th>4.1_2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Digital agenda for Europe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Innovation Union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Youth on the move</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resource efficient Europe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. An industrial policy for the</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>globalization era</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inclusive growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. An agenda for new skills and</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. European platform against</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of relation: + contribution, 0 neutral, # contradiction

4.2. CONSISTENCY WITH RELEVANT STRATEGIC DOCUMENTS

In the followings findings are described related to the Programme’s consistency with the following strategic documents:

- CSF, Danube Strategy
- Country-specific recommendations regarding both Hungary and Slovakia
- Partnership Agreements

Internal consistency:
4.2.1. **CONSISTENCY WITH THE CSF AND OTHER COMMUNITY STRATEGIC DOCUMENTS**

The OP strategy is compliant with Common Strategic Framework (CSF). The areas of support mentioned in CSF are more specific and provide even wider selection although the main areas remain the same. The specification of support measures in CSF is wider than selection for the Programme, it includes e.g. in the area of transport support for the coherent planning of transport infrastructure (including TEN-T) and the development of environmentally friendly and interoperable transport, or in the area of cross-border labour market it mentions services promoting cross-border job-search platforms, advice centres, and other job-related issues such as development of simple and rapid procedures for the mutual recognition of qualifications, agreements on tax, social and health insurance.

The Programme is aligned with the priorities of the Danube Strategy related mainly to the activities, which are directed towards connecting the regions, protecting the environment, building prosperity and strengthening the concerned regions.

While the general framework of the Programme strategy is in line with all relevant strategies, the selection of activities that should lead to desired changes is in some instances more reflecting political wishes than real needs and problems, mainly as regards roads construction. Activities like basic public tourism infrastructure, information and small scale facilities in cross-border cooperation interventions represent potentially justifiable use for CSF funds, namely when addressing diversification or initiating the economic potential of rural areas.

4.2.2. **CONTRIBUTION TO THE FULFILMENT OF COUNTRY-SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS**

The European Council reviews the fulfilment of the Members States’ national reform programmes and the progress of these strategies aiming primarily at economic development. Since the measures of these strategies are primarily to be implemented by the (central) government of the countries, the HU-SK CBC Programme has limited possibility and competence in their implementation however in some areas and sectors it can contribute to their fulfilment. Hereafter follows the review of the Programme’s contribution to the recommended actions for the period 2013-2014.

**CONTRIBUTION TO THE COUNTRY-SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HUNGARY**

After reviewing the relevant document we can state that the issues tackled by the following country-specific recommendations are completely beyond the Programme’s competence.

- Implement a credible and growth friendly fiscal strategy by specifying the necessary measures focusing on expenditure savings and preserve a sound fiscal position in compliance with the medium-term objective over the programme horizon. Building on the above steps, put the general government debt ratio on a firm downward path, also with a view to mitigating the accumulated macroeconomic imbalances. Enhance the medium-term budgetary framework by making it more binding and by closely linking it to numerical rules. Broaden the mandatory remit of the Fiscal Council, including through systematic ex-post monitoring of compliance with numerical fiscal rules as well as the preparation of regular macro-fiscal forecasts and budgetary impact assessments of major policy proposals.

- Help restore normal lending to the economy primarily by improving the capacity for capital accumulation in the financial sector, inter alia by lowering the extra burden currently imposed on it. Improve portfolio quality by removing bad assets from banks' balance sheets, closely
consult stakeholders on new policy initiatives and make sure that new policy measures do not increase moral hazard among borrowers. Enhance financial regulation and supervision, notably by giving more effective emergency powers to the Hungarian Financial Supervisory Authority and by establishing a bank resolution regime.

- Ensure a stable, more balanced and predictable corporate tax system. Streamline corporate taxation and minimise distortions of resource allocation created by sector-specific taxes, so as to foster growth and employment. Continue making taxation of labour more employment-friendly by alleviating the tax burden on low-wage earners, inter alia by refining the eligibility criteria for the Job Protection Act, and by shifting taxation away to environmental taxes. Fully implement and step up the already announced measures to improve tax compliance and reduce the cost of tax compliance.

- Create a supportive business environment, in particular restore an attractive environment for foreign direct investors, by making the regulatory framework more stable and by fostering market competition. Ensure the prompt implementation of measures envisaged to reduce the administrative burden, improve competition in public procurement and take adequate measures to tackle corruption. Address concerns about the independence of the judiciary. Remove recently introduced barriers in the services sector, including in retail services. Provide targeted incentives to support innovative enterprises.

- Gradually abolish regulated energy prices while ensuring the effective protection of economically vulnerable consumers. Take further steps to ensure the independence of the national regulator. Ensure the financial sustainability of state owned enterprises in the transport sector by reducing operational costs and increasing revenues.

The HU-SK CBC Programme has connection with the following country-specific recommendations:

- Address youth unemployment, for example through a Youth Guarantee. Strengthen active labour market policy measures and enhance the client profiling system of the Public Employment Service. Reduce the dominance of the public works scheme within employment measures and strengthen its activation elements. Reinforce training programmes to boost participation in lifelong learning. Continue to expand child-care facilities to encourage women's participation. Ensure that the objective of the National Social Inclusion Strategy is mainstreamed in all policy fields in order to reduce poverty, particularly among children and Roma.

- Implement a national strategy on early school-leaving and ensure that the education system provides all young people with labour-market-relevant skills, competences and qualifications. Improve access to inclusive mainstream education, in particular for Roma. Support the transition between different stages of education and towards the labour market. Implement a higher-education reform that enables greater tertiary attainment, particularly by disadvantaged students.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE COUNTRY-SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SLOVAKIA

Three of the recommendation addressed to the Slovak Republic, have no direct relation to the OP. These recommendations were related to the state budget for the year 2013, namely deficit, structural adjustment, efficiency of public spending, pension reform and sustainability of public finance as well as the cost-effectiveness of the health-care sector; combating tax fraud, improving VAT collection and tax compliance, real-estate taxation; strengthening of the Act on Civil Service, improving the management of human resources in public administration, strengthening analytical capacities in key ministries, improving the absorption of EU funds, improving the efficiency of the judicial system and promoting alternative dispute resolution procedures.
Part of the two other recommendations linked with the employment issues will be subject to the measures planned within the PA3 and 4 of the OP. The two recommendations were stated as:

- „Take measures to enhance the capacity of public employment services to provide personalised services to jobseekers and strengthen the link between activation measures and social assistance. More effectively address long-term unemployment through activation measures and tailored training. Enhance the provision of child-care facilities, in particular for children below three years of age. Reduce the tax wedge for low-paid workers and adapt the benefit system”
- and „Step up efforts to address high youth unemployment, for example through a Youth Guarantee. Take steps to attract young people to the teaching profession and raise educational outcomes. In vocational education and training, reinforce the provision of work-based learning in companies. In higher education, create more job-oriented bachelor programmes. Foster effective knowledge transfer by promoting cooperation between academia, research and the business sector. Step up efforts to improve access to high-quality and inclusive pre-school and school education for marginalised communities, including Roma.”

The measures proposed within PA3 of the OP should address unemployment in general for all groups of unemployed but mainly support cross-border labour mobility, deal with the support to jobseekers, establish networks and cooperation among labour market institutions aimed at the provision and dissemination of information relating to differences between labour market regulations, needs and job opportunities. The activities planned with the PA4 should strengthen inter-institutional cooperation and its focus includes also some education and training activities (also foreseen within PA3).

The last one of the presented recommendation mentioned as:

- „Step up efforts to make the energy market function better; in particular, to increase the transparency of the tariff-setting mechanism, enhance the accountability of the regulator. Strengthen interconnections with neighbouring countries. Improve energy efficiency in particular in the construction sector and in industry”

It will be partly addressed within the PA 1, 2 and 3. All of the measures are the same infrastructure nature and are supposed to deal with the interconnections between Hungary and Slovakia. These activities will increase permeability of the border and make the access from one side of the border to the other side easier. The increase of density of border crossing points should thus facilitate cross-border labour force migration and connect tourism facilities on both sides of the border.

### 4.2.3. CONSISTENCY WITH THE PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS

#### PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT BETWEEN HUNGARY AND THE EU

The development and investment strategy of the Partnership Agreement aims to meet the development needs and exploit the growth potential identified based on the objectives defined in the National Development and Territorial Development Concept (NTDC), in EU2020 Strategy and commitments fixed in the National Reform Programme. The overarching national development objective for Hungary in the 2014-2020 programme period defined by PA is to **achieve sustainable economic growth** based on **high value added production and a rising level of employment**. The main guideline of the defining of the Partnership Agreement’s contribution and identification of the interventions’ objectives and results are the so-called main **national development objectives** which are the following:

1. Improving the competitiveness and global performance of the business sector
2. Promoting employment through economic development, employment, education and social inclusion policies, taking account of territorial disparities
3. Enhancing energy and resource efficiency
4. Tackling social inclusion and demographic challenges
5. Implementation of local and territorial development aimed at promoting economic growth

Programme’s strategy and its approach is totally in line with the Hungarian overarching national development objective, because it also focuses on the economic development of the border region and on fostering the local and regional growth potential. The Programme directly promotes the national development objectives No. 1, 2, while the objective No. 5 is also supported because of the very nature of the Programme, having its focus on a specific target area which’s significant part belongs to the less developed regions of Hungary and because of its integrated approach to the territorial development (primarily through the envisaged use of ITI).

**PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT BETWEEN SLOVAKIA AND THE EU**

The structure of the HU-SK CBC Programme proposal is generally compliant with the major national and European strategic priorities. The selected thematic objectives and investment priorities reflect the priorities set out in the latest version of the Slovak Partnership Agreement in relation to the cross border cooperation. Specifically in relation to the HU-SK CBC Programme (2014 – 2020) it states the main focus on the protection and promotion of the environment, building transport infrastructure, strengthening of cross-border mobility, use of rivers for freight and passenger transport and completion of a modern transport network of the border region.

The current proposal of the HU-SK CBC Programme is eventually a bit wider and in addition it also covers support to the competitiveness of small and medium size enterprises, support to employment and inter-institutional cooperation.

The current proposal of the strategy does not mention any external factors with the potential positive or negative influence on the performance of the Programme. However, based on the experience from the implementation of the currently running Programme it is obvious that some risks might be envisaged and lessons should be learned. For example, the in-depth evaluation confirmed that tourism actions were more popular than viable, therefore more attention should be paid to the sustainability of the projects at their selection stage. It is obvious that national regulations are causing delays or even hinder project implementation and there were some financing discrepancies identified. All these issues should be taken into account at the planning stage and mitigation strategies should be introduced.

### 4.2.4. CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER RELEVANT NATIONAL STRATEGIC DOCUMENTS

**NATIONAL REFORM PROGRAMMES**

The Programme’s strategy and objectives are fundamentally in line with the objectives set by the **National Reform Programme 2013 of Hungary** and they will contribute to reach its target, especially in fields which are not completely in the competence of central government and where the exploitation of potentials significantly depend on regional and local actors and environment, too, such as: research and development, labour market, social inclusion. By increasing the cross-border integration of public services PA5 will contribute to also the modernisation of public administration.

In relation to the **Slovak National Reform Programme** priorities, there are several areas, which are also supported by the interventions planned with the HU-SK CBC Programme. These are
mainly measures related to the innovation, transport, environment and employment. Most of the measures are to be supported through the mainstream Programmes, but cross border measures will be complementary. The border line for identical measures is most often the eligible cross border region.


By the adoption of this strategy inclusion became and overall government policy, thus all the government policies, actions and interventions should consider the aspect of the inclusion of people living in deep poverty and Roma. The strategy also set the criteria of inclusion as a precondition for all development actions taken by any public body in Hungary (from central government to local municipalities). Integration and inclusion are the basic principles of the strategy, thus these should be reflected also in this Programme although it doesn’t address directly this issue. Through PA3 and PA4 that are covering TO8 and 11 the (social) inclusion of people living in deep poverty and Roma should be supported as far as possible especially by relevant measures directly appearing in the call for applications.

The strategy defines the following 6 intervention areas: 1. Child well-being; 2. Education-trainings; 3. Employment; 4. Healthcare; 5. Housing; 6. Inclusion, change of attitudes, fight against discrimination. Out of the 6 areas the Programme might particularly have a positive impact on intervention areas no. 2, 3 and 4.

**Position Paper**

According to the Position paper cross-border actions should concentrate on removing the main bottlenecks in transport, improving accessibility of border regions (including multimodal public transport services), removing barriers to labour mobility, favouring exchanges of know-how and joint innovative projects so that both Slovak and Hungarian bordering regions benefit from knowledge, skills and infrastructure in their immediate neighbourhood. With one exception, these priorities were fully reflected in the proposal of the new HU-SK CBC Programme. The envisaged cooperation in the field of environment, with a cross-border impact (such as water quality or anti-flood measures), is the area where the SWOT analysis showed some potential due to the sources of drinking water in the concerned area but eventual requirements of the stakeholders did not confirm the actual needs/interest therefore no specific measures of this type are included in the proposed Programme.

**4.2.5. Consistency of the SWOT Analysis and the Strategy**

In order to assess and improve the consistency of the SWOT analysis and the Strategy, the ex ante evaluators organised a SWOT & Strategy workshop (see progress report for details). The outcomes of this workshop serve as the main basis for the findings in these sections, some of them already reflected in the programme strategy.

**4.3. External and Internal Coherence**

In order to assess the external consistency and coherence the following national mainstream Operational Programmes have been reviewed:
4.3.1. EXTERNAL CONSISTENCY AND COHERENCE WITH THE HUNGARIAN OPs (2014-2020)

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME (EDIOP)

The developments of EDIOP will be implemented under 7 priority axes, as follows:

1. Small and Medium Enterprises
2. Strengthening the Knowledge Economy
3. Development of Information and Communication Technologies
4. Energy
5. Employment
6. Competitive Tourism Supply
7. Development of Financial Instruments and Services

Despite the fact that both programmes’ overall aim is economic development, the relations between the two programmes is not sufficiently explicit: it creates synergy with a limited extent. Developments aimed at promoting knowledge economy and ICT, does not covered at all by the Programme, and also the links with financial instruments are limited. Slight overlap occurs between PA4 and Programme's specific objective No 2.2.1. Practically the only PA which has closer link with the Programme is the No. 1 covering the issues tackled in the HU-SK CBC PA3.

