

Report

Interreg post 2027 stakeholders' consultation meeting

Subject of consultation

Shape of the post 2027 Interreg programme on the Polish-Ukrainian and Polish-Belarusian borderlands

Objectives of consultation

1. Identify and analyse the key spheres and problems in the region that need solutions and can be addressed by Interreg post 2027 programme;
2. Assess conditions and locate points for cooperation;
3. Collect opinions, propositions and define probable directions of Interreg post 2027 for the region.

Administration

Region	Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast, Ukraine
Conducted by (entity)	Lviv Branch Office of Joint Secretariat
Place/venue/address	Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast State Administration, 21 Hrushevskoho St., Ivano-Frankivsk
Date	8 October 2024

Part 1.

Information about respondents

Number of participants	27 persons 11 entities represented
Categories of participants, structure and share of participation	Regional, urban, local government authorities – (3) 27% Healthcare institutions - (0) 0% Education institutions (schools, universities, academies), training or research centers - (2) 18% Cultural institutions (such as museums, galleries etc.) –(4) 36% Organizations responsible for nature/environment protection - (1) 9% Bodies in charge of disaster and emergency risk management – (1) 9% Economic/social partners, associations, SMEs – (0) 0% NGOs (0/0 0%

The level of awareness of the audience about the Poland-(Belarus)-Ukraine / Interreg and EU/Donor funded projects	<p>Low – heard of EU-funded projects without knowing details on the financing conditions, priorities, objectives etc.;</p> <p>Medium – aware of the EU-funded projects with basic knowledge on conditions, examples of projects in the region or indirectly involved in the implementation;</p> <p>High – directly involved in the Programme/projects implementation as a Monitoring Committee member or beneficiary of current or previous Poland-(Belarus)-Ukraine programme edition.</p>
	<p>Low – 11</p> <p>Medium – 13</p> <p>High - 2</p>

Part 2.

What is Interreg

<p>The audience should be informed about the basic data on the Programme (PL-UA/PBU) - financing structure, area, cross-border cooperation frame, successful projects in the region.</p> <p>The information should be adapted to the participants’ awareness on the issue – if it is medium-high – please communicate rather the analysis of the previous programmes (challenges, resolutions, lessons learnt etc.).</p> <p>Highly informed participants may assist in sharing the basic information for enriching the discussion.</p>
<p>As the majority of participants had medium or low level of awareness about the Programme, more detailed information about the Programme was provided including programme periods, principles of financing, eligibility, types of projects, statistics of the supported projects, current Programme priorities, and future activities in the Programme.</p>

Experience of the region

<p>Please indicate which PBU/PL-UA projects (or other CBC projects) implemented in the region proved most successful in the stakeholders’ opinion, brought strongest results, had highest impact etc.</p>
<p>Invisible Heritage Rosettes SeInCarp</p>

Part 3.

Analysis of feedback and input on key questions

Note: After introductory input and familiarization with the audience please initiate further joint discussion and exchange of opinions of the stakeholders on each of below key questions.

<p>1. Is location next to a border an opportunity or a disadvantage?</p>	<p>As a summary of opinions of stakeholders please put the jointly outlined general answer whether the location next to a border is more opportunity or disadvantage and explain what key arguments state for the chosen answer.</p>
	<p>Advantage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Links with other regions in neighbor country - Availability of funds for development - Common heritage, living history - Possibility of dialogue - Many ideas for common projects - Cooperation in the field of environment and disaster management (as some negative issues know no borders) - In emergency situations people from both countries can act jointly <p>Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unsolved conflicts in the past, controversial issues



<p>2. Where is the biggest potential for territorial cooperation in your area ?</p>	<p>Please work on the joint identification of the region's most actual fields to be addressed in frames of Interreg orientation.</p> <p>Please list maximum 5 from below and arrange the list from the most to less actual. If other arise please add to the list.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Joint cultural heritage; - Health services and healthy lifestyle promotion; - Protection of environment; - Responding to natural and human related threats and hazards - Cooperation between research / science / academic centres - Promotion of entrepreneurship - Facilitations for SME cross-border operability - Easy employment in the neighbouring country - Tourism development - Networking research and enterprises to innovate - Joint sport events - Border security - Road infrastructure - Public transport crossing the border - Social integration - Strengthening local identity - New technologies / innovativeness development and promotion - Other – what exactly? -
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Health services and healthy lifestyle promotion; 2. Tourism development 3. Protection of environment; 4. Joint cultural heritage 5. Cooperation between research / science / academic centres
<p>3. What currently works well in this cooperation and should be either preserved or reinforced?</p>	<p>Please discuss the aspect of cooperation and summarise maximum 5 positive points agreed in the audience.</p> <p>Examples: Creation of joint natural park areas; Shared health services; Jointly coordinated security/emergency services - fire-fighters operations across the border, etc.</p>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Safety and security are important priorities and should remain 2. Good communication in the Programme, involvement of regional and local authorities, availability of information in national languages

