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0. Executive Summary

The draft Council conclusions on the implementation of the EU's macro-regional strategies adopted on 15th May 2019 state: “The council of the European Union (...) CALLS on the participating countries and regions to take into account priorities of the macro-regional strategies in the programming and implementation of post-2020 relevant programmes under shared management...” and “ENCOURAGES the key implementers of the macro-regional strategies to make better use of the programmes directly and indirectly managed by the Commission”.

This evaluation provides the first structured bottom-up analysis of the funding needs of the EUSALP Action Groups (AGs) in relation to the future programmes and shall help to implement paragraph 10 of the General Affairs Council Conclusions as of 21st May 2019.

The EUSALP was established at a time when the programmes of the current 2014-2020 funding period were already in their implementation phase. As a consequence, the embedding of the strategic initiatives initiated by the AGs could not be implemented as intended from the very beginning under the circumstances of the so called “Three No's”. Now, in view of the upcoming programming, there is a unique opportunity to apply this commitment and to better interlink the EUSALP and funding programmes and to leverage synergy potential. This momentum must be exploited.

Even though the various programmes differ greatly in terms of content and administration and European legislation for future programmes is not yet in force, specific funding needs could already be identified for the thematic priorities. In order to make them easier to understand for those responsible for the programme, they were adapted to the corresponding programme logic wherever possible.

The overall view shows that a number of programmes do have the potential to support the implementation of EUSALP priorities. Differences naturally arise depending on the AG. While some AGs (like 2, 6, 7) would have a large portfolio available, others (like 3, 8) would focus on a limited number of programmes.

One focus of the programmes to be addressed is undoubtedly those in shared management, but programmes centrally managed by the European Commission should also be targeted. All in all, there is great potential to put the strategy on a broader footing and to make better use of existing and future funding programmes.
It is confirmed (not surprisingly) that the Alpine Space Programme continues to be one of the core programmes for the implementation of the EUSALP, although only comparatively small financial resources are available here. One reason for this is certainly the programme’s high profile, on the other hand that the programme largely corresponds to that of the EUSALP in terms of its territorial backdrop, covers a broad spectrum of topics and, finally, is highly addressed to transnational cooperation.

The initial phase of EUSALP also had a strong cooperation character with the view to the territorial needs of the wider Alpine region. However, the now formulated funding needs demonstrate that funding needs are clearly going beyond pure cooperation. On different geographical scales various efforts are needed. Thematically, a considerable number of different fields are addressed according to the wide range of AG topics. Structurally, the funding requirements cover a wide range of measures comprising like basic and applied research, strategy development, skills and capacity building, value chain development, governance models and even real investments on the ground.

It is now a question of exploiting this potential. This requires political support at the 2019 Annual Forum, among others through a clear statement in the upcoming Joint Declaration, and in parallel communication of the funding needs to the countries, e.g. by the EB members, bearing in mind that the setting up of the programmes has already started or will start soon. More specifically, during the programming phase potentials for taking EUSALP relevant priorities (see AG points of main interest as mentioned in chapter 4.2) and EUSALP specific implementation procedures (e.g. specific calls, budget shares) into account in future programmes have to be examined carefully.
1. Background

There is a broad political consensus that stronger embedding of strategies in EU funding programmes is needed to make macro-regional strategies more effective. Two successive steps are needed to achieve this goal:

a) Macroregional Strategies must formulate their needs, knowing that it will not be possible to foresee the individual funding requirements for years to come and that this will not be an automatic way of meeting them. In any case, this step is necessary in order to be able to identify the expected funding needs and possible project sponsors from the programme's point of view.

b) Funding programmes should be open to consider the funding needs arising from the Macroregional Strategies in view of the possibility of their inclusion in their programmes and its implementation in the light of existing legal possibilities, technical needs and synergetic potentials.

Following this logic, the EUSALP General Assembly in its decision as of 20 November 2018 was calling for “identifying potential fields of interventions” in order to create synergies between the funding requirements out of the AGs on the one hand and the future funding programmes which are currently under preparation in the scope of the future European financial framework for the period 2021-2027 on the other hand.

With this report, the decision of the EUSALP General Assembly is implemented in concrete terms and step a) as mentioned above is implemented.
2. Purpose of this document

The initial aim of this document is to synoptically present the potential EU funding needs of the EUSALP AGs for the implementation of the corresponding work plans, which in turn are based on the EUSALP Action Plan. To this end, the main thematic focuses of the AGs are outlined. In addition, a comprehensive analysis on funding requirements for each individual programmes covering all AGs is made. This is made for showing the programme managers the overall picture on the EUSALP general interest in their programmes.

A further objective is to provide the bodies responsible for the programmes with an overall picture of the requirements from EUSALP and thus with a technical contribution to the preparation of future programmes.

The idea was to create a simple matrix „easy to use“ and synoptic analysis to make managers of future EU programmes aware of intervention fields EUSALP actors would like to address for implementing EUSALP goals.

The evaluations are expressly not to be interpreted as binding specifications for future programmes. Likewise, it wasn't part of the analysis:

- to elaborate an exhaustive list of very detailed projects planned for the future (obviously AGs cannot predict what might be hot topics in 2026) while at the same time confirming to go for the application of funds
- to replace the real programming of the EU Programmes on the ground
- to elaborate any concrete financial figures on the amount of funds requested, to regionalize funding needs or to refer to any specific legal provisions (like partnership composition, eligibility rules, co-funding rates, concentration requirements, multi fund options) for each funding instrument. This would be way far too complicated for this analysis and is then a matter of the setting up and implementing of the programmes.
- to refer to any further funding sources principally available including national or regional programmes.

