

**Minutes of the
2nd Programming Committee Meeting
of the future
INTERREG PROGRAMME between
ROMANIA and HUNGARY for the period
2021-2027**

Date: 14th June, 2021

- online meeting -



Partnership for a better future

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

NAME	INSTITUTION
Diana GHEORGHE	Managing Authority (2014-2020) – Ministry of Development, Public Works and Administration (MDPWA), Romania
Nikoletta HORVÁTH	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Hungary
Anna-Monika MODZELEWSKA	European Commission (EC) - DG Regional and Urban Policy
Florin Gheorghe POP	Managing Authority (2014-2020) – Ministry of Development, Public Works and Administration (MDPWA), Romania
Ioana MAIORESCU	
Alina HUZUI-STOICULESCU	Ministry of Development, Public Works and Administration (MDPWA), Romania
Vlad POPESCU	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Embassy of Romania in Budapest), Romania
Roxana MIHAI	Ministry of Internal Affairs, Romania
Daniel BOICU	
Andrei LUCACI	Timiș County Council
Gabriela CHIRICHEU	Arad County Council
Mircea MĂLAN	Bihar County Council
István Tamás JANKÓ-SZÉP	Satu Mare County Council
Iulia GUGIU	Ministry of European Investments and Projects, Romania
Raluca DROB	Regional Development Agency – North-West Region, Romania
Bianca BOSOANĂ	
Paul PANTIȘ	
Marius Valentin NICULAE	Regional Development Agency – West Region, Romania

Mihai Sorin PASCU	Association for the Promotion of Natural and Cultural Heritage of Banat and Crisana „Excelsior”
Dóra DÉKÁNY	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Hungary
Tamás MOLNÁR	
András STEFANIK	
Krisztina HIROS	Prime Minister's Office, Hungary
Dániel VARGHA	
Béla HEGYESI	Ministry of Finance, Hungary
Richárd GÖNCZI	Széchenyi Programme Office Consulting Nonprofit Limited Liability Company, Hungary
Tímea KÓSA	Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg County Council
Zsuzsa MIHALIK	Hajdú-Bihar County Council
Mihály ZALAI	Békés County Council
Anikó NAGY-SZÖLLŐSI	
Eszter Anna CSÓKÁSI	Csongrád-Csanád County Council
Zoltán NÓGRÁDI	
Viktor OROSZI	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Hungary - Department for Water Diplomacy and the Danube Region Strategy
László KÖRMÖCZI	CSEMETE Nature and Environment Protection Association
Livia BANU	BRECO
Monica TEREAN	Joint Secretariat (JS)
Cristina VESA	
Monica SAV	
Carmen CHIRILĂ	

Daliana VIGU	
Marius OLARIU	
Sebastian STURZ	
Nóra SEBESI	Info Point (IP) - Szeged
Mónika SEMJÉNINÉ HUSZTI	Info Point (IP) - Debrecen
Gloria ZAGAGLIONI	External experts
Linda JUHÁSZ-HORVÁTH	
Serena ADLER	
Dr. Pietro ELISEI	
Marius ȘTEFĂNICĂ	

A G E N D A

– 2nd Meeting of the PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE –

Decision on selection and justification of Policy Objectives/Specific Objectives/Interreg Specific Objectives to be financed under the future Interreg Programme between Romania and Hungary, for the period 2021-2027

June 14, 2021

Online meeting (10:30 – 13:15 EET)

10⁰⁰-10³⁰	Joining Zoom platform
10³⁰- 10⁴⁵	Opening and welcome speech
10 ⁴⁵ -11 ¹⁵	Presentation of the reviews following the outcomes of the PC preparatory meeting. Recap of the documents to be approved: <ul style="list-style-type: none">– Programme Intervention Logics and TIA Paper as supporting documents;– Interreg Programme sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3;
11 ¹⁵ -12 ¹⁵	Open discussion over the selection of Policy Objectives/Interreg Specific Objectives
12¹⁵-12³⁰	Coffee Break
12 ³⁰ -12 ⁴⁵	Decision on POs/SOs/ISO, as detailed in the Draft Programme
12 ⁴⁵ -13 ⁰⁰	Next programming activities according to calendar
13⁰⁰-13¹⁵	Conclusions and closure of the meeting

Observation:

No other topics were added to the Agenda.