	<p>3. Investment and infrastructural component possible</p> <p>4. Micro project facility, which is good for beginners and smaller entities</p>
<p>4. What currently does not work well in this cooperation and should be improved?</p>	<p>Please discuss the aspect of cooperation and summarise a maximum 5 negative issues agreed in the audience.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>Nature preservation practices in a shared river basin are not unified;</p> <p>Exchanges of practical experience between places facing the same issues are complicated.</p> <hr/> <p>1. Ukrainian legislation has not been taken into account in the Programme requirements (property rights, building permissions etc.)</p> <p>2. National authority has not performed its functions as they didn't correct some issues in the Programme, which are harmful for UA beneficiaries</p> <p>3. Unresolved issues with employment of project staff</p> <p>4. Obtaining of building permission, which is required by the Programme and is a pre-condition for financing is extremely long and complicated. It shouldn't be required at this stage and it's not the same as in Poland</p> <p>5. The infrastructural projects can only be submitted if there are design and estimate documents</p>
<p>5. What are major obstacles for a good cross-border cooperation in your area?</p>	<p>On the issues summarized above please provide the major obstacles that interfere these issues to be duly solved.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>Low and uneven economic development;</p> <p>Little knowledge of the programme and/or partner country language;</p> <p>Uneven competence and salary level of local authorities personnel, etc.</p> <hr/> <p>1. Unequal budgets of Polish and Ukrainian entities, PL partners sometimes are not willing to apply to the programme as they have other sources of funding</p> <p>2. Lack of effective platforms for matching of partners</p> <p>3. Polish partners are reluctant to visit Ukraine for safety reasons, which hampers good communication</p> <p>4. Airports don't function, which hampers travelling</p>
<p>6. Are there things you would like to do under Interreg but cannot? Why?</p>	<p>Please collect probable measures/goals and reasons.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>Involvement of SME as partners to strengthen financial and operational capability cannot be done to regulative limitations of programme rules;</p>

	More finding for VIP projects – currently, VIP projects have almost same budges as regular which is not sufficient to resolve strategic challenges
7. What is the most important novelty that you would like to see in the future Interreg?	Please put the propositions that are new to the programme.
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A facility to finance e.g. design estimate documentation and other preparatory documents (smaller budgets) 2. The possibility of prior consultations of project ideas by external experts 3. Communication platforms for partner matching 4. Discuss “bad practices” regularly to avoid mistakes in future
8. Is there a need for some infrastructure projects?	Please collect opinions/propositions of joint infrastructure projects may be established in the region in cooperation with adjacent region of the partner country.
	Yes, security, heritage (in particular, safeguarding museum collections)
9. What should be done to facilitate the work with your counterparts in another country (governance)?	Please list measures on governance that would be applicable for improvement of the cooperation between bordering countries/regions.
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Organize more events which would facilitate interaction between potential partners 2. Employing more Ukrainians in JS would facilitate the work with projects 3. AI would be useful for rapid interpretation of communication between project managers and partners

Part 4.

Conclusions, other topics of discussion

Please put here everything what was not covered above, but raised/expressed during discussion.
n/a

Overall assessment of the meeting by the organizer

Were the objectives of the consultation achieved?

Please refer to each objective and describe the level of engagement of the stakeholders into discussion.

Not all target groups were represented at the meeting. There were several representatives of different department of Oblast State Administration, hence low number of institutions as compared to the number of participants. The representatives of the ongoing projects were the most active participants. Also, representatives of culture and education expressed their opinion eagerly. The discussion was dynamic, with many general and practical issues covered. However, for a large number of participants it was one of their first contacts with the Programme and they made little input in the discussion (except for identifying future priorities).

Even having no direct border with Poland, Ivano-Frankivsk oblast is one of the most active regions in the Programme. It also has an experience in other CBC programmes such as RO-UA and HUSKROUA as well as in other mechanisms.

1. Health services and healthy lifestyle promotion;
2. Tourism development
3. Protection of environment;
4. Joint cultural heritage
5. Cooperation between research / science / academic centres

Interesting quotes

Please collect interesting, important quotes from the participants on the matter of future post 27 programme.

Please put Name of participant, Quote in "".

Questionnaires

As a final point of the consultation – 10-15 minutes – please ask participants to fill the questionnaire for stakeholders on-line e.g. on their smartphones/laptops using the link (QR-code) to questionnaire for stakeholders (3 language versions available).

Participants that had already filled the survey before the meeting may share the experience and discuss whether consultation allow to improve replies given earlier.

QR code was distributed

Attachments:

1. Agenda.
2. List of Participants.