In summary, this report serves rather as a guidance for EU, national and regional programme managers, the EUSALP Executive Board (EB) and the European Commission services for an integrated development of future programmes in order to facilitate the embedding of MRS specific needs in future programmes and its implementation in accordance with the decisions and legal provisions and through cooperative dialogue.
3. Methodological approach

The starting point for the analysis was the draft legislations for future EU funding programmes which have been published by the European Commission in 2018. Although these legislative documents are still subject of negotiation among European Commission, Member States and European Parliament, the general lines are more or less clear and were considered stable enough to be analyzed.

Although EU (co-) funded Operational Programmes can be formally approved on final legislation only, Programme preparation will – based on the aforementioned draft legislations – most probably start in 2019. It can be assumed, that general future programme priorities at least for programmes under shared management will be identified very soon.

The analysis addressed both centrally managed programmes and programmes under shared management and consisted of the following steps:

1) In a first step, the AlpGov lead partner pre-selected potentially suitable programs and assigned them – as far as known – to the priority areas with the following results for the individual AGs:
   - For all AGs: transnational and cross-border strands of INTERREG and mainstream ERDF programmes plus individualized for the single AGs:
     - AG 1: Horizon Europe
     - AG 2: Horizon Europe, LIFE, LEADER
     - AG 3: ESF+ mainstream, Horizon Europe (Cluster 'Inclusive and Secure Society')
     - AG 4: Horizon Europe (Cluster ‘Climate, Energy and Mobility’), CEF Transport
     - AG 5: Horizon Europe (Cluster 'Digital and Industry'), CEF Digital
     - AG 6: Horizon Europe (Cluster 'Inclusive and secure society'), LIFE, LEADER
     - AG 7: LIFE, (LEADER)
     - AG 8: Horizon Europe (Cluster 'Climate, Energy and Mobility'), LIFE
     - AG 9: Horizon Europe (Cluster ‘Climate, Energy and Mobility’), CEF Energy

2) For the individual AGs, guidance has been developed on which sections of the draft regulations published by the European Commission for the programmes are to be evaluated for further analysis in particular. It turned out, that for programmes under shared management the legal provisions are much more detailed as regards intervention fields than for centrally managed funds. Programme development and monitoring is very much based on more or less concrete intervention fields. It was therefore possible to refer very detailed to these fields when filling the tables. In
contrast to this, for programmes under central management, the available legal provisions describe broad lines of activities, types of actions or sub-programmes only but no further details. Concrete funding opportunities and requirements are to be published on the bases of (yearly) work programmes and calls which cannot be foreseen at the moment.

3) For each AG, AlpGov lead partner has – according to the current knowledge – prepared a preliminary table listing the programmes (and their logic and rationale) which are considered relevant for the topics of the AG. Furthermore the full package of the appropriate legal provisions has been provided. Of course, AG leaders were free to insert further (or even to skip) programme columns.

4) AG leaders were then requested to check the relevant chapters as mentioned in their individual guidance and to get a “feeling” on which funding topics mentioned therein could match with for their future priorities. This could be descriptions of
   - Clusters and – if possible – broad lines of activities for Horizon Europe,
   - Actions for the CEF programme or
   - Intervention fields for programmes under shared management.

5) By doing so and by considering the programme characters, AG leaders preselected the programmes which might be appropriate to fund their activities.

6) In a next step, the AG leaders – with the support of their AGs – were asked to insert the name of the cluster (should be sufficient for most cases) or – if possible – the formulations of the broad lines of activities (in case of Horizon), of actions (in case of CEF) or intervention fields (in case of programmes under shared management) one-to-one as mentioned in the legislative documents in the relevant programme column.

7) Then, AG leaders were requested to name and to insert planned future activities of their AG which match with the appropriate programmes by avoiding long descriptions of the activities but finding short slogans or headlines using few words only which make the overall content and character of the activity clear for programme managers. Schematically, the logic is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AG Activity</th>
<th>Programme (Prefilled by AlpGov LP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Overall content and character of the activity (to be formulated by AG leader) | • **Name of the Cluster** (or broad line of activities or intervention fields) for Horizon Europe  
• **Actions** for the CEF Programme  
• **Intervention field** for programmes under shared management (to be put out of the legislative documents) |

The single tables for each AG are attached to this report.

8) Finally, the AlpGov lead partner collected all single columns and prepared a synthesis of the tables which led to the results as described in the following chapters. This overall matrix is attached to this report too.
4. Results

4.1. General results

Compared to the pre-selected potentially suitable programmes as mentioned in chapter 3, there have been minor shifts in the programmes relevant from the point of view of the AGs. Finally, the following programmes are of particular interest:

- For all AGs: INTERREG and mainstream ERDF programmes plus
- AG 1: Horizon Europe
- AG 2: Horizon Europe, LIFE, COSME, Digital Europe, ESF+ mainstream
- AG 3: ESF+ mainstream, Erasmus
- AG 4: CEF
- AG 5: Horizon Europe, CEF, CAP
- AG 6: Horizon Europe, LIFE, LEADER
- AG 7: LIFE, LEADER, Horizon Europe
- AG 8: Horizon Europe, LIFE
- AG 9: Horizon Europe, CEF

The funding matrixes confirm the hypothesis that a broad range of potential EU funding instruments is in principle available and suitable for the implementation of EUSALP AG measures. The overview also succeeded in identifying a large number of possible funding interventions based on the agreed working priorities of the working groups and in assigning these to relevant funding instruments, even though undoubtedly not all potentially available instruments were covered and it was not possible to achieve the same level of detail across all AGs. However, the main instruments are likely to have been covered by this analysis.

