



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL
REGIONAL AND URBAN POLICY

Political and Inter-Institutional Coordination and Document Management

Brussels, 15 December 2017

Minutes

Meeting of the 7th Structured Dialogue with European Structural
and Investments Funds' partners group of experts

21 November 2017, Brussels

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND OF THE MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The agenda and the minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

II. NATURE OF THE MEETING

The meeting was public, i.e. web-streamed and recorded (available to anyone inside and outside European Commission)

III. LIST OF POINTS DISCUSSED

1. The outcome of the 7th Cohesion Report

with Marc Lemaître, Director-General DG REGIO and Andriana Sukova-Tosheva, Director for Investment DG EMPL

Mr Marc Lemaître started his address by emphasising the importance of the involvement of civil society in the discussions on the 7th Cohesion Report. Outlining the main outcomes of the report, Mr Lemaître underlined that convergence in the EU had accelerated since 2015. Despite that, the impact of the crisis was still evident in some regions. The Director-General then touched on the need to tackle the "middle-income trap" phenomenon, whereby some regions do not move into the higher value added activities and face growing competition from less developed regions.

Mr Lemaître carried on by highlighting the following issues: the need for more action regarding climate change, notably by increasing the share of renewables; the strong influence of the quality of public institutions in achieving economic and social cohesion.

Mr Lemaître also emphasized that the results of the 2007-2013 programming period had exceeded expectations and showcased lasting positive effects of European investments.

Regarding post-2020 cohesion policy, Marc Lemaître insisted that it should continue to be made available to all regions. He also mentioned the need to focus more on less-developed and border regions, as well as regions undergoing industrial transition or stuck in the "middle-income trap". Among investment priorities, the following will be paramount: the improvement of institutions, the promotion of structural reforms and of partnerships between regions (especially in the area of innovation). He also underlined that territorial and place-based development would have a more prominent role in post-2020 cohesion policy; suggested that the number of objectives might be reduced; emphasized the goal of radical simplification of the policy; highlighted the idea of additional socioeconomic indicators to be used along with GDP; stated that the N+2 rule might be reinforced to promote more discipline in spending; stressed the need to have a degree of flexibility in cohesion policy to be able to respond to new and unforeseen challenges; and pointed out to the need to enhance complementarity between financial instruments and funds.

The Director-General closed his speech by indicating that the proposal for the post-2020 MFF would be submitted by May 2018.

Then Ms Andriana Sukova-Tosheva, Director for Investment in DG EMPL, took the floor to touch upon several social issues raised in the 7th Cohesion Report, such as depopulation, shrinking regions as well as migration and integration. Ms Sukova-Tosheva highlighted the fact that the employment rate in 2016 (71.1%) was the highest ever registered in the EU, but acknowledged that a lot should be done to reach the Europe 2020 goal of 75%. In this context, she emphasized the importance of the European Pillar of Social Rights as a key element in ensuring solidarity and cohesion across the Union.

Following the presentation, comments were made by **EUROCHAMBERS** (asking for more details on the notion of EU added-value); **European disability forum** (suggesting to invest not only in the quality of public institutions, but also in capacity building of partners); **CAN Europe** (stressing the importance of the compatibility between climate goals of cohesion policy and national energy and climate plans that are being prepared under the framework of the Paris Agreement); **CEMR** (enquiring about the single-rule book); **CPMR** (questioning how the Commission plans to involve local partners in the Social Pillar, and if it could be envisaged to have regions requesting support from the Structural Reform Support Programme); **EUROCITIES** (highlighting that cohesion policy should focus more on considering and addressing specific local development challenges); **EURAF** (asking about the plans to coordinate contribution of the different funds towards climate change and circular economy); **EAPB** (asking for some clarification on the use of EU-level financial instruments); **EUA** (asking if there was any way to introduce a possible incentive for stakeholders and institutions to better coordinate themselves when face with multilevel governance; suggesting the introduction of an ex-ante conditionality on the minimum amount of spending on research and innovation); **COPA COGECA** (stressing that cohesion policy should go deeper into territorial disparities within regions, and asking how procedures under cohesion policy could be improved to take less time); **ETUC** (stressing the importance of sufficient funding for

post-2020 cohesion policy against Brexit and need to finance the European Pillar of Social Rights, of having more indicators, and suggesting to introduce an ex-ante conditionality on partnership).

The Director-General replied that the EU added-value of cohesion policy was a concept which should not be carved in stone, as it was multi-faceted which depended on how Member States perceived it (he stated the example of the Netherlands which receives hardly anything from cohesion policy but continues to believe that it worth contributing to it, because receiving external stimulus is always better than dwelling within internal patterns).