Welcome speech, introduction of the Programming Committee (PC) members and presentation of the Agenda

Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE, on behalf of the Interreg V-A ROHU Programme Managing Authority, as Chairperson, opened the 2nd meeting of the Programming Committee for the future Interreg Programme between Romania and Hungary for the period 2021-2027 by greeting and thanking all participants for attending the online meeting. She further asked **Mrs. Monica TEREAN**, the Head of Joint Secretariat (JS), to verify the quorum.

Mrs. Monica TEREAN took the floor and invited the participants to introduce themselves. As all the PC voting members were present, the quorum was met, in accordance with the PC Rules of Procedure. The meeting was attended also by part of the observers and by some advisers as well.

Mrs. Nikoletta HORVÁTH, welcomed everyone on behalf of the Hungarian delegation and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

Mrs. Livia BANU, Executive Director of BRECO, also greeted the participants on behalf of ROHU JS hosting institution, expressing her confidence in a well-designed future Programme.

Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE proposed the Agenda to be approved and presented the topics of the 2nd Programming Committee Meeting, namely a presentation delivered by the programming expert on the documents revised following the preparatory meeting on 8th of June, the approval of submitted documents: *Programme Strategy and Intervention Logics*, *Territorial Impact Assessment (TIA) Paper* (as supporting documents and deliverables under programming services contract) and the filled-in sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 of the *Interreg Programme Template*. She recalled the participants that at the preparatory meeting some objections on approving the *Interreg Programme Template* by sections, and recommended to approve it also, according to the proposed agenda. The **Chair** asked participants for observations and, as none of them intervened in order to modify the Agenda, it was noted as approved by the PC members in its original form, i.e. the decision on the proposed POs to be based on the draft Programme (relevant sections). **Mrs. GHEORGHE** considered such approach more appropriate, as the draft Programme was a simplified version of the other 2 deliverable documents under discussion, and a summary of the Territorial Analysis as well.

As no objections and/or proposals regarding the topics on the Agenda were formulated, the Agenda was considered approved by consensus.

Presentation of the reviews following the outcomes of the PC preparatory meeting

Upon **Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE** invitation, the external programming expert, **Mrs. Gloria ZAGAGLIONI**, summarised the outcomes of the PC preparatory meeting on June 8th, underlying the main modifications brought to the *Programme Strategy and Intervention Logics* and shortly presented the Future Programme's vision, overall objective and specific objectives, as well as the expected changes to be achieved in the border region as a result of Programme implementation. She emphasized that, following several rounds of consultations and based on the analysis performed so far, the proposed PO2 - *a greener Europe*, PO4 - *a more social Europe* and ISO1 - *a better cooperation governance* prove to be the main priorities in the area.

The participants unanimously **agreed** that the best approach for achieving immediate results on common challenges, whilst valorising common opportunities, was **to concentrate the resources, with the focus on PO2, PO4 and ISO1 to be further discussed during the meeting.**

Mr. István JANKÓ-SZÉP intervened for a clarification regarding the wordings in the Programme's vision and main objective, especially in what concerned references to joint strategic thinking and joint actions, and **Mrs. Gloria ZAGAGLIONI** replied that the core of the future Programme should be the cooperation, focused on soft cooperation actions translated into Interreg indicators, as recommended by the new Regulations as well. In her opinion, the ERDF type indicators that better help to quantify tangible assets, could be discussed and agreed upon at a later stage, as such indicators were meant to bring added value to the Programme's core principle.

Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE also considered that the indicators-related aspects were to be discussed at a later stage. She proposed the participants to analyse each document previously submitted and invited them to express their opinions.