In order to make a closer link between the two programmes, it has to be considered, how can be developments in ICT and knowledge economy tackled by the Programme. Also the possibility of using different financial instruments in cross-border business developments should be examined.
ENVIRONMENTAL AND ENERGY-EFFICIENCY OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME (EEEOP)

EEEOP’s investment strategy is made up from the following 6 priority axes:

1. Preparation for the climate change
2. Development of public utility service
3. Water protection, waste management, air quality and noise protection related developments and Eco innovation
4. Environmental protection and the protection of the natural habitat
5. Usage of renewable energy resources, energy and energy efficiency improvements
6. Financial instruments for the energy sector

At the case of EEEOP only on one interrelation can be demonstrated at this stage of planning: overlapping between EEEOP’s priority axis No. 4 (Environmental protection and the protection of the natural habitat) and the PA1. This very little interrelation is primarily the result of the EEEOP’s specific sectorial measures which generally require bigger investments financed by CF, but also because of the Programme’s focus on developments which can foster economic growth. It has to be underlined that similar developments and projects to EEEOP’s current profile were financed under the previous HU-SK CBC programme.

INTEGRATED TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME (ITOP)

ITOP’s development strategy is made up from the following priority axes:

1. Improvement of international (TEN-T) road accessibility
2. Improvement of international (TEN-T) rail and inland waterway accessibility
3. Development of regional road accessibility and transport safety
4. Improvement of suburban, regional rail accessibility and energy-efficiency
5. Development of sustainable urban transport

By the examination of the two programmes objectives it can be concluded that there are no overlap between them, despite that the Programme also defines measures with clear transport development aims. The reason for this is that the Programme’s transport development interventions are well-based and well-focused according to the needs and possibilities of the Programme area.

To enhance the complementarity of the two programmes in the field of transport, the content of ITOP’s priorities No. 3, 4 and 5 should be revised and compared with the Programmes similar objectives at the further stage of planning, thus making a more precise selection of measures for transport development.

TERRITORIAL AND SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME (TOP)

The developments in the TOP will be implemented under 6 priority axes, as follows:

1. Regional economic development for promoting employment
2. Development of the environment in the cities and their surroundings
3. Transition into a low carbon economy, especially in urban areas
4. Strengthening social inclusion and development of local public services
5. Community-led local developments in urban regions and local level (CLLD-type developments)
6. Human resource developments, social inclusion and employment promotion at county and local level

Analysing the interrelations between the two Programmes, it is remarkable that the most frequent and strongest interrelations are with 3 priority axes of the TOP (No. 1, 3, 5). These priority axes aimed mainly at economic development and improving employment, thus they are closely linked to the PA3 and between them synergic effects to be expected. PA1 aiming at natural heritage protection/development is also linked with TOP’s tourism and economic development measures and it is overlapping partly with the TOP’s priority axis No. 3 because it also supports investments in transport. Since the HU-SK CBC Programme’s transport development objectives are clearly focused on cross-border developments, there is no serious risk of parallel developments in this field.

Measures for economic development and employment should be planned in a complementary approach to the Hungarian support planned at TOP.

**COMPETITIVE CENTRAL HUNGARY OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME (CCHOP)**

CCHOP has the following priority axes:

1. Enhancing the competitiveness of enterprises, promoting employment and strengthening the knowledge economy
2. Developing financial instruments and services
3. Settlement development
4. Community led local developments – CLLD
5. Energy efficiency focused infrastructure development projects in public services and improving service quality
6. Programmes promoting social inclusion
7. Programmes promoting employability

CCHOP has a strong focus on economic development, thus the interrelations between the objectives of CCHOP and the Programme, shows that synergy is among practically all the priority axes aiming at economic development and promoting employment i.e. among priority axes No. 1 and 7 of the CCHOP and PA3. CCHOP’s CLLD is an exception because it merges a wide range of development objectives, thus it has synergy with all the Programme’s measures. Also transport developments from both programme seem to be complementary. Overlapping might appear only at two cases (tourism and environmental development), but at this stage of planning process it’s not proved that there is real risk of supporting parallel developments.

**HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME (HDOP)**

HDOP defines 6 priority axes:

1. Infrastructure projects in the field of social inclusion
2. An inclusive society
3. Infrastructure investments for the growing knowledge capital
4. Growing knowledge capital
5. Good state
6. Implementation of local strategies, social innovation and transnational cooperation

As mentioned before, the Programme does not tackle adequately the issue of social inclusion thus there is very little interrelation between the two programmes. In fact only HDOP’s priority axis No. 6 has synergy with the PA4.
Considering the programme areas' social conditions it is highly recommended to involve social inclusion at the Programme’s intervention logic and to stress this issue especially when promoting employment. Developments in education (trainings) might be also useful supplement activates of promoting employability and economic development.

**Hungarian Fishery and Aquaculture Operational Programme (FAOP)**

FAOP defines 4 priorities which, aiming at specific sectorial developments, are fundamentally out of the target development priorities of the Programme. Programme will not address directly fishery, but some of its measures will support FAOP’s overall objective, especially by SO1.1. Also, PA3 will indirectly support by its developments FAOP priority No.4 (Increase employment and territorial cohesion).

SO1.1 should directly pay attention to the aspects of fishery sector, investments should be carefully planned in order to facilitate fishing where it is present and to preserve or improve the natural habitat of sensitive fish and aquatic species.

**Rural Development Operational Programme (RDOP)**

The Programme directly does not focus on rural development and it has no specific objective aiming at this issue. Theoretically all the interventions indirectly aiming at economic developments and calls will be open for businesses and other actors from rural areas. The interventions planned under PA 1 and 2 will specially target rural areas and improve their socio-economic situation because their focus on developments of the environment, natural heritage and cross-border mobility which has exactly the least favourable conditions in the rural areas of the programme area. The Programme will most effectively support 3 priority axes of the RDOP (1. Knowledge transfer and innovation in agriculture, forestry and in rural areas; 2. Fostering competitiveness and viability of farms, promoting innovation and sustainable forestry, 4. Restoring, conserving and ameliorating the conditions of ecosystems depending on agriculture and forestry).

In order to foster its positive effects on rural development the Programme might define specific measures for supporting rural development and agriculture within. Especially PA3 could give place for the support of agricultural businesses e.g. by fostering the cooperation of the farmers from both side of the border, merging micro regional agricultural markets and establishing cross-border food supply-chains. Under PA1 farmers and other agricultural actors should be encouraged to participate in tourism developments as it offers them a good opportunity to widen their scope of activity, thus to ensure them a more stable and balanced income structure.

**4.3.2. Consistency and Coherence with the Slovak OPs (2014-2020)**

In the next programming period the Slovak Republic will implement eight mainstream OPs: OP Research and Innovation, OP Integrated Infrastructure, OP Human Resources, OP Quality of Environment, OP Effective Public Administration, Integrated Regional OP, Rural Development OP and OP Fisheries. The OPs are being drafted and thus used in the currently available stage for the assessment purposes.
QUALITY OF ENVIRONMENT OP (QEOP)

The OP is comprising four priority axis built on three TOs (4, 5 and 6). The only common relationship with the HU-SK CBC Programme is TO 6 which is “Preserving and protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency” but support is provided for different investment priorities with one exception. OP Quality of environment contains IP 6a, b, d, e, which are basically waste, water, biodiversity and environment in the cities – actions to improve the urban environment, including regeneration of brownfield sites and reduction of air pollution. HU-SK CBC Programme plans support within 6c “Conserving, protecting, promoting and developing natural and cultural heritage”, which is the only overlap in the IP. Although there are some common activities envisaged the border line is set at the level of eligible area, which must be a CBC location. Thus all of the actions between the two OPs should be complementary.

INTEGRATED REGIONAL OP (IROP)

The Integrated Regional Operational Programme operations on the Slovak side shall be complementary to the Cross border Cooperation Programme with Hungary mainly in several areas. Both of the OPs contain two identical IPs – 7b and 7c. The planned activities of IROP include mainly (re)construction of roads (II. and III. class roads) and cycle-routes in cities and/or public transport in the cities, which does not overlap with the activities of HU-SK CBC Programme. The overlap in the investment priority 8b is not foreseen as the activities planned within IROP should solely deal with the creative industry issues.

OP RESEARCH AND INNOVATION (OP RI)

This OP is the main tool for the implementation of the national Research and Innovation Strategy. The main focus of this OP is the support of Research and Innovation infrastructure, cooperation of research institution and enterprises with the ultimate aim to increase the competitiveness of economy through innovations including energy efficiency measures. The activities of CBC programme may have a complementary nature and the current OP structure will exclude any duplications.

OP INTEGRATED INFRASTRUCTURE (OP II)

The OP II is primarily focused on the transport infrastructure within the Slovak Republic, mainly roads, railways and public transport. The investment priorities 7b and 7c that are supported within both OPs (OP II and CBC HU-SK) have slightly different nature. The road infrastructure activities plan mainly road construction within northern the part of the local speed roads network, which will not interfere with the area on the Hungarian border. The water transport on the Danube plans bigger size investment projects enabling better use for the international water transport and improving harbour facilities. The interventions planned within CBC Programme should be complementary as they will be most likely of smaller size and local and/or regional importance.

OP HUMAN RESOURCES (OP HR)

The primary aims of the OP HR are dealing with education, employment, social inclusion and Roma minority issues. Although most of the measures in the priority axis Employment have the same eventual aim as the measures in the HU-SK CBC Programme, the proposed measures are
not identical. OP HR is focused on internal regional mobility, youth unemployment, long-term unemployed and gender issues.

**Rural Development OP (RDOP)**

This OP is focused on the promotion of knowledge and innovation in agriculture, forestry and rural areas, enhancing the competitiveness of all types of agriculture, supporting organisation in the food chain, restoration of preserving and enhancing ecosystems dependent on agriculture and forestry, promoting efficient use of resources and the transition to the low-carbon and climate resilient agriculture, food and forestry and promoting social inclusion, poverty reduction and economic development in rural areas. Current proposal does not contain any activities, which would duplicate efforts proposed in the HU-SK CBC Programme. However, the cooperation activities envisaged for different types of beneficiaries can potentially overlap if they are of agriculture nature. This concerns mainly development of local food products, common marketing, exhibitions, etc.

**Effective Public Administration OP and OP Fisheries**

These OPs do not contain any actions, which could be of similar type as those planned within the HU-SK CBC Programme.

**4.3.3. Internal Coherence**

The analysis on internal coherence takes into account two aspects. Firstly, the coherence between needs and problems identified in the analytical part of the draft OP. Secondly, the intervention logic of the OP, i.e. if the causal relation between different levels of objectives are coherent, logical and obvious. The judgment is provided if the planned activities are likely to produce outputs (services or products) that would lead to results bringing the expected change – expressed by the specific objectives, and if these objectives are likely to contribute to the achievement of the thematic objectives (investment priorities).

The draft of the HU-SK CBC Programme refers to all relevant strategy documents and provides a basic frame of its operation. Internal coherence has been improved, since the planning process was carried out in parallel with the ex ante evaluation, and was thoroughly discussed by the Task Force members on several occasions.

Overall, only small details remained to improve the quality of the OP. There are still too many results listed but only one can be measured through the indicator concerned. It would be more appropriate to mention that additional impacts might be expected but the result should clearly correspond to the specific objective which should have the respective indicator.

**PA1: Nature & Culture**

Based on the analysis, protection of the environment, natural heritage and biodiversity was identified as a common task for both countries. Apart from that, one of the core topics that should be dealt with in the CBC Programme was common tourism management enabling use of cultural and natural heritage.

PA1 thus follows investment priority (6c) aimed at conserving, protecting, promoting and developing natural and cultural heritage with the specific aim to increase the attractiveness of the border area. The proposed set of activities includes a wide scale of actions supporting development of cultural heritage sites on existing thematic paths including soft measures, small scale
infrastructure and reconstruction; cultural initiatives; natural protection measures; as well as actions combining promotion and protection measures. Nevertheless, due to the significant disproportion in financial allocations (in favour of road construction), a better justification would be welcome to avoid additional comments during the approval process at the Commission services.

The OP mentions the possibility of the use of new PP Light scheme and Small Project Fund (SPF). While it is still possible to use both schemes, in such a case it should be considered to establish a common administrative structure for them to ensure the most efficient and effective way of implementation and minimise administration costs. Provided that SPF is implemented through two priority axes (PA1 and PA4), a decision should be taken whether both schemes are implemented with the same administration mechanism under different calls for proposals (with specific targets compliant with the PA) or a different administration set up is likely to be introduced.

**PA2: Enhancing cross-border mobility**

The analytical part of the OP mentions low density of border crossing points compared to Western European countries. Nevertheless, the IP refers to the Enhancing of regional mobility by connecting secondary and tertiary nodes to TEN-T infrastructure, thus the logical link is not so obvious. As regards the second part of the PA, logistics facilities, the analysis suggests the need for their better use in an integrated way by creating cross-border intermodal logistics zones. The proposed measures of the OP address the issue of logistics centres but planned activities are not sufficiently supported by analytical findings thus the justification is not adequate. The text should clearly mention that the intention to include substantial road infrastructure investments in the OP is based on the mutual agreement signed by both Prime Ministers.

The proposed PA2 aims to promote sustainable transport and remove bottlenecks in key network infrastructures. It comprises two investment priorities: (7b) to enhance regional mobility by connecting secondary and tertiary nodes to TEN-T infrastructure, including multimodal nodes and (7c) to develop and improve environment-friendly and low-carbon transport systems ... in order to promote sustainable regional and local mobility.

The specific objective of the first investment priority is “Increasing the density between border crossing points along the Hungarian-Slovak border”. It is expected to intensify the cross-border mobility and shorten journey time. The actions proposed under the first objective cover both preparatory activities (studies, plans) as well as construction of cross-border roads, bridges, ferries and related infrastructure. The combination of these activities in a single project is potentially risky due to necessity to gain various permits, which may prolong the implementation period and cause difficulties during the project implementation.

The second part of the PA consists of two specific objectives as improvement of cross-border public transport services and logistics services. These interventions should deliver the results described as improved interconnectivity of regional centres and sub-centres, increased volumes of passengers and goods and decreased pollution. The thematic objective assumes environmentally friendly transport services, which should be ensured by the rail and waterway transport eventually resulting in decreased pollution.

As regards the activities they are planned to support the preparation of investments, cross-border intelligent transport systems and services (information systems, on-line schedules, e-ticketing, mobile apps); the establishment of transport associations; cross-border cooperation initiatives in the field of logistics; and investments in relevant infrastructure (vehicles, bus and railway stations, ferry ports). The same conditions should be applied for infrastructure projects, as mentioned above.
PA3: PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE AND QUALITY EMPLOYMENT AND SUPPORTING LABOUR MOBILITY

In relation to employment, the analytical part of the draft OP explains that the cross-border labour force mobility has been determined mainly by the unemployment rate, insufficient language skills of the labour force and poor infrastructural conditions. The PA clearly focuses on employment and integrates two investment priorities: (8b of ERDF Reg.) promoting sustainable and quality employment and supporting labour mobility by supporting employment-friendly growth through the development of endogenous potential as part of a territorial strategy for specific areas, including the conversion of declining industrial regions and enhancement of accessibility to, and development of, specific natural and cultural resources; and (7a of ETC Reg.) promoting sustainable and quality employment and supporting labour mobility by integrating cross-border labour markets, including cross-border mobility, joint local employment initiatives, information and advisory services and joint training.