On improving public institutions, Mr Lemaître referred to the broader goal of creating favourable environment for business. Regarding cohesion policy objectives, notably on climate actions, Mr Lemaître reminded that the Commission was reflecting on the possibility to reduce the number of thematic objectives for the next round, and that the streamlining of climate spending in the cohesion policy budget should be maintained. When it comes to national plans and their implementation at local level, he said it should be left to regional actors.

On the single-rule book, Mrs Sukova-Tosheva underlined that the Commission was already reflecting on ways to have a single-rule book for all funds under shared management. She nevertheless underlined the need for specific rules to mirror the specificities of certain funds.

She also touched upon the European Semester, which she believed could be better linked to the Structural Funds. She believed country-specific recommendations should be more detailed so that cohesion policy can contribute better to the fulfilment of these policy recommendations. Mr Lemaître added that the Commission was reflecting on positive incentives to stimulate reforms, and that going subnational for some recommendations might be worthwhile. He mentioned the newly implemented taskforce that will submit by mid next year a report on how subsidiarity and how to better involve local and regional partners.

On the SRSP, Mr Lemaître indicated that it was gaining momentum, with a growing number of requests. He added there was nothing to stop local and regional authorities to request support for regional reforms, but that it was up to Member States to do the follow-up.

Regarding functional versus geographical areas and the specificity of local development challenges, Mr Lemaître expressed his ongoing support for integrated approaches, such as the sustainable development approach for urban areas.

On the coordination of funds, especially between DG REGIO and DG AGRI, Mr Lemaître said one the keys would be to focus more on result-orientation. In the future, the role of each fund should be more clearly defined, in order to avoid overlaps (such as broadband, Natura 2000, etc.). In the meantime, partnership agreements represent a useful tool whereby Member States strive to identify clearly the funding priorities and the ways to achieve them.

Regarding financial instruments, Mr Lemaître reminded that EFSI was a budget-guarantee approach, to allow for additional lending mostly by EIB and EIF. The complementarity with ESI funds is not an easy task and the Commission is working on it still for the current programming period. He added that that there were different approaches – even within the Commission - regarding financial instruments: a more centralised and "one-size-fits-all" one

with EFSI as the main catalyser, and a more decentralised one with financial instruments of a more modest size, but addressing market gaps at regional level, in a more targeted way. The reflections for the future should focus on finding a mechanism which would allow these two approaches to go side by side.

On ex-ante conditionalities, Marc Lemaître indicated that the Commission was working at reducing their number. Regarding research and innovation, he insisted that it should be at the heart of cohesion policy in the future, but he said one should not be obsessed with a minimum level of spending. It would be better to look at the overall health of the innovation ecosystems (are they linked enough to local strengths, and ready to create added-value?).

On rural development and the overall slowness of the process, Mr Lemaître stressed the Commission's efforts to lessen administrative burden, but also expressed his preference for the n+2 rule, so that Member States would be encouraged to ensure a swifter implementation.

On indicators, Mr Lemaître told the partners that more social indicators would be used in the future.

Lastly, regarding the partnership principle, Mrs Sukova-Tosheva emphasised that the Commission would continue to carefully monitor the implementation of the European Code of Conduct on Partnership throughout all ESI funds.

2. Implementing the Urban Agenda for the EU: first results

First, the Commission (DG REGIO) highlighted the fact that Urban Agenda, after just over a year and a half of existence, had already delivered results. The 12 partnership are operating, 4 first Action Plans will be finalised soon, 22 Member States and 84 cities participate, along with 13 DGs.

Second, the Urban Agenda has influenced the policy-making by showing that cities should be involved. Moreover, the Commission has started to make an urban proofing of existing legislation, to ensure that it is not too burdensome for cities. A "one-stop-shop" for cities has been launched to improve coordination between various levels of governance. Finally, the Commission highlighted initiatives such as the Urban Innovative Actions, aimed at testing innovative solutions with cities, and URBACT, created to encourage networking and sharing of best practices.

Third, the Commission stressed that the Urban Agenda for the EU had an international dimension, as the main instrument to implement the New Urban Agenda at global level. The initiative also gave rise to regional networks of cities (Union for the Mediterranean Urban Agenda). The Commission informed participants that the Urban Agenda for the EU would be assessed in 2019.

Following the presentation, comments were made by **MEDCITIES** (asking the Commission how they chose the cities who joined the various partnerships, and stating that some Member States, especially in Southern and Eastern Europe, are still hesitant to involve cities and would need to be encouraged by the Commission), **EDF** (suggesting to pay more attention to the

issue of accessibility), the Committee of Regions (informing that the Committee is working on an opinion regarding the implementation of the Urban Agenda, and encouraging other organisations to join the Cohesion Alliance to promote a strong cohesion policy for all regions beyond 2020), **EURAF** (asking if home-gardening is addressed in the Urban Agenda).