Considering the TIA Paper was only a supporting document intended to substantiate the intervention logics and the selection of POs, and since no observations were raised in relation to it, based on the proposal of **Mrs. Nikoletta HORVÁTH**, the Chair acknowledged the contents of the TIA Paper and suggested to continue the meeting, as per Agenda, with discussions on the revised version of the *Programme Strategy and Intervention Logics*. It was mentioned that changes related to the wording, or other formal improvements of the content could be made, if necessary, at a later stage when approving a complete Programme document (as confirmed also by the COM).

Further on, the programming expert was invited by the Chair to present the main changes brought to the initial version of the *Programme Strategy and Intervention Logics*, concerning merely the structure of the document and added or deleted information (transferred into *Annex 2* to the document).

Mrs. Gloria ZAGAGLIONI explained that information moved to *Annex 2* was very important for launching the SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessment) procedure. She also mentioned the Technical Assistance Team's intention to launch a survey among potential beneficiaries in the upcoming weeks, aiming at defining the Performance framework of the future Programme.

As one of the information deleted from the initial version of the *Programme Strategy and Intervention Logics* was related to the types of potential beneficiaries, upon **Mrs. Zsuzsa MIHALIK's** proposal, the JS drafted, during the meeting, *Annex 3* to the above-mentioned document, in order to include the indicative categories of potential beneficiaries, based on those already mentioned in the current 2014-2020 ROHU Programme. The indicative categories could be further detailed when designing the future Calls for Proposals.

On behalf of the Ministry of Interior of Romania, **Mrs. Roxana MIHAI** had an intervention regarding the proposed indicators, stating that the ERDF ones should be also selected, in order to reflect the infrastructure component of the projects. **Mrs. Gloria ZAGAGLIONI** explained that, based on the results of the survey to be conducted, the list of indicators, including the ERDF ones, would be defined, depending also on the information collected from potential beneficiaries, i.e.: in order to be selected, an indicator should attain a "critical mass", justifying thus its selection.

Mrs. Monica TEREAN intervened and assured the participants that the menu of the indicators proposed by the experts would include also the ERDF ones, but the most relevant indicators for the future Programme were to be determined based on the intentions expressed by the potential beneficiaries as well.

Mrs. Eszter Anna CSÓKÁSI raised questions about the methodology for selecting the indicators, the categories of stakeholders to be involved in the survey mentioned by Mrs. ZAGAGLIONI, as well as about the Programme's approach in relation to strategic projects. Those aspects were also addressed by **Mr. Zoltán NÓGRÁDI**, who wanted to know the estimated time for launching the survey and some supplementary information about strategic projects preparation.

Considering that the object of the meeting envisaged the selection of the POs and related specific objectives, **Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE** proposed to tackle the above-mentioned aspects in future dedicated meetings and gave the floor to **Mrs. Gloria ZAGAGLIONI** who specified that the contact database developed by ROHU Programme structures, based on previous and current Programmes beneficiaries, and including also other potential applicants, would be used for the survey, in order to reach as many potential beneficiaries as possible. In what concerned the methodology for selecting the indicators, in her opinion, it should be based on the overall intentions expressed by the respondents. She also mentioned that a methodology for strategic projects was under development and would be soon agreed between the MSs, and afterwards consulted with the PC members as well, in view of approval. Preparatory meetings are envisaged, in order to offer the most comprehensive explanations and details on the documents, i.e. *Performance framework* and *Strategic projects Concept and Methodology*.

Mr. István JANKÓ-SZÉP expressed his disagreement on the approach proposed for selecting the indicators, mentioning that the indicators should be decided by the programming structures and not based on the possible project ideas. To this remark, **Mrs. ZAGAGLIONI** replied that the programming experts already preselected several indicators in the *Programme strategy and Intervention logics*, but the most relevant ones for the Programme, to be used also for defining a feasible Performance framework, should be selected based on the "critical mass" principle. She further explained that the top-down approach could not be enough for establishing such indicators, because during the Programme implementation, relevant data on indicators achievement were to be collected from the projects. The information gathered following the survey should be taken into account when establishing the baseline and target values within the Performance framework.