The specific objective is improving the level of employment in the program area. The main focus of actions in PA3 is employment and cross-border commuting by the creation of products and services based on local potential; initiatives aimed at improving cross-border labour mobility; interventions reinforcing improved access to urban functions, infrastructural investments improving mobility, cross-border employment initiatives, business services, joint education and training programmes. All measures should be implemented as part of an integrated territorial action plan.

PA4: ENHANCING CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES AND PEOPLE LIVING IN THE BORDER AREA

Cross-border cooperation is seen as the horizontal aim across the whole OP. PA4 therefore concentrates on investment priority (11) enhancing institutional capacity of public authorities and stakeholders and efficient public administration by promoting legal and administrative cooperation and cooperation between citizens and institutions. The specific objectives of the PA are improving the level of cross border inter-institutional cooperation, and broadening cross-border cooperation between citizens, which should result in more intensive cross-border cooperation at the level of institutions and among people on both sides of the border. Part of the listed results are, in fact, outputs, therefore the second result indicator is also not properly defined.

The list of eligible activities covers a wide range of institutional cooperation and a more specific list of eligible beneficiaries will be determined for the call for proposals. The major part of activities shall be implemented within the Small Project Fund. The list of eligible activities indicates potential duplication with activities mentioned within PA1 and PA3, which needs to be considered when call for proposals are prepared. To avoid overlaps, the demarcation should be determined by selecting beneficiaries and activities.
4.3.4. **SYNERGIES WITHIN THE PROGRAMME**

The table presents synergies within the HU-SK CBC Programme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.1.</th>
<th>2.1.</th>
<th>2.2.</th>
<th>3.1.</th>
<th>4.1.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synergies: + weak, ++ stronger +++ very strong, 0 neutral, - controversial

4.4. **INDICATORS, MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM**

The quality of the indicators has improved significantly during the preparation of the programme. The indicators have not changed much as compared to the previous version of the OP, so the majority of our previous comments still hold. The exact definition and the sources of data for indicators are not always clear. We suggest to prepare indicator sheets for all the indicators, with all the relevant characteristics. The performance framework of the priority axes still needs some minor improvements. Target values for the financial indicator in the performance framework seem overestimated.

4.4.1. **PA1: NATURE & CULTURE**

Expected results of the specific objective 1.1 are numerous and very broad. As for the indicators, the result indicator (total number of visitors in the region) reflects only one expected result (Increase in the number of visitors in the programme area). The definition of the indicator is clear, baseline and target values are clear and reasonable.

Actions of the priority axis are very broad, but output indicators are relevant and cover almost the whole priority axis.

Target values for output indicators are available and reasonable.

Regarding the performance framework of the priority axis:

- The column “explanation of the relevance of the indicators” should contain a justification that output indicators chosen cover much of the priority axis.
- The milestone of the financial indicator has to be in line with the N+3 decommitment rule. In the table of the performance framework, these values are higher than the N+3 threshold (pre-financing was not deducted). However, this is acceptable.

4.4.2. **PA2: ENHANCING CROSS-BORDER MOBILITY**

The result indicator of expected results for specific objective 2.1 does not cover the expected results, and are also conflicting (e.g. if the traffic increases, how will the GHG emission decrease?). Output indicators cover the planned actions. The use of the common indicator is correct.
Result indicators for specific objective 2.2 cover the expected results. Target values should be reported for 2023, too, while target values were set for that year. The definition and the sources of result indicators are not clear (e.g. are they relevant only for road traffic?). Output indicators cover the majority of planned actions. Definitions of indicators are not clear (e.g. what is the definition of a public transport service?).

Regarding the performance framework:

- The key implementation step is not understandable: all the documentation for all the road construction works will be ready for 2018? The relating output indicator for the key implementation step is missing (km of newly built roads). A key implementation step can be used only together with the relevant output indicator.
- The column “explanation of the relevance of the indicators” should contain a justification, that output indicators chosen cover much of the priority axis.
- The milestone of the financial indicator has to be in line with the N+3 decommitment rule. In the table of the performance framework, these values are higher than the N+3 threshold (pre-financing was not deducted). However, this is acceptable.

4.4.3. PA3: PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE AND QUALITY EMPLOYMENT AND SUPPORTING LABOUR MOBILITY

The result indicator of specific objective 3.1 is relevant. However, the definition of the indicator is not clear (both countries, only the border region, only Hungary?). According to the baseline value, the indicator is only for Hungary.

Output indicators cover the majority of actions. The use of common indicators is correct.

Regarding the performance framework:

- The key implementation step and the output indicator are correct.
- The column “explanation of the relevance of the indicators” should contain a justification, that output indicators chosen cover much of the priority axis.
- The milestone of the financial indicator has to be in line with the N+3 decommitment rule. In the table of the performance framework, these values are higher than the N+3 threshold (pre-financing was not deducted). However, this is acceptable.

4.4.4. PRIORITY AXIS 4: ENHANCING CROSS-BORDER COOPERATION OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES AND PEOPLE LIVING IN THE BORDER AREA

The result indicator 4.1_1 is clear, and relevant. The target value is realistic, but it should be measured for 2023, too. The result indicator 4.1_2 is an output indicator. The baseline value for result indicators should not be 0.

Output indicators of the priority axis are relevant, and cover the majority of the actions. However, the target value for 4.1_3 seems overestimated.

Regarding the performance framework:

- The column “explanation of the relevance of the indicators” should contain a justification, that output indicators chosen cover much of the priority axis.
- The milestone of the financial indicator has to be in line with the N+3 decommitment rule. In the table of the performance framework, these values are higher than the N+3 threshold (pre-financing was not deducted). However, this is acceptable.
4.4.5. **Priority Axis 5: Technical Assistance**

Output indicators of the priority axis are relevant, and cover the majority of planned actions.

4.5. **Consistency of Financial Allocations**

Financial allocations of the priority axes are consistent.

4.6. **Horizontal Issues**

Under Structural Funds regulations all supported activities must contribute to the horizontal requirements: equal opportunities between men and women, prevention of discrimination and sustainable development, regardless of the project’s nature and theme. Horizontal aspects must be reflected during the planning and the implementation of the Programme and in the daily operation of its responsible bodies.

With regard to the promotion of equal opportunities and the prevention of discrimination, some general requirements must be taken into account in all actions or projects irrespectively of their scope (among them there are defined legal obligations). Requirements for improving equality apply both for the applicant's organization and for all phases of supported projects.

4.6.1. **Equality between Men and Women**

According to the regulations, supported projects must contribute to the development of equality between women and men.

The Programme’s contribution to gender equality is sufficiently elaborated. The equality principles are applied in planned employment initiatives, background services promoting employment, joint education and training programmes, the organization of cultural events, performances, festivals, and trainings will give extra efforts to involve women and disadvantaged groups (under PA3 and PA4). In case of these actions, a mandatory level of women’s participation will be required.

4.6.2. **Equal Opportunities and Non-Discrimination**

The Programme fulfils the requirements of specific actions to promote equal opportunities and prevent any discrimination.

The analysis of the program area assesses the disadvantaged situation of Roma people, young entrants and permanently unemployed living in the programming area. The needs of these multiple disadvantaged groups are mainly indirectly addressed by the Programme. In PA2, the enhancement of cross-border mobility aims to increase social cohesion and employment rates by decreasing social closeness in the border region. In specific objective 3.1 of PA3 initiates new employment models directly targeting young starters, Roma and permanently unemployed people and specific objective 4.1 of PA4 aims to improve access to public services and education. The Programme also recommends using the number of disadvantaged people as selection criteria although actions where it should be used are not listed.
4.6.3. **PROMOTION OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

The inclusion of main areas of sustainable development is represented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority axis</th>
<th>PA1</th>
<th>PA2</th>
<th>PA3</th>
<th>PA4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific objective</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2_1</td>
<td>2.2_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable development topics</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental protection</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources effectiveness</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change reduction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience to disasters</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention &amp; risk management</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S*= Scope, *SC*= Selection Criteria

- *+: some relation, but unclear, **+: some relation, but not significant, +++: significant relation; -: no relation

Project proposals are eligible if project objectives and activities do not conflict with principles of sustainable development. Explicit linkage can be found in PA1 and PA2 both with expected results and selection criteria e.g. operations must meet general quality criteria and they must be focused, relevant, viable and sustainable.

4.7. **IMPLEMENTATION SYSTEM**

Based on information currently available we can state as follows:

- The MA and JTS will be placed in different countries which is a new solution but could work appropriately.
- Relevant Hungarian and Slovakian authorities have already started to discuss setting up the joint secretariat for the programming period 2014-2020, which is the key factor of implementation.
- The number and qualification of the staff shall correspond to the tasks defined in the OP.
- JTS should work as efficiently as in the implementation phase of the previous OP when absorption and human capacities have been strengthened.
- Gained knowledge and competences could thus be valuable in successful implementation of the future OP. It is essential to hire appropriate number of staff to be efficient.

At present we cannot judge the administrative capacities. Probably experiences of the running system will help to organize capacities efficiently and the new system will be established in order to operate appropriately and effectively. However, regional info points might improve the efficiency.

The implementation mechanism described is in line with implementation regulations: based on Article 21-25 of Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013, for the management and control of the programme the following bodies have to be designated by the Hungarian and Slovakian authorities: Managing Authority (MA), Certifying Authority (CA), Audit Authority (AA), Monitoring Committee (MC), Joint Secretariat (JS).
Nevertheless, the content and structure of this chapter could be clearer. For example the chart visualising the actors and processes is missing, although it could help to understand the implementation mechanisms. The implementation chapter of the Programme provides a very detailed picture of the planned implementation mechanisms to be used in the implementation period. It should be considered that beyond open calls, different types of funding schemes may also be defined. E.g. applying continuously open calls (for example in case of the Small Project Fund), restricted calls, automatic procedure or simplified selection procedure could make the system more effective. Selected procedures have to be recorded in the Implementation Manual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PP Light Scheme</th>
<th>Direct support of SMEs needs to involve intermediaries. Using intermediaries is a good solution and can guarantee professional knowledge in specific fields.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Small Project Fund (in PA1 and PA4)</td>
<td>Due to the high number of proposed P2P projects, it is worth involving intermediaries to manage these projects. Concrete description is missing. The other solution related to manage P2P projects efficiently is to use automatic project selection with basic criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introducing a two-round selection procedure in case of some actions could be useful. The two-step approach contains a pre-selection stage besides the procedure of the one-step model. Applicants submit “expressions of interest” based on which the proposals will be pre-selected to offer the opportunity to applicants to further develop their projects in order to enhance the quality. Pre-selected and further developed projects are submitted again as a next step, and these applications will be evaluated against the relevant pre-defined set of quality criteria set out in the Implementation Manual. It is essential that the two stages do not hinder implementation. The following problems have to be avoided: shifting projects in time, requiring too many capacities from applicants in the first round (especially regarding financial and administrative resources - permissions, feasibility studies, EIA, contracts should be required at a later stage), requiring too strict and unchangeable content during the first step.

For example: It was mentioned that infrastructural projects must need to have completed documentation (technical plans with all permissions needed). In this case the scope of applicants is obvious (state owned companies with objectives related to the objective of the priority axis - public transport), thus providing the possibility of two-round procedure (besides restricted calls) could improve the quality of proposals. There are similar considerations regarding 3.1 in which project proposals must include a territorial analysis, an integrated action plan or strategy and the presentation of the level of preparedness of documentation of main infrastructural projects. Another solution can be determined as strategic projects.

We suggest a much more simplified first round (“expressions of interest”) to establish in the frame of two-round model in order to create a real pre-selection step for project drafts.

Aspects of the above processes can contribute to reducing administrative burden, since introducing strict inflexible procedures is associated with barriers. Application of e-Cohesion principles on programme level also offers many opportunities for simplification. The amount of paperwork is foreseen to be reduced and speeding up the reporting and control procedures seems to be ensured. The fixed rate will be built in line with the relevant articles of the Common Provision Regulation. The harmonisation work carried out jointly by various ETC programmes under the coordination of INTERACT in preparation of the 2014 - 2020 programme period is considered as a key input for simplification. This initiative aims at streamlining programme implementation and procedures through a range of common templates and model forms, fact sheets, handbooks and guidance documents. If these can be inserted in the implementation tools for the period 2014-2020, reduction of administrative burdens will be much more achievable. The HU-SK CBC programme should continue to operate fully in line with these principles from the start of the programming period.
The project level implementation (contracting procedures, reporting) is clearly described. As a result of the ex ante evaluation monitoring of programme-level implementation together with the performance framework of the priority axes (milestones, indicators, etc.) is finalized in the latest version. In particular, result indicators are the cornerstone of the performance analysis of the programme, therefore quality design is essential to create an effectively and sufficiently running Programme.

The performance framework is reasonable and appropriate.

Based on also the SEA recommendations, quality type indicators measuring environmental aspects should be built in the programme document to be able to monitor the fulfilment of the principles of sustainable development. Horizontal principles were extended during programming, which could has improved the aspect of sustainable development.

Furthermore, some of the indicators do not refer to cross-border character, therefore these indicators should be reviewed in order to reflect the results of the programme, e.g. total number of visitors in the region, Increase in the employment rate.

Lessons learnt from previous HU-SK CBC Programme show that the detailed design of the monitoring system is of paramount importance. The described monitoring and evaluation system is in line with the Regulation, however, it lacks the concrete details of operation. It is not clear how the programme monitoring and information system will operate. 
IT systems for the management and monitoring of the Programme will be set up no later than 31 December 2015. The online project reporting system will also be set up in compliance with the requirements. In case it will be set up in time and in an applicable way, it will reduce administrative burdens. Electronic data transfer could simplify the system, but we can assess the effectiveness and efficiency only if it is created and functioning. Quality of monitoring and evaluation procedures and efficiency of obtained empirical data depends on the quality of available data (monitoring systems) and the users’ competency. Important to note that a better communication among project partners should be encouraged to develop more successful cooperation.