Overall, it is striking that the focus of funding needs is clearly on programmes under shared management, also to be explained by the fact that the corresponding draft regulations allow a much more precise addressing of the programmes and that AGs are more familiar with this kind of programmes. In particular, the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) co-financed programmes play a dominant role and within this group INTERREG, while the European Social Fund (ESF) and the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) only play a minor role. Given the following considerations this result is not surprising:
• INTERREG programmes are somehow "natural entry points" for international cooperation formats such as the EUSALP because of their orientation towards cooperating across borders. Furthermore, the idea of networking is one of the core features of these programmes.

• The **ERDF** has a wide range of funding instruments at its disposal, particularly with regard to the topics dealt with in the EUSALP. They range from innovation, SME promotion, transport, digitization to risk prevention and energy, thus covering several AGs.

• The **ESF**, on the other hand, addresses issues that do not play a broad role in EUSALP. Essentially, it is addressed via the topic of education policy in AG 3, partly also by AG 2.

• In principle, only the **LEADER** programme has funding approaches for the EAFRD. However, the individual sub-programmes are very individually tailored to local needs.

Compared to the aforementioned programme group, **programmes centrally managed by the European Commission are mentioned less frequently**. Clear focal points here are **Horizon Europe**, the Connecting Europe Facility and the **LIFE programme**. The **COSME** and Digital Europe programmes and the **Erasmus** programme, on the other hand, are already falling somewhat or significantly. This can be justified as follows:

• These programmes are often special programmes with thematically limited funding priorities and are therefore only relevant to individual AGs.

• The **draft regulations** remain at the level of funding priorities and do not extend to specific intervention categories, as is the case with the EU Structural Funds. More concrete starting points will therefore only become visible in the respective calls or annual work programmes. This makes it more difficult to address the AGs at this early stage.

• While AG leaders or AG members have already gained experience with the LIFE programme in the current funding period, this is not the case with other programmes. Accordingly, programmes such as the Connecting Europe Facility or Digital Europe were sometimes difficult for the AGs to assess.

For individual AGs, the general challenge was to address the right funding areas or intervention categories. This was due on the one hand to a lack of basic knowledge of the EU funding instruments and on the other hand to the difficulty of linking one's own working priorities with concrete funding priorities. On the basis of
this, it will be even important in any case to work towards increased capacity building of the AG leaders or members with regard to "funding competence". Overall, it is noticeable that the funding needs of the working groups go far beyond pure networking aspects. This proves that macro-regional strategies go beyond the creation of pure cooperation formats. Rather, very concrete implementation activities are also addressed, e.g. SME-support, research and technological development, investments in infrastructure (research, transport and mobility, nature, digital, risk prevention, renewable energies, smart villages, technology), databases, industrial hubs, value chains, clusters, plans, analysis training, regulatory framework, services, stock market, accounting.

Since EUSALP does not have its own financing instrument and, at the same time, many strategic decisions are being taken from EUSALP, the importance of better embedding cannot be emphasized enough. According to this analysis, a sole concentration on the "classical" instrument INTERREG Alpine Space would be inappropriate.

4.2. Summary of AG points of main interest

This chapter contains AG-specific information on the planned activities. Based on the detailed descriptions of the individual tables of the AGs (for details, see there), the aim was to present them as uniformly as possible. This information can be helpful for programme Managing Authorities in identifying and formulating general or specific programme objectives and in establishing or monitoring links to EUSALP objectives and can be further operationalized within the framework of programme development.

AG1
- Linking specific value chains with smart specialization strategies
- Innovation processes in areas of smart specialization
- Capacity building of Research in the Alpine Region
- Platforms and networks to promote and share clusters, best cases and results
- Promotion of Innovation hubs
- Establishing a transnational research and innovation ecosystem and network in the Alpine Region
- Creating a macro-regional Innovation Ecosystem, starting from open innovation
AG2

- Inter-regional value chain projects promoting Bioeconomy, through the creation of inter-regional calls or joint programs for R & I
- Enhancing Cluster tool with the aim of promoting knowledge and collaboration between the Smart Specialization Strategies of EUSALP
- Modernisation of EUSALP Bioeconomic value chain (Bioeconomisation of value chains)
- Bioeconomy to boost best practices and efficient solutions to improve the management of bioresources after the environmental disaster
- Bridging different macro-area and exporting Alpine-Model
- Resilient and innovative business companies.
- Development of EUSALP Network of DIH
- Modernisation of EUSALP value chain through industry 4.0
- EUSALP artificial intelligent plan
- Analytical activities, creation and improving of networks, mutual learning, cooperation, awareness raising and dissemination activities.
- Activities relating to the integration of cross-border labour markets, local employment initiatives
- Activities aimed at sharing facilities for R&TD (e.g. DIHs)
- Transnational R&I activities aimed at enhance the competitiveness and competences of the actors involved in the projects.
- Skills and workspaces fully adapted to the new technologies
- Adoption of different enabling technologies
- Innovation ecosystem of technology infrastructures
- Tools for measurements, design of monitoring
- Digitisation in individual sectors, such as energy, transport
- Capacity building of local and regional actors for implementation of macroregional strategies
- Open innovation programmes for SMEs