Mrs. Nikoletta HORVÁTH intervened and supported **Mr. JANKÓ-SZÉP**'s point of view in what concerned the selection of indicators and setting-up the Performance framework. In her opinion, the strategic vision of the programme should follow a logical programming process (namely intervention logic approach: from a same concept for a whole programme, followed by and justified by selection of simplest indicators, which helps the European Union to show aggregated data, as much as possible). The structures involved in the programming should first define the Programme's strategic vision and establish the Performance framework, and later should design the Call for Proposals in such a way so that the selected projects would contribute to its achievement. **Mrs. HORVÁTH** considered that shaping the Performance framework, and even the future allocations based on the collected projects ideas and the "critical mass" principle might not be a good approach. She also mentioned that by selecting Interreg indicators, the future Programme, along with other Interreg Programmes, could contribute to the EU goals and be easier aggregated at EU level. **Mrs. HORVÁTH** underlined

that the above-mentioned aspects could be however further fine-tuned during the programming process.

Mrs. Gloria ZAGAGLIONI acknowledged the programme vision and intervention logic as PC attributes, but explained that, in order to select the most suitable indicators for the Programme, project level information was however needed. She considered such information very useful for setting-up the base line and target values of the Interreg-type indicators, too. The topic should anyhow be open to discussions, neither of the 2 approaches (i.e. the top-down and the bottom-up), being considered as incorrect.

Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE took the floor in order to state her opinion, namely that the method proposed for establishing the Performance framework should be a mixture between a top-down (only some indicators have been already preselected and proposed by the programming expert) and a bottom-up (based on potential beneficiaries' feedback) and only a limited number and the most relevant indicators among those preselected will be chosen) approach.

Mrs. Nikoletta HORVÁTH considered that the selection of a certain ERDF/Interreg specific indicator was rather an administrative task, namely a tool to measure whether the outlined strategy and vision will be implemented or not at the end.

As the topic is not the purpose of the PC meeting, it remained to be further discussed in the future programming meetings

In relation to the potential beneficiaries' issue, **Mrs. HORVÁTH** underlined that, even if the template of the Interreg Programme did not request such information, it should be included in an annex to the discussed document, in line with the recommendations made by the Hungarian delegation.

Mrs. Monica TEREAN informed the participants that based on the request of the PC members during the meeting, the JS started to prepare the draft lists with such information as Annex to the *Programme Strategy and Intervention logics*.

Mrs. Tímea KÓSA took the floor, supporting Hajdú-Bihar County Council's idea regarding the indicative list of potential beneficiaries and expressed, on behalf of Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg County Council, the interest in strategic project ideas and the related methodology. She also raised the allocation of funds aspect, as important issue to be discussed in future meetings.

Mrs. Zsuzsa MIHALIK intervened and also underlined the importance of the allocation aspect, stating that the specific allocation of funds for strategic projects in the current ROHU Programme was a good approach, that could be implemented in the future Programme as well.

Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE reiterated that discussions on the future allocations should be tackled at future PC meetings. Afterwards, she asked the JS to present the list of indicative categories of potential beneficiaries, prepared as *Annex 3* to the *Programme Strategy and Intervention logics*.

Mr. Marius OLARIU presented *Annex 3*, drafted based on the categories of potential beneficiaries agreed for the 2014-2020 period and currently listed in the Interreg V-A ROHU Programme, and structured on 4 parts: a general one and 3 specific parts related to each selected PO/ISO1. He also explained that a correlation between the POs/ISO1 and the Investment priorities of the current ROHU Programme had been made.

Following the presentation of the content of the annex, clarifications on categories of potential beneficiaries and discussions, **Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE** proposed the Programming

Committee to approve *Annex 3* as part of the Programme Strategy and Intervention Logics package.