Based on Apportionment of liabilities (5.1.4) it is ensured in financial and legal terms that all implementation processes will be carried out. Flexibility of the implementation regarding changes is not described in details, e.g.: changes of environment, possibilities of reallocation, system errors, etc.

### 4.8. **APPLICATION OF THE PARTNERSHIP PRINCIPLE**

In accordance with Article 5 of Regulation (EU) 1303/2013, Code of Conduct on Partnership (CCOP) was approved in order to support Member States in the organisation of partnership. The assessment of the application of the partnership principle was twofold:

- In accordance with the ex ante evaluation guidelines we reviewed whether the stakeholders outlined in the CCOP had fully been involved in the programming process. 4

- Additionally, we checked if these stakeholders will continue being involved in all stages of the programme implementation, including monitoring and evaluation.

### 4.8.1. **PROGRAMMING AND DECISION MAKING**

The programming process could be assessed from the Partnership point of view from two aspects: the process of the programming (workshops) and the involvement in the decision making.

---

4 The application of the Partnership Principle in relation to the Partnership Agreements are assessed in the ex ante evaluations of the mainstream programmes.
PROGRAMMING

Article 8 of the CCOP states that „Member States shall involve relevant partners in the preparation of programmes“. The programming process followed a strictly participative approach, several workshops and consultations were organised where a wide range of stakeholders were involved and provided input to the programme preparation process.

The table below shows the involvement of key stakeholders in the preparation of the Programme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement in…</th>
<th>Competent regional, local, urban and other public authorities</th>
<th>Economic and social partners</th>
<th>Bodies representing civil society</th>
<th>EGTCs operating in the respective cross-border programme area</th>
<th>Bodies that are involved in the development or implementation of a macro-regional strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…the analysis and identification of needs</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… the definition or selection of priorities and related specific</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… the allocation of funding;</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… the definition of programmes’ specific indicators</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… the implementation of the horizontal principles⁸</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… the composition of the monitoring committee</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

++: full involvement; +: partial involvement; -: no involvement at all

Source of the list: Article 4, Code of Conduct on Partnership, (7.1.2014) p10

Although the programme designers and the authorities concerned have definitely taken all necessary steps to involve relevant stakeholders into the programming phase, the involvement of relevant parties has not fully met the requirements of the Code of Conduct on Partnership during the programming process. Nevertheless, these partners have been participated in the public consultation of the Programme and the SEA; therefore, the evaluators consider the partnership principle as fulfilled.

---

⁵ e.g. representatives of larger cities, higher educational institutions and research centres; other public authorities responsible for the application of horizontal principles; other bodies relevant in the integrated territorial investments (Article 4 (a) CCOP)
⁶ e.g. cross-industry and sectoral organisations, national/regional chambers, business associations; (Article 4 (b) CCOP)
⁷ e.g. environmental partners, local action groups; NGOs; bodies responsible for promoting social inclusion, gender equality and non-discrimination (Article 4 (c) CCOP)
⁸ as defined in Articles 7 and 8 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013
DECISION MAKING DURING PROGRAMMING

To elaborate the assessment we used the results of the ethnographic observations and the information gathered from document reviews, mainly the review of the Rules of Procedures of the Programming Task Force\(^9\). We found that the following stakeholders took part in the TF meetings during the programming phase:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Governing Bodies:</th>
<th>Observers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prime Minister’s Office</td>
<td>Representative of the DG Regio, European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Public Administration and Justice</td>
<td>Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry for National Economy</td>
<td>Central Coordinating Authority - Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUTS III regions:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 counties from Hungary</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 counties from Slovakia</td>
<td>Association of Towns and Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association of Towns and Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association of Business Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Representatives from Slovakia;
- Representatives from Hungary;
- DG Regio

*Source: Rules of Procedures of the Programming TF (5 March, 2014)*

Additionally, representatives of the JTS and the Info Points participate at the TF meetings as supportive members.

We would like to add, that although they are not included in the Rules of Procedures, some other relevant stakeholders were invited e.g. to the Programming Group meetings including the representatives of the Hungarian Transport Administration (HU) and representatives of EGTCs.

4.8.2. **ENSURING THE PARTNERSHIP PRINCIPLE DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

With regard to the composition of the Monitoring Committee, the draft Programming document outlines the role of relevant partners. The members of the Monitoring Committee are identified in the Programme; however, they are not precisely set yet (the text of the CCOP is basically integrated in the Programme).

A detailed Rules of Procedure will have been drafted by the time the Programme will be approved.

---

\(^9\) Approved by the TF on 5 March, 2014
5. **EX ANTE EVALUATION: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The recommendations have continuously been liaised with the planning team, however the ex ante evaluators still hold some of the comments that are listed below. During the meetings and workshops recommendations were discussed and consensus has been reached on the majority of them. In the case of recommendations that have not been accepted, planners provided detailed explanation on the reasons of rejection.

5.1. **CONTRIBUTION TO EUROPE 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Planner’s justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.</td>
<td>There are many indirect linkages with the relevant EU2020 targets (e.g. SME development, employment, R&amp;D, climate and energy, social inclusion).</td>
<td>Programs contribution to EU2020 goal should be more clearly presented. We suggest to explicitly mention the possible contribution and the concerned goal.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>In Table 7 the contribution to EU2020 goals are sufficiently detailed and clear in relation to the selected TOs. Additionally, in Section 8, under the horizontal principles, the relevant envisaged actions contributing directly to EU2020 targets are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.</td>
<td>Although, the flagship initiatives do not contain recommendations with direct implications on ETC or specific regions, there are many overlaps among the targeted policy areas.</td>
<td>The relations with the national OPs should be expressed with special regards to how HU-SK CBC Program complete the mainstream programs.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>The coordination with the draft Operational Programmes of the Partnership Agreements of Hungary and Slovakia is described in detail in Chapter 6.1. of the CBC Programme. Mentioning and detailing of the flagship initiatives of the EU2020 strategy would overburden the description of the CBC Programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5.2. **EXTERNAL CONSISTENCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Planner’s justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>The issues of poverty, deficiencies in education, problems of Roma and big differences in social conditions within programme area are still not reflected adequately in the HU-SK Programme. Only PA3 addresses this issue, which is unlikely to create an impact on the lives of those living in deep poverty that could be reasonably achieved by the Programme.</td>
<td>The HU-SK Programme’s investment strategy should more directly address social and demographic challenges in the border region since it seriously hampers the economic growth especially in the Eastern part of the programme area. Social inclusion should not only appear as a horizontal policy issue but direct measures should aim at improving the socio-economic conditions of the population. Particularly, PA4 could contribute the most effective way for boosting social inclusion in the programme area.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The targeted actions under PA3 give the possibility to the development of the social economy mainly in the regions with high level of poverty and inhabited by Roma people. In the case of nature protection or road construction direct linkages with poverty issues can hardly be presented. However, the interventions planned are based on the regional analysis treating this topic exhaustively. PA4 contributes by defined possible activities the most effective way for boosting social inclusion in the programme area. In Calls for proposals of PA4 we will focus on emphasizing of this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Energy efficiency is touched in PA1 and/or PA2 via green developments and resource efficiency which does not define specific measures with this objective. Although presumably they will contribute to promote energy efficiency, it should be more clearly targeted, especially transport developments should enforce this issue considering the operation costs of new transport systems.</td>
<td>Energy and resource efficiency can be increased by indirect stimulation of the HU-SK CBC Programme and practically all the investments supported from it should fulfil and promote energy efficiency.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Energy efficiency is a key thematic objective of mainstream programmes in both countries. The SKHU CBC Programme is not directly targeting TO 4 hence there are no specific objectives directly aimed at energy efficiency. Nonetheless this concept can be incorporated in the project selection process and elaborated on the level of manuals. PA2 handles green transport infrastructure when focussing on the development of low-carbon transport modes and solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>The PA3 will contribute to the fulfilment of the “Address youth unemployment…” Hungarian</td>
<td>The problem of youth unemployment should be also tackled by the Programme. More attention should be given to disadvantaged groups of the</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>The SKHU CBC Programme addresses the youth unemployment as it is justifiable in the frame of that.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Planner’s justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>country-specific recommendation. Although, some recommended measures are totally in the central governments’ competence (e.g. public works scheme) the overall objective and approach of this Priority is in line with the goals of this recommendation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth unemployment is a crucial problem in both countries and receives big attention at the level of mainstream programmes financed through ESF. The SKHU CBC Programme with its limited resources is unable to tackle this problem and a further diversification of its objectives would lead to loss of focus. Regardless its limited possibilities, the programme can contribute to higher youth employment level through the particular action plans to be realized within the PA3. In Chapter 8.2. the specific actions promoting equal opportunities are listed in detail. In Calls for proposals of PA4 we will focus on emphasizing of this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>population, measures aiming to improve their living conditions might be involved also in PA 1, 2 and 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Planner’s justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA4 will partially contribute to the fulfilment of “Implement a national strategy on early school-leaving...” Hungarian country-specific recommendation by enhancing the institutional capacity of education and labour services through strengthening the cross-border integration in these fields.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>The possible actions under PA3 addresses the joint education and training possibilities and the labour market cooperation initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5.3. EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL COHERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Planner’s justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.</td>
<td>The description of eligible activities within PA1 and eventual distribution of funds for individual eligible measures is not sufficiently explained to justify the disproportion in the allocation for the road construction.</td>
<td>Better justification would be welcome to avoid additional comments during the approval process at the Commission services.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The programme was drafted with respect to the agreement signed by the two prime ministers in March 2014. This agreement defines 21 road connections between the two countries that shall be constructed till 2022 also with the help of the SKHU CBC Programme. The guiding principles for the selection of operations for PA1 clearly state that only those roads will be constructed contributing to the overall objective of the priority. The evaluation of particular projects will be carried out during the implementation of the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.</td>
<td>The Programme proposal indicates the possibility that two SPF schemes can be implemented within the OP. The explanation/justification for such a case is however missing and there is not sufficient guidance provided in terms of aims of administration arrangements. Moreover, PP Light scheme may be also introduced but the implementation mechanism is similar and therefore the administration mechanism could be simplified and made more efficient and effective.</td>
<td>Provided that SPF is implemented in two priority axis (PA1 and PA4), further explanation should be provided if both of the schemes are implemented with the same administration mechanism under different Call for proposals with different objectives (corresponding the PA objective) or different set up is likely to be introduced. In case PP Light is also introduced the same administrative structure should be considered to minimise administration costs.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The programme sets only a framework for the SPF and PP light schemes. The implementation mechanism for both schemes will be elaborated on the level of the programme’s management documentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5.4. **INDICATORS AND MONITORING SYSTEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Planner’s justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>4.1.</strong> The use of the key implementation steps are not always correct.</td>
<td>The use of the key implementation steps should be revised.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>The increase in the density of border crossing points will contribute to the increase of border crossing mobility. At the same time, travelling distances will decrease (because the nearest border crossing point will be closer than before), consequently the specific GHG emission will decrease, as well. In case of PA2, the types of actions make it clear that the SO targets not only road but rail and water transport as well. The sources of data are identified. The definition of public transport services is given in the footnote No 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.2.</strong> The explanation of the relevance of the indicators should contain the explanation, that the output indicators chosen cover the majority of the priority axis.</td>
<td>The explanation should be inserted in the performance framework table, where relevant.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>The explanations are given, The limited space (500 characters max.) does not allow more detailed explanations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.3.</strong> The definition and the source of the result indicators are not always clear.</td>
<td>We recommend preparing indicator sheets with all the relevant properties.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>In case of result indicators specifications have been given. Indicators sheets have already been prepared and sent to the JS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.4.</strong> The milestone of the financial indicator has to be in line with the N+3 decommitment rule. In the table of the performance framework, these values are bigger than the N+3 threshold (pre-financing was not deducted).</td>
<td>The milestones for the financial indicators should be revised.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>The differences are arising from the rounding of the numbers, and the exact numbers in 2018 could only differ slightly. The final evaluation of the evaluation reports declares that this is acceptable for all the PAs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5. **FINANCIAL ALLOCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Planner’s justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The basis for the calculation of the union support will be the public eligible cost. This means, that the national budgets have to put more money in the programme.</td>
<td>The basis for the calculation of the union support should be justified. (Why not the total eligible cost will be the basis for calculating the union support?)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>As no private funding is planned, the bases for calculation is the public eligible cost. For the appropriate tables in the Guidance for the ETC programmes, there is no requirement to justify the calculation basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6. **HORIZONTAL ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Planner’s justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Slight links can be detected with the promotion of equal opportunities between men and women in PA3 and also project selection criterion refer to this requirement. The territorial analysis draws attention to the importance of social inclusion and some actions promote equal opportunities and non-discrimination.</td>
<td>We recommend the further strengthening of horizontal aspects in the project selection.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>The recommendation relates to the selection procedure, which will be defined in detail in the Implementation Manual.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5.7. IMPLEMENTATION SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Planner’s justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Probably experiences of the running system will help to organize capacities efficiently and new system will be established in order to operate appropriately and effectively.</td>
<td>Experiences of the running system should be integrated during organizing capacities and new system should be established to operate effectively.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The description of the main actions planned to reduce the administrative burden are described exactly so, as the recommendation is demanding. (Point 7.2. of the CBC Programme).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.</td>
<td>Financial allocation are reasonable and consistent. The performance framework of the priority axes is appropriate.</td>
<td>Recommendations regarding milestones and target values of the performance framework is detailed in chapter 4.4.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>The differences are arising from the rounding of the numbers, and the exact numbers in 2018 could only differ slightly. The final evaluation of the evaluation reports declares that this is acceptable for all the PAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.</td>
<td>The content and structure of this chapter could be clearer.</td>
<td>The chart visualising the actors and processes are missing, it could help to understand the implementation mechanisms, even if it is not compulsory.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>As it is not compulsory, the description in the present form is enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.</td>
<td>The implementation chapter of the Programme provides a very detailed picture of the planned implementation mechanisms to be used in the implementation period. Involving intermediaries:</td>
<td>Type of calls: It should be considered that there are different types of funding schemes, not uniquely open calls: continuously open calls, or using restricted calls / automatic procedure / simpler selection procedure could make the system more effective. In the frame of two rounds model: We suggest establishing a more simplified first round (real &quot;expressions of interest&quot;) in order to create a real pre-selection step for project drafts. Action plans (in PA3) in case of two rounds could be appropriate, but it is not obvious and fixed how it will work.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The CBC Programme contains the following: “One-step and two-step models of selection will be developed with the participation of the MC and will be described in details in the Implementation Manual.” This gives the possibility to regulate the selection during the implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>Planner’s justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it is worth to involve intermediaries to manage these projects Introducing two rounds in case of some actions could be useful.</td>
<td>The results of common simplification (like INTERACT) a range of common templates and model forms, fact sheets, handbooks and guidance documents should be built in the implementation tools for the period 2014 – 2020, reduction of administrative burdens will be much more achievable. The HU-SK CBC programme should continue to operate fully in line with these principles from the start of the programme period.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>There is a possibility to meet this recommendation during the implementation phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.</td>
<td>Application of e-Cohesion principles on programme level also offer many opportunities for simplification. The amount of needed paperwork are foreseen to be reduced and speeding up the reporting and control procedures seems to be ensured. The harmonisation work carried out jointly by various ETC programmes under the coordination of INTERACT in preparation of the 2014-2020 programme period is considered as a key input for simplification.</td>
<td>Details should be elaborated, providing flexibility for programme implementation.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>The recommendation is not clear, as the related conclusion is not explained in the Ex Ante evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6.</td>
<td>Flexibility of the implementation regarding changes is not described in details, e.g.: changes of environment, possibilities of reallocation, system errors (mistake in CfPs), etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.8. PARTNERSHIP PRINCIPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Planner’s justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>The Programming document identifies the “type” of Monitoring Committee members to be involved which serves as a good starting point for the drafting of the Rules of Procedure to be drafted after the approval of the Programme.</td>
<td>After the approval of the Programme the Monitoring Committee should be set up by a Rules of Procedures document. We would like to draw the attention that, in line with the Partnership Principle, this document should precisely name those stakeholders (including competent regional, local, urban and other public authorities; economic and social partners; bodies representing civil society and EGTCs) and their involvement in the monitoring and evaluation processes. Moreover, we would like to draw the attention on Article 11 of the Code of Conduct on Partnership, which describes the key elements of procedure of the Monitoring Committee.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>According to Article 47 of Regulation (EU) 1303/2013, the procedure of setting up the MC is described in the CBC Programme (page 96.), including the meeting of Code of Conduct on Partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>The Rules of Procedures regarding the operation of the Task Force and the JMC regarding the new Programme has not been prepared yet. Before preparing the document certain consideration has to be made.</td>
<td>We recommend considering to widen the list of members of the Task Force and the Joint Monitoring Committee for the next programming period. The basis of the involvement of new members in the Task Force should be the Article 4 of the CCOP and the identified stakeholder list mentioned in the previous recommendations. In order to not to have a TF with “overhead” we would recommend rethink the delegation system of members.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>According to Article 47 of Regulation (EU) 1303/2013, the procedure of setting up the MC is described in the CBC Programme (page 96.), including the meeting of Code of Conduct on Partnership. The role of the Task Force was the preparation of the CBC Programme for the years 2014-2020. There is no need to set up a Task Force for the implementation period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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ANNEX 1  HU-SK CBC PROGRAMME (2014-2020)
## ANNEX 2 FRAMEWORK AND INDICATORS (EXTRACT FROM THE PROGRAMME)