On choosing the cities, the Commission specified that the selection was done by the Member States, CEMR, Eurocities, the Committee of the Regions and URBACT. On encouraging Member States to involve cities, the Commission has been pushing for it for months. On accessibility and home-gardening, the issue has not been addressed yet, but the Commission encouraged the partners to suggest it through the Urban Agenda dedicated website, and provide their contributions.

3. Implementation of the Partnership Principle

The experts from the Commission (DG EMPL) informed participants on the Activities of the Thematic Network on Partnership. The network includes Managing Authorities, NGOs and social partners, aimed at sharing experiences and tools in promoting partnership.

The experts outlined the main outputs of the Network: mapping of relevant concepts in partnership promotion; reviewing European Code of Conduct on Partnership (ECCP); creating co-production dossier in a framework of cross-network activity; -collecting practices on how the partnership principle operates (database of peer-reviewed partnership practices); reinforcing partnership principle (process connections).

Regarding the ECCP review, the Commission stated that partnerships could be a solution to overcome political distrust and noted that they demonstrated their value in regional development, due to a strong local attachment.

As a result of its activities from April to December 2017, the Thematic Network found that stakeholders lacked awareness of ECCP. The need to improve stakeholders' involvement in operational programmes, as well as the reporting, was also emphasized. With a view to prepare the next ECCP 2021-2027, partners were asked to send their recommendations on the European Code of Conduct on Partnership by January 19, 2018 (a questionnaire was circulate to the partners through the functional mail box of the Structured Dialogue).

Following the presentation, comments were made by **EASPD** (praising the efforts of the Thematic Network), **ENIL** (stating that NGOs experience difficulties when it comes to supervision of how EU Funds are spent, and urging the Commission to encourage managing authorities to cooperate with NGOs), **EUROCHILD** (asking for a more active role of the Commission in monitoring committees, to ensure transparency and meaningful participation of civil society).

The Commission replied that it would indeed be relevant to be more involved in monitoring committees (beyond its usual observatory role) but that it would have to be discussed and decided with the other institutions.

4. A feedback from the conferences "Our Ocean" and "Beyond-2020: supporting Europe's coastal communities"

with Joao Aguiar Machado, Director-General DG MARE

Mr Joao Aguiar Machado, Director-General of DG MARE, started his presentation by stressing the importance of synergies between funds, as well as the involvement of stakeholders in the Common Fisheries Policy.

He then presented the outcome of the "Our Ocean" Conference hosted by the EU in Malta, on October 5-6, stating that it had welcomed more than 1000 participants from 123 countries. Mr Machado stressed that the Conference had generated EUR 7.2 billion in financial commitments, and participants had pledged to create 2.5 million square kilometres of additional Marine Protected Areas. The Commission, in its turn, announced 35 new initiatives aimed at protection the oceans. The Director-General pointed out that for the first time, multinational companies had committed to specific actions for the health of oceans. He added that the next Conference would take place in Bali in 2018.

Mr Machado also provided an insight into the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) stakeholder conference "Beyond 2020: supporting Europe's coastal communities". The conference focused on two issues: the ways to ensure the best use of the EMFF; post-2020 support to Europe's coastal communities.

Stating that, since 2014, the EMFF had helped mobilise more than 1 billion euros of public and private investment, the Director-General underlined however that the uptake of EMFF by Member States had been insufficient, and that small-scale coastal fleets still experienced difficulties. Mr Machado also highlighted the problem of slow spending, noting that Member States had to speed up programmes' implementation.

Regarding the post-2020 agenda, the Director-General emphasized that it had been agreed during the conference that the EU should continue safeguarding healthy seas and oceans, as well as investing in sustainable fisheries, especially considering overfishing in the Mediterranean. He called for a strong focus on Blue Economy and stressed that the EU should continue to strengthen international ocean governance.

Remarks were made by **COPA COGECA** (inquiring, in the frame of the LEADER programme, whether the EMFF was rural or maritime, and whether Fisheries Local Action Groups (FLAGs) were limited to maritime and coastal projects or could be opened to multi-functional projects (such as tourism)); **ESIN** (asking about the support that small coastal fishing communities can get from EMFF, as well as raising the problem of marine plastic pollution and the possibility to address this issue through the scope of circular economy); **EAPN** (pointing out the problem of poor working conditions and "in-work poverty" in fisheries sector); **REVES** (inquiring about the possibility to have an integrated approach to funding as many policy aspects are interlinked).

Regarding the scope of the EMFF (rural versus coastal development), Mr Machado said that the question remained open: in countries where there is no coastal area (such as Austria), the EMFF has been used for rural development, in order to strike a balance between Member States. It is still not decided whether this situation will continue or not under the next programming period. As for the FLAGs, Mr Machado specified that they were aimed at financing various projects in areas with prevalent – but not only - fishing activities.