Mrs. Nikoletta HORVÁTH took the floor by referring to the strategic project idea mentioned by the Romanian Ministry of Internal Affairs, in partnership with Hungarian corresponding Ministry, asking for the rationale and possibility to submit such project under ISO1 (assumably with more infra element). Furthermore, in terms of future strategic projects, she articulated the Hungarian standpoint towards the experts and asked to put a proposal on the table in a way where county pairs' ideas (original Hungarian opening standpoint) could be managed.

In addition, in terms of split on allocation which is also a strategic question she stated that the Hungarian delegation has a firm position to have the greater allocation on culture (PO4), followed by ISO1 and PO2.

Mrs. Gloria ZAGAGLIONI explained that, due to the specificity of the strategic project idea in discussion, it should be implemented under ISO1, as that one addresses all topics not already covered under PO2 and PO4. The investments in infrastructure under ISO1, even if not recommended by the COM, are still possible, if properly justified and significantly contributing to the attainment of Programme's objectives. However, further discussions are needed and the possibility to submit the project under a different PO is still open, the expert underlined. As regards the allocation, **Mrs. ZAGAGLIONI** mentioned that the expert team already envisaged a specific methodology, to be presented and discussed at future meetings.

Mr. Andrei LUCACI, on behalf of Timiș County Council, intervened and raised questions regarding the opportunities of PO3 and PO1.

Invited by **Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE**, the **programming expert** summed-up the rationale behind the proposed scenarios resulting from the consultations carried out and the conclusions drawn from the Territorial Analysis. **Mrs. ZAGAGLIONI** also provided valid arguments on not selecting PO3 and PO1 (e.g. not enough allocation in order to support investments in road/railway infrastructure).

Mrs. Anna-Monika MODZELEWSKA, the European Commission representative, intervened and asked to take the floor. **Mrs. MODZELEWSKA** pointed out that Interreg Programmes are not intended to deliver merely physical infrastructures due to several reasons such as: limited amounts of allocation, the long period of time needed for implementing a big infrastructure project as compared to the short period of Interreg Programmes implementation (7 years), considerable administrative burden, etc. Although not against implementing hard infrastructure projects under Interreg, the EC is currently more focused on the "embedded cooperation" concept, recommending thus to support such type of interventions under the national regional programmes, rather than under Interreg ones.

Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE thanked the COM representative for the intervention and gave the floor to **Mrs. Eszter Anna CSÓKÁSI**, who shared Timiș County Council's position in relation to PO3. Although **Mrs. CSÓKÁSI** accepted that PO3 could not be included as a priority of the future Programme, still the possibility to design and develop railway related projects under the ISO1, respectively bicycle paths under the PO2 should be considered. She also encouraged the PC members to make proposals regarding the future allocations on POs and related specific objectives, in the future meetings.

Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE reminded that the PC members agreed on the concentration of funds and on the Interreg mandatory selection of PO2, PO4 and the agreement of selection of ISO1. The *Programme Strategy and Intervention Logics* is thus submitted the PC members' approval,

including the new *Annex 3*. As no objections were raised by the participants, **the document was considered approved by unanimity**.

Further on, **the Chair** pointed out that the allocation would be the subject of future discussions and consultations.

PO2 – a greener Europe, PO4 – a more social Europe and ISO1 – a better cooperation governance, as well as the *related specific objectives*:

- under **PO2**: *climate change adaptation and disaster risk prevention (2.1), renewable energy (2.2) and protection and preservation of nature, biodiversity and green infrastructure (2.3)*;
- under **PO4**: *health care infrastructure and services (4.1) and culture and tourism (4.2)*;
- under **ISO1**: *a better cooperation governance, based on increased trust, evidence and strengthened institutional cooperation*;

were selected for financing under the future Interreg Programme between Romania and Hungary for the period 2021-2027.

*As no objections regarding the **Programme Strategy and Intervention Logics** were formulated, the document and Annexes, including new Annex 3, were considered approved by consensus.*

Coffee Break

After the break, **Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE** resumed the meeting by thanking the participants for the contributions brought so far, as well as for the expressed interest in the next programming steps.