AG3

- Improvement of the governance of the dual systems
- Increasing of the number of youngsters involved in transborder/ transregional mobility in the Alpine Region
- Empower the recognition of competences/titles between the Alpine Region
AG4
- Investments in new technologies for optimized combined transport
- Common pilot activities on combined transport in the Alpine Region
- Infrastructures for modal shift and decarbonisation of freight transport
- Combined Transport efficiency initiative / Freight matching initiative
- Coordination of local and regional transport planning
- Modernization of vehicle fleets
- Innovation and digitalization in public transport
- Pilot activities on autonomous vehicles and road safety
- Guidelines for macro-regional infrastructure planning
- Harmonization of infrastructure design and maintenance
- Monitoring air quality and noise
- Comprehensive planning for closing gaps and missing links
- Rail and road infrastructure projects in peripheral or remote regions across regional borders
- Pilot actions on the integration and harmonization of passenger information and ticketing systems across borders.
- Roadmap for the modal integration of innovative mobility services in the Alpine Region e.g. cable ways, carpooling and on-demand transport, car sharing

AG5
- Develop infrastructure of cross border fiber-optics backbones to fulfill the connectivity gap in the Alpine area
- Create a network of “proximity data centers” to support low-latency 5G-enabled critical services diffusion
- Develop a set of vertical pilot for low latency services enabled by 5G networks
- Promote Smart Villages approach
- Enhance digitalization in the provision of Services of general interest
- Enhance political dialogue on crossborder mobility
- Develop new models of crossborder commuting
- Promote knowledge transfer on digitalization from research to (very small) SME’s
- Digital 3D landscape model of the entire Alpine region

AG6
- Foster activities in Sustainable land use and soil protection
- Improving value chains from Alpine food products in urban areas
- Strengthening rural urban relationships
Implementation of the FAO Programme on GIAHS
Using Ecosystem Services for enhancing biodiversity and mitigation of climate change
Develop Action Plan for decreasing fragmentation in rivers
Expanding the Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe in the Alpine Region

AG7
Investments in Green Infrastructure
  a) for natural flood prevention, biodiversity and soil protection
  b) for conservation or restoration of connectivity areas (animal and plant species)
Develop integrated trans-national / cross-border river basin strategies
Develop strategic (spatial) plans and related interventions for macro-regional scale ecological connectivity priority areas
Enhance integrated governance, strategies and related investments in GI in urban areas
Create alpine digital, web-based cadaster of green or green/solar roof potentials
Improving the management, restoration and monitoring of Natura 2000 sites
Development of concepts, masterplans, integrated governance models for natural flood prevention and to improve landscape quality
Development of an “Alpine GI stock market”
Development of strategies for urban and peri-urban development which is enhancing GI networks
Improving value chains from rural products in urban areas
Strengthening rural-urban relationships
Establishment of transnational »TEN-G« coordination
Strengthen communication and capacity building on green infrastructure
Development and exchange of best practice and knowledge on planning and management of GI in rural and peri-urban areas
Development of new economic products and concepts for
  - Green Infrastructure
  - Climate adaptation and mitigation
  - Flood protection
Mapping of plant and animal species as decision support for GI network design
AG8
- Development of forest fire risk map
- Increase awareness on natural hazards management and climate change adaptation by appropriate communication measures
- Digitization in the fields of natural hazard management and climate change adaptation for decision making processes
- Sustainable management of multifunctional and protective forest
- Transfer of the “local natural hazard advisor” concept of CH to other Alpine countries
- Developing a comprehensive study on “handling the risk of extreme events”

AG9
- Raising competences in Energy data collection (Energy Observatory and Energy Survey)
- Promoting energy accounting and energy management systems at local level
- Enhancement of energy efficiency in enterprises
- Support the roll-out of renewables in the Alps
- Promote the approach of Smart Villages
- Setting-up and promoting energy communities
- Enhance refurbishment activities
- Sustainable use of resources and supply chains

4.3. Specific statements on the individual funding programmes

This chapter contains program-specific evaluations and represents the core of the analysis. For each addressed funding programme or the relevant programme category, statements are made about the relevance of the intervention categories or funding objectives as mentioned in the original draft proposals. The collected entries of all AGs are included. For each programme a brief summary of focus topics is given.

The assessment of relevance is oriented on the one hand on the absolute number of mentions of the individual intervention categories or funding objectives and on the other hand on the number of AGs addressing the intervention categories or funding objectives. The more frequently funding goals are addressed in absolute terms, the higher the need for embedding can be assumed.
Please note: For the sake of completeness, it should be noted that this evaluation is – although the assessment of relevance of funding topics was partly made on the basis of counting by AGs – predominantly qualitative but by no means statistically reliable. Background is the fact that the evaluation width, depth and quality of the different AGs are not coherent. This does not permit a purely quantitative analysis. Nevertheless, the frequency of the mentions provides a certain indication as to which funding area is addressed from the perspective of the AGs.

A further challenge lies in the fact that information on funding needs in the programme categories (e.g. mainstream ERDF) must be further regionalised, especially in the programmes under shared management. The data on the Alpine Space Programme already clearly reflect the funding requirements for joint projects of the EUSALP in relation to the whole area due to its transnational character and the largely congruent territorial backdrop with the EUSALP.