### Priority Axis 1: Nature & Culture

**Investment Priority:** 1.1. Conserving, protecting, promoting and developing natural and cultural heritage (ERDF Reg., Art. 5. (6) (c))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific objective</th>
<th>Expected result</th>
<th>Type of actions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To increase the attractiveness of the border area.</td>
<td>Better utilization of the regions endogenous natural and cultural potential in supporting the sustainable development of local economies;</td>
<td>1. Supporting the cooperation and development of cultural heritage sites (e.g. heritage renewal strategies, studies and plans, reconstruction, building of related infrastructure like car parking, to site signage, visitor centres, access roads, small bridges, etc.)</td>
<td>ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in social, economic and territorial cohesion by supporting joint cultural activities and activities concerning to nature preserving and protection;</td>
<td>2. Maintaining and promoting natural heritage in the programme area (e.g. such as floodplain restoration, wetlands, renaturalising rivers and river banks, projects aimed at non-productive functions of forests - ecological, environmental and public functions, integrated cross-border strategic plans for the restoration and conservation of green infrastructure, environmental awareness raising activities, landscape and species protection activities, etc.)</td>
<td>SRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving social, economic and territorial cohesion by supporting joint cultural and nature conservation activities;</td>
<td>3. Design cross border action plans, set up models and test pilot actions to better capitalize the regions cultural and natural heritage and to combine tourism with the promotion and protection of the regions natural and cultural heritage by performing creative and artistic actions (destination management, joint marketing strategies, exchange of experiences, mutual learning, pilot activities e.g.);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in the number of visitors in the programme area.</td>
<td>4. Design and construction of local access roads linked to sites of cultural and natural heritage, preparation and construction of cross-border road infrastructure which on the one hand decrease the travelling time between the towns of the regions, thus decrease the GHG emission (environment); on the other hand these new connections increase the number of visitors (culture and tourism). As the planned roads and bridges will be constructed with weight limit, heavy traffic will not be allowed, the pollution will decrease;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Joint development of environmentally friendly tourism products and offers and development of cross border infrastructure for eco-tourism (e.g. support for planning and building safe and sustainable small vessel cross-border water trails and related infrastructure like watercourse access and egress facilities, parking, and craft loading and unloading spaces, route and hazard signage on the watercourse, etc. and support for planning and building safe and sustainable cross border shared ‘green ways’ and related infrastructure like pre-development of green-ways including feasibility and planning studies, trail service facilities like car parking, toilets, showers, bike wash, shelters, information centres, access roads, small bridges, etc.;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Small Project Fund supporting people-to-people actions small scale investments, related to people to people actions in the field of tourism, environment, sports and culture.,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target Groups

The eligible region’s population, local communities, entrepreneurs, tourists, non-profit organizations

### Beneficiaries

- Public institutions;
- Private institutions serving public interests;
- State owned companies;
- Churches;
- EGTC;
- NGOs;
- Development agencies;
- Municipalities, county municipalities;
- Universities and research institutes;
### Priority Axis 2: Enhancing cross-border mobility

**Investment Priority: 2.1.** Enhancing regional mobility by connecting secondary and tertiary nodes to TEN-T infrastructure, including multimodal nodes (ERDF Reg., Art. 5. (7) (b))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific objective</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>Target Value (2023)</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Increasing the density of between border crossing points along the Hungarian-Slovak border</td>
<td>SRI 2.1.</td>
<td>Average distance between border crossing points</td>
<td>km</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>15 beneficiaries</td>
<td>yearly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected result</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a consequence of the implementation of activities under the SO 2.1, the density of border crossing road infrastructure will be increased, the journey time from regional and subregional centres to the TEN-T corridors will be shortened, consequently the specific GHG emission will decrease.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of actions</td>
<td>Common and specific output indicator</td>
<td>Total length of newly built roads</td>
<td>km</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. preparation of particular investments: elaboration of studies, analyses, feasibility studies, technical plans, purchase of permissions;</td>
<td>OI 2.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. construction of cross-border roads, bridges and ferries and related infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People crossing the border regularly (students, workers, entrepreneurs etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations set up by special law, providing public services (e.g. foundations, associations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small and medium sized enterprises.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations set up by special law, providing public services (e.g. foundations, associations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small and medium sized enterprises, NGOs;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Investment Priority: 2.2.** Developing and improving environment-friendly (including low-noise), and low-carbon transport systems including inland waterways and maritime transport, ports, multimodal links and airport infrastructure, in order to promote sustainable regional and local mobility (ERDF Reg., Art. 5. (7) (c))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific objective</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>Target Value (2023)</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 Improving cross-border public transport services</td>
<td>SRI 2.2.1</td>
<td>Change in the volume of cross-border public transport</td>
<td>persons</td>
<td>382 849</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>450 000</td>
<td>service providers</td>
<td>in 2016, 2018, 2020 and 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected result</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Thanks to the planned interventions the interconnectivity of regional centres and sub-centres will be improved. Increase in number of users of public transport facilities decreases the pollution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 Improving cross-border logistic services</td>
<td>SRI 2.2.2</td>
<td>Change in the volume of cross-border good transport</td>
<td>EUR</td>
<td>565 130 424</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>10 000 000 000</td>
<td>national statistical offices</td>
<td>in 2016, 2018, 2020 and 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected result</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Thanks to the planned interventions the interconnectivity of regional centres and sub-centres as well as economic areas along the border will be improved. Increase in volume of rail and inland waterway transport decreases the pollution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of actions (2.2.1)</td>
<td>Common and specific output indicator</td>
<td>Number of new public transport services started within the framework of the programme</td>
<td>piece</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparation of particular investments: elaboration of studies, analyses, concepts; elaboration of recommendations concerning legal-administrative bottlenecks hampering cross-border mobility (e.g. allowance of cabotage, ease of international transport rules between the two states etc.);</td>
<td>OI 2.1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development of cross-border intelligent transport systems (ITS), passenger information systems, online schedules, e-ticketing, mobile apps, common tariff systems;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Development and integration of cross-border public transport services, establishing transport associations;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Investments on relevant infrastructure (vehicles, bus and railway stations, ferry ports).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Priority Axis 3: Promoting sustainable and quality employment, and supporting labour mobility

**Investment Priority:** Promoting sustainable and quality employment and supporting labour mobility by integrating cross-border labour markets, including cross-border mobility, joint local employment initiatives, information and advisory services and joint training. (ETC Reg., Art. 7. (a) (i) as amended to ERDF Reg., Art. 5. (b) (b)).

#### Specific objective

1. **3.1. Improving the level of employment within the programming region**

   **Expected result:** As a result of the integrated projects implemented within the framework of the PA the employment level of the less developed regions of the programming area is expected to grow and the conditions of cross-border commuting will be improved.

#### Type of actions

1. **1. Targeted actions strengthening employment by the development of products and services based on local potential (e.g. development of local product markets; revitalising rust belts and declining industrial zones by ensuring new ways of utilisation; improving the conditions of tourism; development of social economy mainly in the regions with high level of poverty and habited by Roma people etc.):**

2. **2. Initiations and services aimed at improving cross-border labour mobility:**

3. **3. Interventions reinforcing improved access to urban functions:**

4. **4. Infrastructural investments contributing to modernization, structural transformation and sustainable development of specific areas and resulting in measurable improvement in terms of labour mobility:**

5. **5. Initiation and implementation of joint integrated cross-border employment initiatives:**

6. **6. Establishment of business services promoting employment and the creation of infrastructural conditions thereof:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>indicator name</th>
<th>unit</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>Target Value (2023)</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRI 3.1</td>
<td>increase in the employment rate</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>EUROSTAT</td>
<td>yearly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI 3.1_1</td>
<td>Number of (integrated territorial) action plans</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>beneficiaries</td>
<td>yearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI 3.1_2</td>
<td>Total length of newly built roads</td>
<td>km</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>beneficiaries</td>
<td>yearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI 3.1_3</td>
<td>Number of participants in joint local employment initiatives and (joint trainings (participants of employment initiatives)</td>
<td>persons</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>(100 - participants of employment initiatives 100 - participants in joint training)</td>
<td>beneficiaries</td>
<td>yearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI 3.1_4</td>
<td>Number of new services</td>
<td>number/yea</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>beneficiaries</td>
<td>yearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Targets

- **Beneficiaries:**
  - Public institutions;
  - Private institutions serving public interests;
  - State owned companies;
  - EGTCs;
  - NGOs;
  - Development agencies;
  - Municipalities, regional municipalities (as subjects of state subvention);
  - Universities and research institutes of transport.

- **Target Groups (2.2.1):** People crossing the border regularly (students, workers, entrepreneurs etc.)

- **Target Groups (2.2.2):** Enterprises interested in Hungarian-Slovak cross-border good transport.
**Priority Axis 4: Enhancing cross-border cooperation of public authorities and people living in the border area**

Investment Priority: Enhancing institutional capacity of public authorities and stakeholders and efficient public administration by promoting legal and administrative cooperation and cooperation between citizens and institutions (ERDF Reg., Art. 5. (11) amended by ETC Reg., Art. 7. (a) (iv))

### Specific objective 4.1 Improving the level of cross border inter-institutional cooperation

**Expected result**

- Improved level of cross border interinstitutional cooperation.

**Type of actions**

1. Strengthening and improving the cooperation capacity and the cooperation efficiency between different organisations (public authorities) of particular sectors (e.g. education, health care, risk prevention, water management, culture etc.) through common professional programmes, trainings, exchange of experiences etc.

2. Support of activities focusing on the improvement of cross-border services provided jointly, as well as development of small infrastructure necessary for joint service provision:
   - elaboration of studies and plans related to the development of the border region in sectorial bases (involving institutions from both sides of the border)
   - joint planning and development of cross-border services.
   - development of legal instruments and ICT solutions improving cross-border service provision (strengthening the flow of information, e-governance, m-governance etc.),
   - development of cross-border services in the field of health care, training and education, social care, security, administration (e.g. data provision) etc.

**Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Indicator name</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>Target Value (2023)</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRI 4.1.1</td>
<td>Level of satisfaction with cross border cooperation of institutions</td>
<td>Rating of cross border services provided by institutions offering cross border services according to specific survey</td>
<td>Specified according to outputs of the survey (for example Rating 3 /min1. max10/)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Depends on the results of survey</td>
<td>beneficiaries</td>
<td>In 2017 and in 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRI 4.1.2</td>
<td>Number of people involved in cross-border long-term activities through small projects</td>
<td>persons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>20 000</td>
<td>beneficiaries</td>
<td>In 2017 and in 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI 4.1.1</td>
<td>Number of cross border products and services developed</td>
<td>Number/ year</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>beneficiaries</td>
<td>yearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI 4.1.2</td>
<td>Number of documents published or elaborated outside of the framework of SPF</td>
<td>Number /year</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>beneficiaries</td>
<td>yearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Common presentation and promotion of borderland

- **Activities related to joint promotion of the borderland.** By better promotion of borderland, the cross-border services are indirectly improved (for example: elaboration of brochures and publications about the borderland by public institutions enhances the cross-border tourist agencies for better performance, because of more tourists are interested for cross-border region).