Mrs. Gloria ZAGAGLIONI intervened, by completing the discussions on PO1, namely the possibility to develop joint strategies for smart specialization and/or further analyses of innovation capacity under ISO1.

Mrs. Monica TEREAN reconfirmed the presence of all participants and returned the floor to **Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE** for discussions on the filled-in parts of the *Interreg Programme Template*, namely sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3. **Mrs. GHEORGHE** underlined that the document actually contained the same information as the one included in the documents already elaborated (approved *Territorial Analysis*, respectively *Territorial Impact Assessment Paper* and *Programme Strategy and Intervention Logics*). A complete draft of the *Interreg Programme Template* is to be submitted to PC members in autumn, **Mrs. GHEORGHE** noted. She afterwards gave the floor to **Mrs. ZAGAGLIONI**, inviting her to present the Section 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 of the draft Programme.

Mrs. Gloria ZAGAGLIONI took the floor and reiterated that the *Interreg Programme Template* was drafted based on the documents already consulted with and/or approved by the PC (e.g. information from the *Territorial Analysis* were included in section 1.2). She also clarified the aspect related to EUSDR, raised by **Mr. Viktor OROSZI**, observer on behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Hungary - Department for Water Diplomacy and the Danube Region Strategy.

Mrs. Nikoletta HORVÁTH thanked for the openness to address additional requests raised by Hungarian delegation, namely the list of indicative categories of potential beneficiaries, the

aspects regarding the allocation on POs and its weight in priorities and the HU approach towards strategic projects.

Further on, **Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE** asked the participants if there are any other comments/observations related to sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 regarding the *programme area, the joint programme strategy and justification for the selection of policy objectives and the Interreg specific objectives* of the *Interreg Programme Template*.

As no participant intervened, the sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 were considered approved.

The sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 of the Interreg Programme Template were approved.

Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE thanked the programming experts for all efforts and considered that an important step ahead in the programming process was made during the meeting. Afterwards, she gave the floor to **Mrs. Gloria ZAGAGLIONI**, who briefly presented the future programming calendar and related actions i.e. launching of SEA procedure, drafting SCO methodology, Strategic Projects Methodology and the Performance framework, the first complete draft of the of the future Interreg Programme between Romania and Hungary for the period 2021-2027, public consultations etc.

Mrs. Nikoletta HORVÁTH made several technical remarks on the SEA procedure in Hungary, such as the need for coordination with the SEA Contact Point in Hungary, the requirements regarding the scoping report that, in Hungary, is a compulsory preliminary step in SEA procedure and is to be consulted with relevant stakeholders for a 30 days period.

Mrs. Eszter Anna CSÓKÁSI took the floor and resumed the aspect regarding allocations, underlining the importance of reaching an agreement on the subject, allowing thus the potential beneficiaries having strategic project ideas to start developing them, as soon as possible, taking also into consideration the deadline for submitting the Interreg Programme to the COM. **Mrs. CSÓKÁSI** also made reference to the strategic projects implemented under Hungary-Serbia IPA Programme and considered to be effective.

Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE noticed the participants' interest in strategic projects and mentioned that several aspects should be previously analysed in this respect, such as lessons learnt from the current 2014-2020 programming period (e.g. the strategic projects with important infrastructure component have a slow implementing pace, even if developed in 2 stages). She acknowledged that allocation was an important aspect to be decided upon, as starting point for strategic projects idea development. However, **Mrs. GHEORGHE** reiterated that both the decisions on future allocations and the approach in relation to strategic projects were subjects of the up-coming meetings.

Mrs. GHEORGHE further concluded that all submitted documents on the agenda were approved during the meeting, namely:

- the revised version of the *Programme Strategy and Intervention Logics*, including its Annex 3 developed and presented during the meeting;
- sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 of the *Interreg Programme*.