In contrast, the other programmes are more addressed in the form of "programme categories". For example, it remains to be seen how far these funding requirements will be broken down into the individual programmes and how suitable the resulting projects will be for meeting overarching EUSALP objectives. One example. The intervention categories 35-37 of the Common Provisions address adaptation to climate change measures and prevention and management of climate related risks with different focuses, which are at the same time clearly anchored as EUSALP objectives. However, the focus on floods is likely to be more relevant for the northern part of the EUSALP region, while the focus on fires is likely to be more relevant for the western southern part.

In addition, AGs did not have the necessary knowledge to examine the extent to which coordinated projects are possible across several EUSALP countries and regions. The above-mentioned intervention categories for adaptation to climate change again provide a good example of this. For example, coordinated flood protection projects along major transboundary Alpine rivers can certainly contribute to the achievement of EUSALP objectives. Since, however, the regulations have not yet been finalized at European level, the programming is therefore still fraught with uncertainties and, moreover, there are different regional-specific political focal points, the probability of realization of coordinated projects can only be assessed downstream and under no circumstances solely by the AGs. For this purpose, an exchange of programme managers is particularly necessary in the further course of the project in order to exchange the results of these studies of the AG with them.

Finally, the participants in this study are aware that concentration needs resulting from future regulations or current political priorities may result in individual
intervention categories not being taken into account. For example, the General Regulation imposes clear concentration requirements on the EU Member States. As a result, it will not be possible, for example, to map all the funding priorities mentioned in the ERDF mainstream programmes.

The programmes were evaluated thematically. Overarching governance aspects, which are to be covered in particular by the future INTERREG programmes, were not the focus. These questions must be clarified in principle at the political steering level of the EUSALP. At this point, however, the AG Leaders point out that the support of governance structures in their current form with the help of the AlpGov project, supported by the Alpine Space Programme, is not sustainable. In particular, the linking of purely administrative elements, i.e. the promotion of AGs as such, with thematic governance issues, e.g. cross-sectoral cooperation, capacity building, communication, is not effective. A model for the future could be to separate the two elements, for example in the form of a facility for the technical assistance of the AGs on the one hand, and on the other hand with projects that are thematically limited to priority topics, in which parts of or all the AG leaders cooperate in projects, as is currently the case with ARPAF.

4.3.1. INTERREG Alpine Space Programme

To meet the above mentioned topics of specific relevance, the demand to the following intervention topics is considered to be very high (counted more than 5 times or by more than two AGs):

016 Skills development for smart specialization, industrial transition and entrepreneurship
021 Technology transfer and cooperation between enterprises, research centres and higher education sector
035 Adaptation to climate change measures and prevention and management of climate related risks: floods
036 Adaptation to climate change measures and prevention and management of climate related risks: fires
037 Adaptation to climate change measures and prevention and management of climate related risks
050 Nature and biodiversity protection, green infrastructure

The demand to the following intervention topics is considered to be high (counted between two and five times):
008 Research and innovation activities in small and medium-sized enterprises, including networking
019 Innovation cluster support and business networks primarily benefiting SMEs
022 Research and Innovation processes, technology transfer and cooperation between enterprises focusing on the low carbon economy, resilience and adaptation to climate change
033 Smart Energy Distribution Systems at medium and low voltage levels (including smart grids and ICT systems) and related storage
040 Water management and water resource conservation (including river basin management, specific climate change adaptation measures)
048 Air quality and noise reduction measures
049 Protection, restoration and sustainable use of Natura 2000 sites
055 ICT: Other types of ICT infrastructure (including large-scale computer resources/equipment, data centers, sensors and other wireless equipment)
079 Multimodal transport (not urban)
088 Infrastructure for vocational education and training and adult learning
099 Specific support for youth employment and socio-economic integration of young people
129 Protection, development and promotion of cultural heritage and cultural services
130 Protection, development and promotion of natural heritage and eco-tourism

Further demand has been given to the following intervention topics (counted one time):

002 Investment in fixed assets in small and medium-sized enterprises (including private research centres) directly linked to research and innovation activities
007: Research and innovation activities in micro enterprises including networking (industrial research, experimental development, feasibility studies)
009 Research and innovation activities in public research centres, higher education and centres of competence including networking (industrial research, experimental development, feasibility studies)
010 Digitizing SMEs (including e-Commerce, e-Business and networked business processes, digital innovation hubs, living labs, web entrepreneurs and ICT start-ups, B2B)
024 Energy efficiency and demonstration projects in SMEs and supporting measures
025 Energy efficiency renovation of existing housing stock, demonstration projects and supporting measures
Energy efficiency renovation of public infrastructure, demonstration projects and supporting measures

Support to enterprises that provide services contributing to the low carbon economy and to resilience to climate change

Renewable energy: wind

Renewable energy: solar

Renewable energy: biomass

Other renewable energy (including geothermal energy)

High efficiency co-generation, district heating and cooling

Household waste management: mechanical biological treatment, thermal treatment

Support to environmentally-friendly production processes and resource efficiency in SMEs

Alternative fuels infrastructure

Support for labour market matching and transitions

Support for labour mobility

Support for the development of digital skills

Protection, development and promotion of public tourism assets and related tourism services

In brief: all Policy Objectives (PO) as mentioned in the common provisions are addressed with a focus on POs 1 and 2.