### Target Groups

- The eligible region's population, local communities, entrepreneurs

### Beneficiaries

- Public institutions;
- Private institutions serving public interests;
- State owned companies;
- Churches;
- EGTC;
- NGOs;
- Development agencies;
- Municipalities, county municipalities;
- Universities and research institutes;
- Chambers;
- Organizations set up by special law, providing public services (e.g. foundations, associations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Id</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Yearly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OI 4.1.3</td>
<td>Number of cross border events</td>
<td>Number/ year</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI 4.1.4</td>
<td>Number of documents published or elaborated in the framework of SPF</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 3  LIST OF REVIEWED DOCUMENTS


- Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 on specific provisions for the support from the European Regional Development Fund to the European territorial cooperation goal, available online


- Gov. Regulation No 2/2005 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (Hungary), available online [Accessed in January 2014]

- Act No. 24/2006 Coll. on environmental impact assessment (Slovakia), available online [Accessed in January 2014]


- Guidance on Integrating Climate Change and Biodiversity into Strategic Environmental Assessment, available online [Accessed in January 2014]

- EU 2020 A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, available online


- European Code of conduct on Partnership (1.7.2014); available online

- Roma Strategy available online (HU) and available online (SK)

- ETC template (January, 2014), available online
ANNEX 4  SWOT AND STRATEGY WORKSHOP REPORT

Date: 02/12/2012, 10.00-14.00
Place: Tatabánya, City Hall (Government Office for Komárom-Esztergom county)

1 Introduction

This a summary report of the outcome of the workshop on SWOT and Strategy under the framework of "Ex ante evaluation and Strategic Environmental Assessment of the HU-SK CBC Programme (2014-2020)". The workshop took place between 10:00-14:00 on 2nd December 2013 in the Government Office for Komárom-Esztergom county (2800 Tatabánya, Bárdos László u. 2.)

Workshop objectives

On one hand the workshop aimed to support the planning team in order to build an adequate SWOT analysis and draft strategy with the inclusion of the main planning and programming actors’ opinion. On the other hand, the role of the ex ante evaluators is to assure programme quality by giving a constructive feedback for the planners on the validity and the relevance of regional analysis-SWOT-strategy line.

The aim of the workshop to find out which investment priorities could be applied in the next period’s HU-SK CBC Programme and to cross-check the following information through the involvement of stakeholders:

- Which are those investment priorities that are underpinned by the SWOT analysis?
- Which are those investment priorities which are typical cross-border issues and should be included in the Programme?

Participants

The workshop was organised prior to the submission of the first draft programme document. By their nature, the main target group of the ex ante evaluation workshops are core planning and programming actors and not a wider scope of stakeholders.

Altogether 40 participants (12 from Slovakia and 28 from Hungary) participated in the discussions representing 29 organisations (8 Slovakian, 21 Hungarian).

The workshop provided opportunity for the planners to react on the evaluation judgements and when it is justified revise their conclusions based on participants’ feedback. This constructive iterative dialogue will lead to higher quality of the SWOT and the strategy.

2 Comments during the SWOT and Strategy presentation

At the first part of the workshop the main findings of the regional analysis and the SWOT were presented by the planners. In the end participants were asked to tell their opinion about the validity of the findings. In this chapter below you can read the summary of this discussion:
Cross border cooperation

- Regional analysis harmonize with the Strategy of Komárom–Esztergom County;
- County planning might contribute to the OP planning;
- In the recent HU-SK CBC Programme Hungarian-Hungarian partnerships are typical. There are much less Slovak-Slovak and Slovak-Hungarian partnerships were formulated as the result of the Programme;
- Economic development: Little Hungarian Plain (Kisalföld) as an economic opportunity is missing from the whole Program;
- The regional analysis focuses on cross border cooperation, common interests and on those problems which are existing on the both side of the border (e.g.: risk management, environment protection, flood protection etc.)
- Focusing not only on the border areas, but also on the beneficiaries;
- Focusing on the cohesion, concentration on the mitigation of social-economic problems;
- Areas which are situated further from the border which results that the cross border effect does not appreciable in these areas. For example Igló sub region (which has not a border with Hungary) does not detect the cross border impact. It would be good, if these sub-regions could feel the impact of the cross-border cooperation programme. (Planners response: Igló and other areas will receive fewer money in the future because they do not belong to the border region;)
- There are 64 points for Hungarian-Slovak cooperation in the field of the infrastructure’s development;
- Road development: road should not be developed without having an economic impact;
- Railway connection: development volume exceeds the framework; (Planners response: There are several areas whose development will be necessary but financial needs beyond the scope of the programme ;)
- CBC Programme is not an additional source of county improvements. It focusing on the connection between the two countries;

SMEs, agriculture and local production

- SME development could be the solution for the unemployment, but SME’s receive little support;
- SME strengthens and support should focusing on these entrepreneurs (in rural area these entrepreneurs are the employers) – SMEs could be supported in the agriculture primary production (promotion of the local products);
- Opportunity: cooperation with rural development cooperation, but ERFA subsidies could not support agriculture

SWOT & Situation Analysis

- in general SWOT analysis is justified;
- Impoverished regions should be highlighted in the documents;
- North-South economic connection should be strengthen;
- There are disparities between Eastern and Western regions in both country;
3 Sessions

After the plenary session participants were divided into four groups according to the following topics:

1. Economy
2. Environment
3. Human resources
4. Transport

The aim of the workshop to find out which investment priorities could be applied in the next period’s HU-SK cross-border cooperation programme. The aim of the workshop is to cross-check the following information with the involvement of stakeholders:

- Which are those investment priorities that are underpinned by the SWOT analysis?
- Which are those investment priorities which are typical cross-border issues and should be included in the Programme?

During the workshop participants completed two scoring activities:

1st scoring exercise: the participants were asked to score interventions evaluating how strongly they are supported by the situation analysis and the SWOT. This was not a voting on which interventions should be included in the programme. The number of votes per participants was half of the total number of interventions. HU and SK participants used different colours, so that the national differences were visible.

The results were discussed focusing on these questions:

- Which are the interventions most/less supported by the SWOT? Why?
- Are there national differences? Why?

2nd scoring exercise: the participants were asked to score interventions ranking which interventions they would like to be included in the OP.

The number of votes per participants was half of the total number of interventions. HU and SK participants used different colours, so that the national differences were visible. The results were discussed focusing on these questions:

- Which are the interventions most/less wanted? Why?
- Are the wanted interventions supported by the SWOT?
- Are the SWOT-supported interventions wanted?
- Are there national differences? Why?

Minutes of each section can be read in the following chapter.
4 Minutes of Sessions

4.1 ECONOMY

Workshop objective

The aim of the workshop to find out which investment priorities (within Economic thematic objective) could be applied in the next period’s HU-SK cross-border Programme. The aim of the workshop is to cross-check the following information with the involvement of stakeholders:

- Which are those investment priorities that are underpinned by the SWOT analysis?
- Which are those investment priorities which are typical cross-border issues and should be included in the Programme?

Workshop activities

The planned measures and their short content were reviewed. It was decided by voting, which measures were supported by the SWOT and situation analysis:

1. Priorities (2.), (7.), (9.) got the most votes. These development directions were the most supported by the situation analysis.
2. There is no difference between the distributions of HU-SK participant’s votes. Both parties prioritized the above.

Further observations:

1. Point (2.) is considered justified because of the importance of the automobile industry by participants.
2. Point (6.) the survey on entrepreneurial density is emphasized in the material, which is why it appears.

There was a vote for supporting the necessities: participants nominated which measure they think is the most important to support:

- The necessities coincided with the previous points, thus it can be stated that the situation analysis/SWOT gives an adequate answer to the handling of issues raised.
### Investment priority (IP) | Important and underpinned by the SWOT analysis | Comment 1 | Typical CB, important | Final comments and conclusions
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1. Strengthening research, technological development and innovation |  |  |  |  |
2. Enhancing access to and use and quality of ICT | ⬤⬜⬜⬜⬜⬜⬜ |  | This IP was considered justified because of the importance of the automobile industry by participants. One of the most underpinned and necessary IP. |  |
3. Enhancing the competitiveness of SMEs |  |  |  | It is important as well, but it does not necessarily need EU funds (the deployment of broadband internet should also work on market basis) The development of SMEs’ device fleet and development based on the partnership should be a further emphasized element. |
4. Supporting the shift towards a low-carbon economy in all sectors |  |  |  | Although this IP is underpinned by the SWOT analysis the financial resources are not sufficient implementing low-carbon economy in all sectors in the near future. |
5. Promoting climate change adaptation, risk prevention and management |  |  | This IP is very relevant regarding to the CBC but it is not underpinned enough by the recent SWOT analysis. This might mean that the SWOT analysis needs a further amendment. |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment priority (IP)</th>
<th>Important and underpinned by the SWOT analysis</th>
<th>Comment 1</th>
<th>Typical CB, important</th>
<th>Final comments and conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Preserving and protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The support of measure (6.) requires even more attention on the Slovakian side. Point (6.) the survey on entrepreneurial density is emphasized in the material, which is why it appears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Promoting sustainable transport and removing bottlenecks in key network infrastructures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One of the most underpinned and necessary IP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Promoting sustainable and quality employment and supporting labour mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The issue of increasing labour mobility, the importance of labour retraining should not only be discussed by the human committee (in the future)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Promoting social inclusion and combating poverty and any discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fight against poverty, the development of social economy (infrastructure development) - non-competitive, but a solution that manages social issues. One of the most underpinned and necessary IP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Investing in education, skills and lifelong learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Enhancing institutional capacity and ensuring an efficient public administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* HU • SK (votes)
Workshop conclusions

- The support of measure (6.) requires even more attention on the Slovakian side.
- Point (3.) is important as well, but does not necessarily need EU funds (the deployment of broadband internet should also work on market basis)
- There is little correlation between the SWOT and the measures.
- The issue of increasing labour mobility, the importance of labour retraining should not only be discussed by the human committee (in the future)
- The development of SMEs’ device fleet and development based on the partnership should be a further emphasized element.
- Fight against poverty, the development of social economy (infrastructure development) - non-competitive, but a solution that manages social issues.
4.2 ENVIRONMENT

Workshop objective

The aim of the workshop to find out which investment priorities (within Environmental protection and climate change thematic objective) could be applied in the next period’s HU-SK cross-border Programme. The aim of the workshop is to cross-check the following information with the involvement of stakeholders:

- Which are those investment priorities that are underpinned by the SWOT analysis?
- Which are those investment priorities which are typical cross-border issues and should be included in the Programme?

According to the EC regulations the following thematic objectives can be covered by the „Environmental protection and Climate change“ topic:

1. Promoting climate change adaptation, risk prevention and management;
2. Preserving and protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency;
3. Promoting sustainable transport and removing bottlenecks in key network infrastructures;

Workshop activities

The evaluators asked the participants to vote on investment priorities according to the following 2 aspects in 2 rounds:

- Which are those investment priorities that are important and underpinned by the SWOT analysis?
- Which are those investment priorities which are typical cross-border issues and should be included in the Programme?

In both rounds all participant have 8 votes.

The following table shows the results and the comments after each round.
### Investment priority (IP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment priority (IP)</th>
<th>SWOT analysis</th>
<th>Comment 1</th>
<th>Typical CB, important</th>
<th>Final comments and conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) promoting the production and distribution of energy derived from renewable sources;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Regional needs vary between west and east. The eastern part need more funding on residential houses energy efficiency (insulation, solar collector, geothermal, building energy etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) promoting energy efficiency and renewable energy use in enterprises;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>There were significant differences between the two nations on the importance of this priority. Since this topic is covered by Hungarian OPs but not covered on the same level in Slovakia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) supporting energy efficiency, smart energy management and renewable energy use in public infrastructures, including in public buildings, and in the housing sector;</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) developing and implementing smart distribution systems at low and medium voltage levels;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) promoting low-carbon strategies for all types of territories, in particular for urban areas, including the promotion of sustainable multi-modal urban mobility and mitigation relevant adaptation measures;</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) promoting research in, innovation in and adoption of low-carbon technologies;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Promoting the use of high-efficiency co-generation of heat and power based on useful heat demand;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment priority (IP)</td>
<td>SWOT analysis</td>
<td>Comment 1</td>
<td>Typical CB, important</td>
<td>Final comments and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) supporting investment for adaptation to climate change, including eco-system based</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecosystem approach is important and can be applied in many way e.g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td>reforestation;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) promoting investment to address specific risks, ensuring disaster resilience and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developing disaster management systems;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Preserving and protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency through:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investing in the waste sector to meet the requirements of the Union's environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acquis and to address needs, identified by the Member States, for investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going beyond those requirements;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) investing in the water sector to meet the requirements of the Union's environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acquis and to address needs, identified by the Member States, for investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going beyond those requirements;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) conserving, protecting, promoting and developing natural and cultural heritage;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) protecting and restoring biodiversity, soil protection and restoration and promoting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecosystem services including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment priority (IP)</td>
<td>SWOT analysis</td>
<td>Comment 1</td>
<td>Typical CB, important</td>
<td>Final comments and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURA 2000 and green infrastructures;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) action to improve the urban environment, revitalisation of cities, regeneration and decontamination of brownfield sites (including conversion areas), reduction of air pollution and promotion of noise-reduction measures</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) promoting innovative technologies to improve environmental protection and resource efficiency in the waste sector, water sector, soil protection or to reduce air pollution;</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) supporting industrial transition towards a resource-efficient economy, promoting green growth, eco-innovation and environmental performance management in the public and private sectors;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Improving energy efficiency and security of supply through the development of smart energy distribution, storage and transmission systems and through the integration of distributed generation from renewable sources.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

● HU ● SK (3 votes per person in both rounds)
Workshop conclusions

- It is concluded that CBC investment priorities should not overlap with national OPs those investment priorities;
- Each participant had a different point of view on which priorities they recommend (e.g. the water management, cultural heritage, energy efficiency);
- Cooperation between the two country are possible in many ways especially in water management and civil defence, environmental protection and cultural heritage;
- Tourism related developments were emphasised since they are not included to any other thematic objective (investment priority number 12 can cover it). There was no consensus about on this issue. Particularly because these projects have high prize and they hardly relate with environmental protection or climate change.
- Participants have concluded that that opinions in this sessions does not represent each region and field so, such method designed which overcome this obstacle;
- Based on the results of the workshop, the following investment priorities seem to be relevant in the HU-SK CBC Programme:
  - IP12: conserving, protecting, promoting and developing natural and cultural heritage;
  - IP13: protecting and restoring biodiversity, soil protection and restoration and promoting ecosystem services including NATURA 2000 and green infrastructures.
4.3 HUMAN RESOURCES

Workshop objective

The aim of the workshop to find out which investment priorities (within Human resources thematic objective) could be applied in the next period’s HU-SK cross-border Programme. The aim of the workshop is to cross-check the following information with the involvement of stakeholders:

- Which are those investment priorities that are underpinned by the SWOT analysis?
- Which are those investment priorities which are typical cross-border issues and should be included in the Programme?

