LESSONS LEARNT

❖ Need to collect in future the input of programmes before designing the event's agenda: consulting with programmes about the possible most needed topics/contents to be touched upon, to avoid a "one-way Commission event"

❖ Need to include more technical/practical subjects: programming, closure, implementation, and general management issues (also consulting with programmes which are the "hottest topics")

❖ Need to leave more time for Q&A sessions and discussion during and after presentations and voting.

❖ Need to continue using interactive tools such as the voting system, surveys, which make the event much more dynamic and allow programmes to express their opinion, share their ideas and contribute to the event.

❖ Need to think about the possibility of setting-up thematic workshops or seminars on specific subjects

❖ Need to facilitate some space for the exchange of ideas between programmes on best practices, problems, solutions, comparisons, etc.

❖ Need to improve the show-casing/story telling session so it is more relevant to the programmes, more dynamic, also attending to the geographical balance and new programming constraints.
KEY MESSAGES

- **SUCCESS OF THE EVENT**: the event objectives were successfully met and useful. According to the statistics *the majority of respondents* (between 65-70 %) found the event useful, considered that it met their objectives for attending and thought they were able to use the outcome of the event in their work.

- **CONTENT - TECHNICAL/PRACTICAL INFORMATION**: 59 % of the respondents consider that the event covered the most relevant issues, while 26 % declared it had not. Information on these issues is considered one of the most valuable and the most useful outcome of the event. Respondents also considered the need for more technical and practical information as critical. The most interesting/needed topics for the attendees are:
  - closure
  - new programming (programme design, intervention logic, result orientation, indicators),
  - budgetary issues: shortage of payment appropriations, logic of interruptions
  - audit & control issues and bureaucracy burden,
  - information on regulations,
  - designation of management and control authorities
  - information on decision process, calendar and procedures for the validation of OPs

- **NETWORKING**, the most valuable part of the event, is very important for programmes: with Commission officers and with other programmes, to exchange ideas, best practices, problems and solutions. It was also highlighted as one of the most useful outcomes of the event.

- **"BEING ABLE TO EXPRESS OPINION"**: Attendees considered that it was very valuable and one of the most useful outcomes to be able to express their opinions via the voting tool (and the Customer satisfaction survey beforehand). It also made the event much more dynamic. Some respondents thought it could have been used even more, having time to then discuss the answers.

- **INTERREG BRANDING!**: considered as a very valuable, positive and useful outcome of the event.

- **FACILITATION** was very praised by attendees

- **SHOW-CASED PROJECTS**: Mixed evaluation. Half of the respondents praised it as a good idea; some consider the show-casing irrelevant for the programmes as they are used to work and
see projects all the time; and others consider that the projects should be more carefully chosen according to geographical balance and/or new period requirements.

- **AGENDA**: Several respondents complained about the limited practical/technical content, the very limited time for Q&A sessions and discussions, and the overall packed agenda. It was also underlined by several attendees the lack of target group orientation relating to content and method of an event covering ALL ETC strands & need to allow the programmes to give some input to the event's agenda: "Prepare the content in view of what the audience knows, might need to know, to discuss"

  Mixed feelings about the panel of experts and on and high political discussions: not liked by some and praised by others. Some respondents also considered the lack of relevance of Macro-regional strategies information.

- **METHOD EVENT - WORKSHOPS**: 72% thought the chosen method was suited to the events objective. However, several respondents suggested a different organisation of the event, based on specialised thematic or other type of seminars or workshops, with just a little part of the event dedicated to core issues.

- **BACKGROUND MATERIALS**: 50% considered that the background materials were clear and useful. Some respondents asked for the presentations to be given prior to the event or at the start of it.

- **FACILITATE EXCHANGE BETWEEN PROGRAMMES**: The exchange of practices (and networking) between programmes was one of the most valued things. Yet it was underlined that it should be further facilitated, i.e. focus on comparative analyses on solved problems

- **SCENOGRAFY** and preparation of and with the speakers should be improved according to some respondents.

- **COMMUNICATION**: Some answers were outside the scope of the questions regarding Communication issues.
  - Requests for improvement of the communication between the European Commission and the programme bodies, directly to Managing authorities and not through the MS contacts
  - Requests for guidelines to be more accessible to public and be updated
  - Better use of Interact, keeping them up-to-date so that they can help the programmes