4.3.2. INTERREG Cross border programmes

To meet the above mentioned topics of specific relevance, the demand to the following intervention topics is considered to be very high (counted more than 5 times or by more than two AGs):

Adaptation to climate change measures and prevention and management of climate related risks: floods

Adaptation to climate change measures and prevention and management of climate related risks: others, e.g. storms and drought

Adaptation to climate change measures and prevention and management of climate related risks: fires

Nature and biodiversity protection, green infrastructure
The demand to the following intervention topics is considered to be high (counted between two and five times):

008 Research and innovation activities in small and medium-sized enterprises, including networking
016 Skills development for smart specialisation, industrial transition and entrepreneurship
019 Innovation cluster support and business networks primarily benefiting SMEs (3x)
018 Incubation, support to spin offs and spin outs and start ups
021 Technology transfer and cooperation between enterprises, research centres and higher education sector
022 Research and Innovation processes, technology transfer and cooperation between enterprises focusing on the low carbon economy, resilience and adaptation to climate change
024 Energy efficiency, renovation of existing housing stock, demonstration projects and supporting measures
033 Smart Energy Distribution Systems at medium and low voltage levels (including smart grids and ICT systems) and related storage
040 Water management and water resource conservation (including river basin management, specific climate change adaptation measures, reuse, leakage reduction)
047 Support to environmentally-friendly production processes and resource efficiency in SMEs
055 ICT: Other types of ICT infrastructure (including large-scale computer resources/equipment, data centres, sensors and other wireless equipment)
079 Multimodal transport (not urban)
081 Other seaports
083 Inland waterways and ports (regional and local)
128 Protection, development and promotion of public tourism assets and related tourism services

The following indications refer to wider POs. They have been included for completeness only.

PO1 A smarter Europe by promoting innovative and smart economic transformation;
PO4 A more social Europe implementing the European Pillar of Social Rights
SO (i) enhancing the effectiveness of labour markets and access to quality employment through developing social innovation and infrastructure;

Further demand has been given to the following intervention topics (counted one time):

002 Investment in fixed assets in small and medium-sized enterprises (including private research centres) directly linked to research and innovation activities
007 Research and innovation activities in micro enterprises including networking (industrial research, experimental development, feasibility studies)
010 Digitizing SMEs (including e-Commerce, e-Business and networked business processes, digital innovation hubs, living labs, web entrepreneurs and ICT start-ups, B2B)
020 Innovation processes in SMEs (process, organisational, marketing, co-creation, user and demand driven innovation)
025 Energy efficiency renovation of existing housing stock, demonstration projects and supporting measures
026 Energy efficiency renovation of public infrastructure, demonstration projects and supporting measures"
027 Support to enterprises that provide services contributing to the low carbon economy and to resilience to climate change
028 Renewable energy: wind
046 Rehabilitation of industrial sites and contaminated land
048 Air quality and noise reduction measures
049 Protection, restoration and sustainable use of Natura 2000 sites
075 Cycling infrastructure
077 Alternative fuels infrastructure
130 Protection, development and promotion of natural heritage and eco-tourism"

In brief: all Policy Objectives (PO) as mentioned in the common provisions are addressed with a focus on POs 1 and 2.

4.3.3. ERDF Mainstream Programmes

To meet the above mentioned topics of specific relevance, the demand to the following intervention topics is considered to be very high (counted more than 5 times or by more than two AGs):
Skills development for smart specialisation, industrial transition and entrepreneurship

Technology transfer and cooperation between enterprises, research centres and higher education sector

Adaptation to climate change measures and prevention and management of climate related risks: floods

Adaptation to climate change measures and prevention and management of climate related risks: fires

Adaptation to climate change measures and prevention and management of climate related risks

Nature and biodiversity protection, green infrastructure

Protection, development and promotion of natural heritage and eco-tourism

The demand to the following intervention topics is considered to be high (counted between two and five times):

Innovation cluster support and business networks primarily benefiting SMEs (3x)

Technology transfer and cooperation between enterprises, research centres and higher education sector

Research and Innovation processes, technology transfer and cooperation between enterprises focusing on the low carbon economy, resilience and adaptation to climate change

Energy efficiency, renovation of existing housing stock, demonstration projects and supporting measures

Smart Energy Distribution Systems at medium and low voltage levels (including smart grids and ICT systems) and related storage

Water management and water resource conservation (including river basin management, specific climate change adaptation measures, reuse, leakage reduction)

Support to environmentally-friendly production processes and resource efficiency in SMEs

ICT: Other types of ICT infrastructure (including large-scale computer resources/equipment, data centres, sensors and other wireless equipment)

Multimodal transport (not urban)

Other seaports

Inland waterways and ports (regional and local)
Protection, development and promotion of public tourism assets and related tourism services

The following indications refer to wider Political Objectives. They have been included for completeness only.

PO1 A smarter Europe by promoting innovative and smart economic transformation;

PO4 A more social Europe implementing the European Pillar of Social Rights
   SO (i) enhancing the effectiveness of labour markets and access to quality employment through developing social innovation and infrastructure;
   SO (ii) improving access to inclusive and quality services in education, training and lifelong learning through developing infrastructure

Further demand has been given to the following intervention topics (counted one time):

007 Research and innovation activities in micro enterprises including networking (industrial research, experimental development, feasibility studies)
009 Research and innovation activities in public research centres, higher education and centres of competence including networking (industrial research, experimental development, feasibility studies)
012 IT services and applications for digital skills and digital inclusion
018 Incubation, support to spin offs and spin outs and start ups
020 Innovation processes in SMEs (process, organisational, marketing, co-creation, user and demand driven innovation)
022 Research and Innovation processes, technology transfer and cooperation between enterprises focusing on the low carbon economy, resilience and adaptation to climate change"
024 Energy efficiency, renovation of existing housing stock, demonstration projects and supporting measures
038 Risk prevention and management of non-climate related natural risks (i.e. earthquakes) and risks linked to human activities (e.g. technological accidents), including awareness raising, civil protection and disaster management systems and infrastructures
040 Water management and water resource conservation (including river basin management, specific climate change adaptation measures, reuse, leakage reduction)"