According to the EC regulations the following investment priorities can be covered by the Promoting sustainable and quality employment and supporting labour mobility

1. Investing in infrastructure for employment services;
2. Integrating cross-border labour markets, including cross-border mobility, joint local employment initiatives, information and advisory services and joint training;
3. Investing in health and social infrastructure which contribute to national, regional and local development, reducing inequalities in terms of health status, promoting social inclusion through improved access to social, cultural and recreational services and the transition from institutional to community-based services;
4. Support for physical, economic and social regeneration of deprived communities in urban and rural areas;
5. Support for social enterprises;
6. Investments undertaken in the context of Community-led local development strategies;
7. Promoting gender equality, equal opportunities, and the integration of communities across borders;
8. Investing in education, training and vocational training for skills and lifelong learning by developing education and training infrastructure;
9. Developing and implementing joint education, vocational training and training schemes;
10. Enhancing institutional capacity of public authorities and stakeholders and an efficient public administration by strengthening of institutional capacity and the efficiency of public administrations and public services related to implementation of the ERDF, and in support of actions institutional capacity and in the efficiency of public administration supported by the ESF.

Workshop activities

The evaluators asked the participants to vote on the agreed six investment priorities according to the following 2 aspects in 2 rounds:

- Which are those investment priorities that are important and underpinned by the SWOT analysis?
- Which are those investment priorities which are typical cross-border issues and should be included in the Programme?

In both rounds all participant have 5 votes.

The following table shows the results and the comments after each round.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment priority (IP)</th>
<th>Important and underpinned by the SWOT analysis</th>
<th>Comment 1</th>
<th>Typical CB, important</th>
<th>Final comments and conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Investing in infrastructure for employment services;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Integrating cross-border labour markets, including cross-border mobility, joint local employment initiatives, information and advisory services and joint training;</td>
<td>⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤ - 2nd Priority includes training and employment. It could be a tool for fighting against the Poverty.</td>
<td>- -Participants agreed with the importance of the 2nd Investment Priority. This Priority has real cross border impact. Along the border there are the same problems.</td>
<td>⬤⬤⬤⬤ - 2nd Priority includes training and employment. It could be a tool for fighting against the Poverty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Investing in health and social infrastructure which contribute to national, regional and local development, reducing inequalities in terms of health status, promoting social inclusion through improved access to social, cultural and recreational services and the transition from institutional to community-based services;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Support for physical, economic and social regeneration of deprived communities in urban and rural areas;</td>
<td>⬤⬤⬤ - 4th Priority includes training and employment.</td>
<td>- -Participants agreed with the importance of the 2nd Investment Priority. This Priority has real cross border impact. Along the border there are the same problems.</td>
<td>⬤⬤ - 2nd Priority includes training and employment. It could be a tool for fighting against the Poverty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Support for social enterprises;</td>
<td>⬤ - Social enterprises not the appropriate definition. Family enterprise or farmers ‘co-operative Family business opportunities on both sides of the border should be exploited.</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤ - 2nd Priority includes training and employment. It could be a tool for fighting against the Poverty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment priority (IP)</td>
<td>Important and underpinned by the SWOT analysis</td>
<td>Comment 1</td>
<td>Typical CB, important</td>
<td>Final comments and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Investments undertaken in the context of Community-led local development strategies;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>●●●●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Promoting gender equality, equal opportunities, and the integration of communities across borders;</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Investing in education, training and vocational training for skills and lifelong learning by developing education and training infrastructure;</td>
<td>●●●●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Developing and implementing joint education, vocational training and training schemes;</td>
<td>●●●●</td>
<td>●●●●</td>
<td></td>
<td>According to the Slovak participants education does not solve the problem in an integrated way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Enhancing institutional capacity of public authorities and stakeholders and an efficient public administration by strengthening of institutional capacity and the efficiency of public administrations and public services related to implementation of the ERDF, and in support of actions in institutional capacity and in the efficiency of public administration supported by the ESF.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>●●</td>
<td>No direct cross border impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

● **HU** ● **SK** (5 votes per person in both rounds)
Workshop conclusions

- Both Hungarian and Slovakian participants highlighted the importance of the 2nd priority. Slovak participants represented East part of Slovakia;
- Slovakia should be mentioned related to the dual vocational training in the strengths of SWOT analysis;
- Fight against poverty through Integrating cross-border labour markets;
- Roma issue should base on poverty not ethnic basis;
- Projects with real cross border impact should be implemented;
- Joint employment could be implemented for example by two Municipalities not just through entrepreneurs. The aim should be encourage the local product and production;
- According to the Slovakian participants education does not solve the problem in an integrated way
4.4 TRANSPORT

Workshop objective

The aim of the workshop to find out which investment priorities (within Transport thematic objective) could be applied in the next period’s HU-SK cross-border Programme. The aim of the workshop is to cross-check the following information with the involvement of stakeholders:

- Which are those investment priorities that are underpinned by the SWOT analysis?
- Which are those investment priorities which are typical cross-border issues and should be included in the Programme?

According to the EC regulations the following investment priorities can be covered by the “Transport” thematic objective (no.7):

1. Supporting a multimodal Single European Transport Area by investing in the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T);
2. Enhancing regional mobility through connecting secondary and tertiary nodes to TEN-T infrastructure, including multimodal nodes;
3. Developing and improving environment-friendly (including low-noise), and low-carbon transport systems including inland waterways and maritime transport, ports, multimodal links and airport infrastructure, in order to promote sustainable regional and local mobility;
4. Developing and rehabilitating comprehensive, high quality and interoperable railway system, and promoting noise-reduction measures,

It’s important to know that EC regulations allow non-TEN-T connected road constructions, but only in case they contribute to economic development or social objectives. Therefore, the workshop participants agreed on adding two ‘extra’ investment priorities to the original list:

5. Road constructions related to economic development (roads that are not connecting TEN-T routes, but play important role in cross-border communication)
6. Road constructions related to social issues (roads that are not connecting TEN-T routes, but promote social developments in the border area e.g. commuters)

Workshop activities

The evaluators asked the participants to vote on the agreed six investment priorities according to the following 2 aspects in 2 rounds:

- Which are those investment priorities that are important and underpinned by the SWOT analysis?
- Which are those investment priorities which are typical cross-border issues and should be included in the Programme?

In both rounds all participant have 3 votes.

The following table shows the results and the comments after each round.
### Ex ante evaluation and SEA of the HU-SK CBC Programme (2014-2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment priority (IP)</th>
<th>Important and underpinned by the SWOT analysis</th>
<th>Comment 1</th>
<th>Typical CB, important</th>
<th>Final comments and conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Supporting a multimodal Single European Transport Area by investing in the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T);</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Underpinned by the SWOT, but it does not fit in the Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Enhancing regional mobility through connecting secondary and tertiary nodes to TEN-T infrastructure, including multimodal nodes</td>
<td>✗ ✗</td>
<td></td>
<td>✗ ✗</td>
<td>According to the HU participants the IP could be included in the OP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lately, a “Hungarian Transport Administration” study has been published about road improvement needs. The study defines which among these roads connected to TEN-T roads.

- January 2013: visibility study was published (regarding the border area as well). Financed from Transport OP
- Out of 103 possible roads, 60 was chosen based on risk analysis etc.
- The final "road-list" was approved by the Slovakian bordering counties as well.
- Next step: Action plan on road developments

**BUT is it justified that these road developments should be included in the CBC Programme?**

**Conclusion:** Maybe including IP5 is better and if that road development is connected to TEN-T, than it is a "plus". The participants agreed that the points of this IP can be added to IP5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment priority (IP)</th>
<th>Important and underpinned by the SWOT analysis</th>
<th>Comment 1</th>
<th>Typical CB, important</th>
<th>Final comments and conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) Developing and improving environment-friendly (including low-noise), and low-carbon transport systems including inland waterways and maritime transport, ports, multimodal links and airport infrastructure, in order to promote sustainable regional and local mobility;</td>
<td>⬠ ⬠ ⬠</td>
<td>SWOT is more underpinned here.</td>
<td>⬠ ⬠ ⬠ ⬠ ⬠ ⬠ ⬠</td>
<td>This IP is very relevant regarding to the CBC but it is not underpinned enough by the recent SWOT analysis. This might mean that the SWOT analysis needs a further amendment. The understanding of IP3 can be very wide. It can be improvement of the followings (according to the participants): o ferries and roadstead o cross-border public transport o connecting cross-border public transport (improvement connections to the border-crossing railway lines) o border crossing bike roads Comment: Although, visibility studies have been drafted by the Hungarian Transport Administration, the related roads will not be named in the Programme in order to avoid obligations set by the EU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Developing and rehabilitating comprehensive, high quality and interoperable railway system, and promoting noise-reduction measures;</td>
<td>⬠ ⬠</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬠ ⬠ ⬠</td>
<td>Although this IP is underpinned by the SWOT analysis the financial resources are not sufficient for railway improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Road constructions related to economic development</td>
<td>⬠ ⬠ ⬠ ⬠ ⬠ ⬠</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬠ ⬠ ⬠ ⬠ ⬠</td>
<td>The most underpinned and necessary IP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Investment priority (IP)

### 6) Road constructions related to social issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IP</th>
<th>Important and underpinned by the SWOT analysis</th>
<th>Comment 1</th>
<th>Typical CB, important</th>
<th>Final comments and conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The SWOT says:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cases of IP6 are the followings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o low number of border crossing points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Bike roads on Ipoly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building of a bridge between Komárom and Komárno would be relevant but the financial resources are not sufficient.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUT usually (~70%) people cross the border for work/tourism. This means that most cases the purpose of the road is economic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusion: the participants agreed that the points of IP6 should be added to IP5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*HU* ● *SK* (3 votes per person in both rounds)
Workshop conclusions

- It is concluded that economic development related cross-border road developments are important, even if they are not connected to TEN-T roads;
- The SWOT analysis should assess further the possibility of cross-border public transport issues (e.g. border-crossing bus lines, ferries, bike roads etc.)
- Although, there are improvement needs which are justified by the SWOT analysis, in many cases these are not typical cross-border issues or the programme’s financial resources are not sufficient for their implementation.
- Based on the results of the workshop, the following investment priorities seem to be relevant in the HU-SK CBC Programme:
  - IP3: Developing and improving environment-friendly (including low-noise), and low-carbon transport systems including inland waterways and maritime transport, ports, multimodal links and airport infrastructure, in order to promote sustainable regional and local mobility;
  - IP5: Road constructions related to economic development (This investment priority should be included in Thematic Objective no. 3)

5 Workshop closing

After the sessions spokespersons presented the findings and conclusions each section in plenary.

At the end of the workshop planners concluded remarks on the selection of TOs and defined the strategy. They presented the next steps of the planning process.

On 12 February 2014 the next workshop will be organised regarding to indicators (How could we measure the cross border impact?)
ANNEX 5  IMPLEMENTATION WORKSHOP REPORT

Implementation workshop - MEMO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic:</th>
<th>Implementation workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>04/02/2014, 10.00-16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place:</td>
<td>Banksá Bystrica, Kongres Hotel Dixon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workshop objective
The main objective of this event was to have the participants brainstorm and propose possible activity measures corresponding to each of the five selected thematic objectives (TOs).

The secondary objective of the workshop was to familiarize the participants with the 2014-2020 HU-SK CBC Program planning’s current situation.

Prior to the commencement of the event target areas were reviewed and identified as the following; society, economy and cultural. In addition, group discussions were held and in depth interviews with stakeholders were conducted to validate the program.

Structure of the workshop and instructions
The workshop contained individual presentation regarded information related to each of the TOs and subsections. After the speeches the participants were invited to brainstorm ideas for the actions on which the program will be based on.

The suggestions were written on post-it notes and were provided if required. It was suggested that all ideas cover these points:

- the name of the action;
- the corresponding category (SO);
- suggested method of funding application;
- the suggested beneficiary.

Hereinafter, the suggestions were collected, collated and displayed to the appropriate investment priority (IP) by the planners and evaluators (ex-ante) during this process the planners distributed their previously completed action suggestion plans to the participants review. At which point a discussion occurred comparing and assessing the brainstormed suggestions with the pre prepared planners suggestions. These suggestions were read out by the planners so as to allow to each suggestion to be discussed and to all participants have a voice. This process was repeated at each SOs.

The closing presentation on providing information regarding the next steps of the planning process and thanking the participants.
### Key Points (by TO sections)

Below you can find the summarized some of the suggestions, generated by the sections that have been grouped according to their relevance.

**TO3 – PA1 - Competitive economy through cooperation section**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO</th>
<th>Investment priority (IP)</th>
<th>Specific objection</th>
<th>Suggested actions</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Relevancy related to the SOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Enhancing the competitiveness of SMEs by promoting entrepreneurship, in particular by facilitating the economic exploitation of new ideas and fostering the creation of new firms, including through business incubators (3a)</td>
<td>Promoting competitiveness of the border region through innovative cross-border cooperation.</td>
<td>Supporting the innovative cooperation of SMEs and knowledge institutions (public research institutes, universities, institutes of higher education) across the border throughout the phases of the innovation chain.</td>
<td>SMEs, Universities, Public research institute’s Clusters,</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Enhancing the competitiveness of SMEs by supporting the creation and the extension of advanced capacities for product and service development (3c)</td>
<td>Solving cross-border regional problems and challenges through business cooperative activity of SMEs offering products and providing services in emerging areas linked to these challenges</td>
<td>Supporting the setting up cross-border cooperating new enterprises, spin-offs from knowledge institutions such as universities, higher education.</td>
<td></td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting the setting up and operating innovative clusters across the border.</td>
<td></td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting the provision of cross-border business advisory services to foster knowledge and idea-exchange across the border, in particular in the areas: - of technology transfer across the border, - of access to new markets, - user-oriented and design-driven innovation.</td>
<td>SMEs, Universities, Public research institute’s Clusters,</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Investments will be supported for cooperation of SMEs in emerging areas linked to regional challenges such as creative and cultural industries serving mutually enhancing understanding and knowledge of the people across the border (e.g.: electronic and printed press, advertisement industry, films and videos, software and digital game development, architecture, publishing of books, music, performing arts, fine arts, applied arts, design, cultural and antiquities market, handicrafts etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Further actions will be supported for cooperation of SMEs linked to innovative cross-border services reflecting new societal demands</td>
<td></td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the brainstorming, the participants drew the attention to the East-West development gap, which can significantly influence the success of the program. In the East area, instead of the innovation development, subsidy and development of the labor-intensive sector is the main task. Launching common enterprise development platform and raising awareness are also suggested.
### TO6 – PA2 - Environment protection and resource efficiency section

List of suggested actions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO</th>
<th>Investment priority (IP)</th>
<th>Specific objection</th>
<th>Suggested actions</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Relevancy related to the SO’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Preserving and protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency by conserving, protecting, promoting and developing natural and cultural heritage</td>
<td>Sustainable use of natural and cultural heritage of the border region.</td>
<td>Building up cross-border bicycle roads, bike path stops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of studies related to bike roads</td>
<td></td>
<td>🌳🌳🌳🌳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building up green tourism roads, integrate with tourist routes</td>
<td>Municipalities, National Parks, Universities,</td>
<td>🌳🌳🌳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting common marketing actions</td>
<td></td>
<td>🌳🌳🌳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction of border crossing buildings, implementing them in bike-road systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>🌳🌳🌳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting “Little Danube” territories</td>
<td></td>
<td>🌳🌳🌳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural reconstruction of oxbows</td>
<td></td>
<td>🌳🌳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensuring the operation of waterways</td>
<td></td>
<td>🌳🌳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement of green and thematic roads</td>
<td></td>
<td>🌳🌳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting the protection of patrimony</td>
<td></td>
<td>🌳🌳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment of an eco-centre</td>
<td>National Park HQ-s,</td>
<td>🌳🌳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuation of NATURA 2000 protecting program</td>
<td></td>
<td>🌳🌳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting of the silviculture reconstructions</td>
<td></td>
<td>🌳🌳</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preserving and protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency by conserving, protecting, promoting and developing natural and cultural heritage**

**Sustainable use of natural and cultural heritage of the border region.**

**Increasing the ecological stability of the program area.**
### Key findings and recommendations:

According to the previous evaluations tourism developments are less sustainable. Maintenance is expensive. In case of cultural heritage sustainability is crucial, since in case there is a revenue while operating, that should be minused from the grant.