In addition, being one of deliverable documents of programming prepared under the programming services contract, the Territorial Impact Assessment Paper, was acknowledged by the members of the PC, with no comments/modifications on the contents.

She also underlined that the aspects raised by the Hungarian delegation regarding the allocations and strategic projects approach were taken into account and would be further

tackled in dedicated meetings, thanked the participants for the cooperation and gave the floor to programming experts for closing words.

Mr. István JANKÓ-SZÉP intervened, stating that he did not recall that the sections of the Interreg Programme were approved during the meeting. He reiterated his position, already presented during the preparatory meeting that he was against approving the Interreg Programme by parts, but rather as a whole.

Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE underlined that the subject regarding the approval of the relevant sections of the Interreg Programme and the objection against such approach, expressed during the preparatory meeting, were raised at the very beginning of the meeting, when discussing the Agenda. **Mrs. GHEORGHE** asked if the intervention is to be considered an objection and reminded that, at that time, it was expressly stressed that, in case no modifications are proposed in relation to the Agenda, the approval of the sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 of the draft Programme would remain a point to be tackled and decided upon during the current meeting. She further specifically underlined that the intervention of **Mr. JANKÓ-SZÉP** in relation to the topic would be written-down in the minutes of the meeting, to be submitted for approval by the PC through a Written Procedure.

Mr. István JANKÓ-SZÉP thanked and requested a face-to-face future meeting of the Programming Committee.

Mrs. Nikoletta HORVÁTH also took the floor, confirmed that she agreed with **Mr. JANKÓ-SZÉP**, the Agenda was correctly formulated by saying “decision”. Decision can be an approval or acknowledged or postponement, or even rejection etc. So, it cannot be assumed that decision is always an approval. Moreover, it is very important to highlight, that the principle in this long process should be that “nothing is approved until everything is approved”.

Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE stated that, in her opinion, if included on the Agenda, a certain topic should be also decided upon.

Mrs. Gloria ZAGAGLIONI reiterated that sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 of the Programme were developed based on information provided in other documents already approved, i.e. the *Territorial Analysis and Programme Strategy and Intervention Logics* and that only the part concerning the ISO1 had to be revised, in compliance with the revised version of the *Programme Strategy*. Basically, there were no new elements to be approved through the content of the said sections of Interreg Programme. She also pointed out that steps ahead should be made during PC meetings, and not returning to aspects already approved. **Mrs. Nikoletta HORVÁTH** intervened, recalling the previous interventions during the preparatory meeting regarding the content of the Interreg Programme that, due to the evolving process, could be further fine-tuned and that the PC members could change the content in case they disagree on certain parts.

Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE underlined again that an integral draft of the Interreg Programme is to be approved by the PC members in a dedicated meeting, estimated to take place in October. Afterwards, she informed the participants that the PC Decision approving the POs/ISO and related specific objectives to be financed under the future Programme and the discussed documents would be sent, via e-mail, to all PC members, immediately after the meeting. The minutes of the meeting, also to be approved by the PC, would be drafted and consulted with the PC in the upcoming period.

Mrs. Monica TEREAN confirmed that the PC Decision on approving the selection of the POs/ISO1 and the documents submitted along with the invitation would be sent to all PC

members by the end of the day, while a summary of conclusions of the meeting would be soon prepared. She thanked everyone for participation and involvement.

Mrs. Diana GHEORGHE also thanked the participants for attendance and closed the 2nd Programming Committee meeting.

Synthesis of the 2nd PC meeting

During the 2nd PC meeting, the following decision was made:

Decision no 06, *approving the selection of the Policy Objectives and Interreg Specific Objective to be financed under the future Interreg Programme between Romania and Hungary, for the period 2021-2027*

Programme Strategy and Intervention Logics and sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 of the *Interreg Programme* are attached as *Annex 1* and *Annex 2* to the PC Decision no 06 and are part of it.

Territorial Impact Assessment Paper was endorsed by the Programming Committee, as a deliverable under the programming services contract.