046 Rehabilitation of industrial sites and contaminated land

047 Support to environmentally friendly production processes and resource efficiency in SMEs

051 ICT: Very High-Capacity broadband network (backbone/backhaul network)

053 ICT: Very High-Capacity broadband network (access/local loop with a performance equivalent to an optical fibre installation up to the distribution point at the serving location for homes and business premises)

059 Newly built other national, regional and local access road

062 Other reconstructed or improved roads (motorway, national, regional or local)

066 Other newly built railways

069 Other reconstructed or improved railways

073 Clean urban transport infrastructure

076 Digitalisation of urban transport

077 Alternative fuels infrastructure

092 Health infrastructure

094 Health mobile assets

097 Measures to improve access to employment

103 Support for labour market matching and transitions

104 Support for labour mobility

106 Measures promoting work-life balance, including access to childcare and care for dependent persons

109 Support for adaptation of workers, enterprises and entrepreneurs to change

111 Support for early childhood education and care (excluding infrastructure)

112 Support for primary to secondary education (excluding infrastructure)

131 Physical regeneration and security of public"

The following indications do not refer to the intervention categories but to output, results and performance indicators respectively wider Political Objectives. They have been included for completeness only.

CCO 12 Surface area of green infrastructure in urban areas

CCR 11 Population benefiting from measures for air quality

RCO 76 Collaborative projects
RCO 77 Capacity of cultural and tourism infrastructure supported
RCR 35 Population benefiting from flood protection measures
RCR 37 Population benefiting from protection measures against climate related natural disasters (other than floods and forest fires)
RCR 51 Population benefiting from measures for noise reduction
RCR 52 Rehabilitated land used for green areas, social housing, economic or community activities
RCR 76 Stakeholders involved in the preparation and implementation of strategies of urban development
RCR 95 Population having access to new or upgraded green infrastructure in urban areas

PO1 A smarter Europe by promoting innovative and smart economic transformation
   SO (i) Enhancing research and innovation capacities and the uptake of advanced technologies
   SO (ii) Reaping the benefits of digitisation for citizens, companies and governments
   SO (iii) Enhancing growth and competitiveness of SMEs
   SO (iv) Developing skills for smart specialization, industrial transition and entrepreneurship

PO2 A greener, low-carbon Europe by promoting clean and fair energy transition, green and blue investment, the circular economy, climate adaptation and risk prevention and management
   SO (i) Promoting energy efficiency measures
   SO (ii) Promoting renewable energy
   SO (iii) Developing smart energy systems, grids and storage at local level
   SO (vi) Promoting the transition to a circular economy

PO5 A Europe closer to citizens by fostering the sustainable and integrated development of urban, rural and coastal areas and local initiatives,
   SO (i) Fostering the integrated social, economic and environmental development, cultural heritage and security in urban areas

In brief: all Policy Objectives (PO) as mentioned in the common provisions are addressed. There is some focus on POs 1 and 2, but more often than in the INTERREG-programmes also other policy objectives are addressed.
4.3.4. ESF mainstream Programmes

The following intervention fields were considered as highly relevant by AG 2:

005 Investment in intangible assets in small and medium-sized enterprises (including private research centres) directly linked to research and innovation activities
006 Investment in intangible assets in public research centres and higher education directly linked to research and innovation activities

This programme is generally of particular relevance for AG 3.

4.3.5. LEADER Programme

To meet the above mentioned topics of specific relevance, the demand to the Rural development initiative is considered to be particularly high for AG 6 and AG 7.

4.3.6. Horizon Europe Programme

Based on the structure of Article 3 on the COM(2018) 436 final, the following importance was indicated to the single Pillars and Clusters: 1 count: Single Relevance, 2-5 counts: High Relevance, more than 5 counts: Very High Relevance

(1) Pillar I 'Open Science' with the following components:
(a) the European Research Council (ERC), as described in Annex I, Pillar I, section 1; (0x) NO RELEVANCE
(b) Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions (MSCA), as described in Annex I, Pillar I, section 2; (1x) SINGLE RELEVANCE
(c) research infrastructures, as described in Annex I, Pillar I, section 3; (3x) HIGH RELEVANCE

(2) Pillar II 'Global Challenges and Industrial Competitiveness' with the following components:
(a) cluster 'Health', as described in Annex I, Pillar II, section 1; (1x) SINGLE RELEVANCE
(b) cluster 'Inclusive and Secure Society', as described in Annex I, Pillar II, section 2; (1x) SINGLE RELEVANCE
(c) cluster 'Digital and Industry', as described in Annex I, Pillar II, section 3; (12x) VERY HIGH RELEVANCE
(d) cluster 'Climate, Energy and Mobility', as described in Annex I, Pillar II, section 4; (11x) VERY HIGH RELEVANCE
(e) cluster Food and Natural Resources', as described in Annex I, Pillar II, section 5; (5x) HIGH RELEVANCE
(f) non-nuclear direct actions of the Joint Research Centre (JRC), as described in Annex I, Pillar II, section 6; (0x) NO RELEVANCE