The planners carry out the further investigation and the possible inclusion of the measures considered relevant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restoration and promoting ecosystem services including NATURA 2000 and green infrastructures</th>
<th>Protecting and restoring habitats</th>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To build fish ladders in the area</td>
<td></td>
<td>●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness common raisings and trainings (environment topic)</td>
<td></td>
<td>●●●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TO 7 – PA3 - Enhancing cross-border mobility section

#### List of suggested actions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO</th>
<th>Investment priority (IP)</th>
<th>Specific objection</th>
<th>Suggested actions</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Relevancy related to the SO’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting a multimodal Single European Transport Area by investing in the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T) (ERDF Reg., Art. 5. (7) (a))</td>
<td>Enhancement of a higher-level competitiveness of the Hungarian-Slovakian border area along with the development of the Trans-European infrastructure network.</td>
<td>7a is suggested to remove from the program, because it is concerned only to concrete corridors. Though, without 7a there is not opportunity for supporting planning documents and studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Establishing an effective and sustainable public transport system (ERDF Reg., Art. 5. (7) (c))</td>
<td>Road developments should be joint in integrated touristic or labour market developments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>🟢ierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing and improving environment-friendly (including low-noise), and low-carbon transport systems including inland waterways and maritime transport, ports, multimodal links and airport infrastructure, in order to promote sustainable regional and local mobility (ERDF Reg., Art. 5. (7) (c)) Reg., Art. 5. (7) (a))</td>
<td>The suggested soft projects can be in the 11TO or stay in the 7a – it depends on the decision of DG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>🟢ierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7b should not be on the list, though planning documents and studies can be in it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>🟢ierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The VIA Karpatia is not an approved TEN-T corridor yet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>🟢ierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Road developments should not be goal of development, rather a tool of it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>🟢ierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle path developments should be in 6 TO instead of 7c, because it is a tourism-related transport development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>🟢ierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ferry developments are suggested to be between the supported actions as well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>🟢ierre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **7a**: Suggested to remove from the program, because it is concerned only to concrete corridors. Though, without 7a there is not opportunity for supporting planning documents and studies.
- **7b**: Should not be on the list, though planning documents and studies can be in it.
- **7c**: The VIA Karpatia is not an approved TEN-T corridor yet.
- **Road developments**: Should not be goal of development, rather a tool of it.
- **Bicycle path developments**: Should be in 6 TO instead of 7c, because it is a tourism-related transport development.
- **Ferry developments**: Are suggested to be between the supported actions as well.
Key findings and recommendations:

The main debate was about TO 7a. Finally, 7a was suggested to remove from the program which means planning documents and studies can be only in the TO 11 or in 7b (currently it is not in the program).
**TO11 – PA5 – Enhancing cross-border cooperations of public authorities and people**

The main result was to split and reorganize each of the SO’s co-operation between public authorities and stakeholders, and people to people measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO</th>
<th>Investment priority (IP)</th>
<th>Suggested actions</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Relevancy related to the SO’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Enhancing institutional capacity of public authorities and stakeholders and efficient public administration through actions to strengthen the institutional capacity and the efficiency of public administrations and public services related to the implementation of the ERDF, and in support of actions under the ESF to strengthen the institutional capacity and the efficiency of public administration.</td>
<td>Knowledge-exchange, Common Discussion, practice and continuation of previous projects</td>
<td>Chamber of commerce; Development Agencies,</td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal advice related to the exercise of the right of other countries to Chambers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting small project for umbrella organizations such as chambers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancing information flow (grants, events etc.) between by contribution with/ cooperation with town, village and county municipalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperation in the field of nature protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting educational and cultural cooperations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting traditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving cooperation between labour centres and high schools (focus on trainings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synchronizing the cross-border higher educational systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishing common TDM (tourist destination management organization), synchronize their operation, exchange of experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting local product developments and the flow of information.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EGTC-s</td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Key findings and recommendations:**

The most received proposals were concerned to improve the cooperation of chambers of commerce, development agencies, and local governments (authorities). Several general recommendations were received about the action, which still require further specification.

Endorsed by the workshop participants, the key finding was that the common strategies can be handled (marketing, tourism and regional development) within this IP. Further consideration of the measures considered relevant for planners perform their possible inclusion.

The planners carry out the further investigation and the possible inclusion of the measures considered relevant.
ANNEX 6  INDICATOR WORKSHOP REPORT

This is a summary report of the indicator workshop which was organized under the framework of the "Ex ante evaluation and Strategic Environmental Assessment of the HU-SK CBC Programme (2014-2020)". The workshop took place between 10:00-14:00 on 6th February 2014 at VÁTI, Budapest.

Workshop objectives

The workshop main objective was to support the planning team in order to establish an adequate indicator system for the programme. The workshop provided space for discussion on concerns and constructive feedbacks in relation to the indicator and some aspects of the monitoring system.

The aim of the workshop was to find out which result and output indicators could be measure well the program success in the selected priority axes. This ongoing iterative dialogue will lead to higher quality of the indicator system.

Indicator workshop agenda:

- Introductory presentation about Commission’s regulation in relation to the indicators system
- Discussion about specific objectives and result indicators
- Discussion about common output indicators (covered only PA1 and PA2)
- Conclusion and next step

Participants

Altogether 27 people (3 from Slovakia and 24 from Hungary) participated in the discussion including stakeholders from governmental bodies involved in program planning and Zsolt Szokolai from DG Regio.

1 General indicator requirements

The next things should be considered when indicators are being identified:

- What is SMART indicator?
  - Specific: indicator should use clear definition which has common understanding
  - Measurable: either quantitatively or qualitatively possible to evaluate or analyse
  - Available: easy to access the data, or it can be measured in a cost effective way
  - Relevant: should be relevant in terms of the programme aims and objectives
  - Time-related: to know when to expect the targets to be achieved

- CB added value can be captured

- Overlapping effects with mainstream OPs need to be considered, usage of a very specific objectives and indicators are recommended in order to avoid the influences of the mainstream OPs

- Maximum two result indicators can be selected per specific objectives

- Any indicator which belongs to the common output indicators cannot be selected as result indicator

- Indicators should relate to the eligible area

You can find the related regulations and more requirements elaborated in the presentation slides you may receive with this document.
2 Comments on result and common indicators

In this planning period impact indicators are not used anymore. Result indicators are responsible to measure whether the specific objectives are achieved their goals or not. During the workshop we have discussed the each priority axes. It should be considered that the specific objectives perhaps will be modified after including the result of the implementation workshop.

Here you can read the summary of the comments:

- Result indicators should be specific enough to measure cross border impact. Some of the indicators collected from statistic office might be too general.
- Some specific objectives need more clarifications when the planners finalize them.

### Competitive economy through cooperation: PA1. SO1. Investment Priority ERFA Art.5. (3.a)

SO: Promoting competitiveness of the border region through innovative cross-border cooperation

1.1 Result indicator: Innovative SME’s from the region (source: Eurostat, CIS, biannually)

- To be measured in county level
- Should be specified the number of the innovative SME’s whether reflects what we would like to achieve under competitiveness
- Specific objective should be in line with the indicator and should specifically refer to what we aim to achieve (e.g. increase the number of the new enterprises etc.)
- Under this investment priority (3a) we should define the focus which should be reflected in the specific objective as well
- Selected focus should not overlap with mainstream OP’s specific objective
- Indicator should allow us to see the cross border added value of the programme

### Environment protection and enhancement of resource efficiency - PA2. SO1. IP: ERFA Art. 5. (6.c)

SO: Sustainable use of natural and cultural heritage of the border region

Result indicator: number of visitors and number of guest (annual data, measured in person)

- Number of visitors can be good output indicator but does not specifically refer to the specific objective. (e.g. sustainable use are not included) The aim is to increase touristic attractiveness or quality of the environment? Specific objective should be more clear about the goal (e.g. support XX actions which will attract more people to come to these regions)
- Both indicator good in point of measurability
SO: Increasing the ecological stability of the program area.

Result indicator: The economic value of ecosystem services (according to German methodology pilot tested in Slovakia and under pilot testing in Hungary)

- Surface area approach is another possibility depending on the final SO goal (e.g. if habitat reconstruction is included). Surface area approach is only applicable if the chosen result indicator does not belong to the list of common output indicators.
- Disadvantage of this indicator that it might be expensive the evaluation and longer timeframe needed to have the accessible data.

Flood protection will be probably included into this specific objective:

- Flood protection measures (non-investment actions) – number of people benefits from flood protection measures as a common outcome indicator. Result indicator can’t be a common indicators.
- Slovak mainstream environmental program include flood protection, overlapping should be checked. National strategy will be finalized in 2015 which include flood protection and all the affected areas will be included.

**Common indicators**

According to the EC whenever it is possible it is highly recommended to use the common indicators (if they suit with the proposed activities).

For PA2 (Environment protection and enhancement of resource efficiency) the below presented indicators had been selected as relevant indicators:

- Increase in expected number of visits to supported sites of cultural and natural heritage and attraction
- Population benefiting from flood protection measures
- Surface area of habitats supported in order to attain a better conservation status

Since the results of implementation workshop will influence the selected types activities in most of the priority axes at this stage it was not possible to go further with the selection of common output indicators. Output indicators should be directly linked with actions so indicator can be established after the activities are chosen. However common indicators also can direct planners to specify actions as clearly as possible and establish strong link between the actions – actions’ output – output indicators.

### 3 Conclusion and next steps

Several aspects are needed to be taken under consideration when indicator system is established. Some of them even seem to be contradictory e.g. result indicators coming from reliable statistical data collection and capturing the cross border added value of the programme. When the adequate indicator system will be establish it is important to have common understanding of the definitions and measure.

Lessons learned:

- Stronger focus is needed regarding the priorities
- Result indicators cannot be selected from the list of common output indicators
- Output indicators should be linked directly to the actions
The ToR defines an indicative list of evaluation questions which draw the attention to the cross-border characteristic of the Programme. These questions are the followings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation topic</th>
<th>Related EQs*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Programme strategy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Consistency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) To what extent is the selection of the thematic objectives and the priorities relevant to the regional and the cross-border needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Are the selected thematic objectives, the priorities and corresponding objectives of the programme sufficiently justified and consistent with the Common Strategic Framework, the Partnership Contract and the country-specific recommendations for Hungary and Slovakia?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Coherence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) How does the strategy take into account potential external factors and how it should reflect them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Is the contribution of the proposed thematic objectives/priority axes/investing priorities appropriate for fulfilment of the regional and cross-border needs and priorities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) To what extent are the thematic objectives/priority axes/investing priorities coherent and mutually complementary (they do not overlap)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h) Does the programme reflect synergy and complementarity, programmes and EU policies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Horizontal issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j) To what extent are the planned measures to promote equal opportunities between men and women, to prevent discrimination and to promote sustainable development adequately described and to what extent do they reflect European and national policies and strategies for these issues? Is it possible to evaluate particular measures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k) To what extent are the measures for the sustainable development support established (environmental protection, sources effectiveness, climate change reduction, resilience to disasters, prevention and risk management) and to what extent do they reflect the European and national policies and strategies for these issues? Is it possible to evaluate particular measures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Indicators, monitoring and evaluation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l) Are the indicators set up for each priority? Are they clear, relevant, valid and appropriate to the programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m) Do the indicators reflect shortages from previous programming periods?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n) Are the planned quantified target values of the output and the result indicators realistic and achievable (mainly having regard to the support from the funds envisaged)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o) To what extent and how do the planned outputs contribute to the change in the results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p) Are the milestones and intermediate targets of the performance framework set up appropriately and realistically?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q) Are the proposed indicators sufficiently appropriate for monitoring, evaluation and examination of the programme’s performance?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation topic | Related EQs*
---|---
### Implementation system  
| r) Is the implementation system of the programme, including administrative capacities established appropriately and effectively?  
| s) Are the measures on reducing the administrative burdens on beneficiaries realistic and achievable?  
| t) Are the procedures for monitoring the programme and collecting the necessary data described and set up sufficiently?  
| u) Is an electronic data transfer and administration secured effectively and efficiently?  
| v) Is it secured that all implementation processes will be carried out?  
| w) Is a functional division of particular bodies involved in implementation secured?  
| z) How and to what extent will the partners be involved in implementation, evaluation and monitoring the programme?  

### 3. Consistency of financial allocations  
| e) To what extent is the proposed form of support justified?  
| i) Are the allocated funds adequate for the programme’s objectives?  

### 4. Contribution to Europe 2020 strategy  
| a) Does the programme’s strategy sufficiently define and justify the programme’s contribution to the Union strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth?  

### 5. Strategic Environmental Assessment  
| aa) To what extent were the requirements for Strategic Environmental Assessment set out in implementation of Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27th June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment and national legislation of Hungary and Slovakia concerning the assessment of the effects on the environment met?  

### + Questions regarding the partnership  
| x) To what extent were the criteria of the partnership principle reflected in the programme preparation process?  
| y) Is the representation of the partners adequate to the strategy, objectives and priority axes of the programme?  

*The numbering of the EQs refers to the indication in the ToR*