(3) Pillar III 'Open Innovation' with the following components:
(a) the European Innovation Council (EIC), as described in Annex I, Pillar III, section 1; (1x) SINGLE RELEVANCE
(b) European innovation ecosystems, as described in Annex I, Pillar III, section 2; (2x) HIGH RELEVANCE
(c) the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT), as described in Annex I, Pillar III, section 3. (1x) SINGLE RELEVANCE

(4) Part 'Strengthening the European Research Area' with the following components:
(a) sharing excellence, as described in Annex I, Part 'Strengthening the European Research Area', section 1; NO RELEVANCE
(b) reforming and enhancing the European R&I system, as described in Annex I, Part 'Strengthening the European Research Area', section 2. NO RELEVANCE

In brief: there is quite a number of broad lines of activities which shall be addressed with a focus on research infrastructures, a wide range of clusters and innovation.

4.3.7. LIFE Programme

The following sub-programmes are considered to be of very high relevance (more than five counts):

- Sub-programme Nature and Biodiversity (17x)
- Sub-programme Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation (16x)

The following sub-programmes are considered to be of high relevance (1-5 counts):

- Sub-programme Clean Energy Transition" (6x)
- Sub programme Environment and resource efficiency (2x)
- Sub-programme Circular Economy and Quality of Life (2x)
In brief: there is a clear focus on the sub-programmes Nature and Biodiversity and Climate change.

4.3.8. CEF Programme

To meet the above mentioned topics of specific relevance for AG4 and AG9, the demand to the following actions is considered to be particularly high (3-9 counts):

2 (a) (iii) actions implementing sections of the comprehensive network located in outermost regions (3x)
2 (b) (iii) actions supporting freight transport services (4x)
2 (b) (iv) actions supporting new technologies and innovation, including automation, enhanced transport services, modal integration and alternative fuels infrastructure (9x)

Further demand has been given to the following actions (single counts)

2 (a) (ii) actions implementing cross-border links of the comprehensive network
2 (b) (vi) actions implementing safe and secure infrastructure and mobility, including road safety,
2 (b) (vii) actions improving transport infrastructure resilience to climate change and natural disasters
2 (b) (ix) actions improving transport infrastructure accessibility and availability for security and civil protection purposes

4 (b) actions supporting cross-border projects in the field of renewable energy, including their conception"
4 (f) actions implementing digital connectivity infrastructure requirements related to cross-border projects in the areas of transport or energy and/or supporting operational digital platforms directly associated to transport or energy infrastructures.

4.3.9. DIGITAL Europe Programme

To meet the above mentioned topics of specific relevance for AGs 2 and 5, the demand to the following topics are considered to be particularly high:
• Ensuring the wide use of digital technologies across the economy and society;
• Artificial Intelligence
• Digitalization of Bioeconomy to boost best practices and efficient solutions to improve the management of bio resources after the environmental disaster
• Bridging different macro-area and exporting Alpine-Model
• Resilient and innovative business companies.

Please note: the topics do not refer to specific objectives of the programme but should be seen as horizontal topics which can be addressed under different specific objectives.

4.3.10. Single Market Programme (successor of “COSME”)

To meet the above mentioned topics of specific relevance for AG 2, the demand to the following intervention topics is considered to be particularly high:

• Climate Mitigation
• Improve farmer position in the value chain
• Enhance market orientation
• Promote employment, social inclusion, Bioeconomy and sustainable forestry.

Please note: the topics do not refer to specific objectives of the programme but should be seen as horizontal topics which can be addressed under different specific objectives.

4.3.11. Erasmus+ Programme

The following intervention fields were considered as highly relevant by AG 3:

(a) learning mobility (‘key action 1’);
(b) cooperation among organisations and institutions (‘key action 2’); and
(c) support to policy development and cooperation (‘key action 3’)
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5. The way ahead

This synopsis creates an essential precondition for better embedding of macro-regional strategies into EU instruments at a time when programme preparation for the period 2021-2027 is in an early phase. For the first time, the EUSALP AGs have formulated concrete funding needs on the basis of their own priorities. In order for this synopsis to become effective, several steps might be considered:

- Political appreciation of this basis, for example by endorsing a corresponding passage in the Joint Declaration to be adopted at the end of the Italian EUSALP Presidency.
- Use of this material in the preparation of the programmes. For this purpose, the document should be made available to the centrally managed programmes and programmes under shared management. However, the overriding requirements of the individual programmes and also the limits of the programmes must be taken into account here. For example, the ERDF mainstream programmes respond first and foremost to regional or national challenges and are subject to concentration requirements (e.g. from draft regulations or investment guidelines, where a certain focus on specific policy objectives is required), so international approaches can only be addressed to a limited extent.
- In the further course, it is particularly important to identify the opportunities and the mutual benefits. For programmes under shared management (ERDF, ESF and EAFRD) for example, the creation of international networks could be helpful in order to identify joint contributions to the implementation of the macroregional strategies and to organize joint or harmonized calls.
- Accompanying introduction of the members of the EB to the competent European and national bodies for EU funding. DG REGIO should inform the corresponding line DGs accordingly, the national coordinators of the states and regions should approach their programme managers in order to start a cooperative process of exchange between AGs and funding managers on European, national and regional level. If necessary, this could also take place within the framework of events, based on the EUSALP presidencies.
- Wherever possible, AG leaders should get in direct contact with programme managers to demonstrate their funding needs.