The Director-General also stressed that small-scale fishing operators can benefit from preferential support from the EMFF, but underlined that their fishing activities – often exempted from certain obligations – cannot be systematically considered as sustainable. In the Mediterranean Sea for example, where small-scale fishing represent 80% of the total fishing activities, stocks are in a very bad state of conservation.

Mr Machado acknowledged the seriousness of the problem of marine pollution and stressed the importance of proper land-based strategies as well as waste prevention. He also underlined that the Commission addressed the problem of working conditions in fisheries sector through promoting enforcement of the conventions of the International Labour Organisation, as well as supporting measures for better safety conditions on board through EMFF. Lastly, Mr Machado acknowledged the need to better define the scope of the different areas of activity as well as the role of funds, in order to avoid overlapping and ensure synergies in the post-2020 period.

5. Presentation of the Communication on growth in cross-border regions

The Commission (DG REGIO) shared with partners the recently adopted (20/09/2017) communication "Boosting Growth and Cohesion in EU Border Regions", stressing that it addressed internal borders of the Union, where development capacity of regions was limited by existence of an administrative boundary. It was highlighted that border regions tend to be less developed and suffer from poor access to public services. It is a significant problem for the EU as border regions represent 30% of the population, 40% of the EU territory and 40% of the GDP of the Union.

The Commission pointed out the following challenges, due to different administrative and legal systems: high cost of cross-border formalities (60% higher than for domestic ones); non-complementarity of social security/tax systems; lack of integration/insufficiency of public transport systems; gaps in healthcare provision across the border.

To tackle these various issues, the Commission proposed in its Communication the creation of a Border Focal Point, which is currently being set up. It will be composed of experts from DG REGIO.

The Commission also presented its 10-point Action Plan, the implementation of which will be monitored by the Border Focal Point. It consists of the following points: 1) deepening cooperation and exchange (particularly by the means of EU-wide online professional network to facilitate exchange on good practices and pilot projects to find replicable innovative solutions to specific border issues); 2) improving the legislative process; 3) enabling cross-

border public administration; 4) providing reliable and understandable information and assistance (Single Digital Gateway to ensure one-stop-shop principle and promote border information services); 5) supporting cross-border employment; 6) promoting border multilingualism; 7) facilitating cross-border accessibility (including integrated public transportation); 8) promoting better integration of health-care facilities; 9) considering legal and financial cross-border cooperation; 10) building statistical evidence to inform decision-making.

It was underlined that the plan involved different DGs of the European Commission and not only DG REGIO, and was open to collaboration with a wider circle of stakeholders.

After the presentation, comments were made by **ERRIN** (asking for more information on the pilot projects to address specific innovation issues of border regions); **EURAF** (highlighting the need to cooperate better between emergency services of Galicia and North of Portugal regarding forest fires); **EDF** (stressing the need for a stronger quality control of cross-border medical services, once cooperation has taken place); **COPA COGECA** (emphasising the lack of clarity regarding the definition and scale of border regions).

Regarding the pilot projects, the Commission replied that they were meant to look for innovative solutions to overcome specific obstacles, and which can then be replicated to address other obstacles. The call will be launched early 2018. Around 20 projects will be funded for one year (maximum support of EUR 20 000 each) to allow public administrations to reflect together on concrete solutions.

The Commission also acknowledged the importance of a better coordination between emergency services, and said that some cases had been identified in the inventory of border obstacles made before the Communication.

Regarding healthcare services, the Commission acknowledged the significant role and impact of healthcare services in border regions, but stressed that it was up to national authorities to ensure the quality of social protection.

Lastly, the Commission emphasised the complexity of the notions of "border" and "border region", pointing out that this depended, to a large extent, on local stakeholders. The Commission also explained the need for a clear definition was also a requirement of specific initiatives (i.e. Interreg).

6. Presentation of the Communication on strengthening innovation in Europe's Regions

The Commission (DG REGIO) presented its Communication on Innovation in Europe's Regions, adopted in July 2017. This Communication is meant to take smart specialisation strategies a step further to increase the competitiveness of Europe.

Disparities regarding innovation performance still exist between and within Member States and regions. The Commission highlighted the unused innovative potential of regions, and the decisive push incurred by Smart Specialisation Strategy (S3).

The Commission then outlined the various lessons that could be drawn from S3, including: the benefit of an ex-ante conditionality to help implement a regional strategy; the need to encourage bottom-up information flows and broad partnerships, etc. The Commission added that smart specialisation as an approach could be effectively applied to various policy fields (i.e. industrial policy, energy policy, cross-border cooperation in innovation etc.).

Regarding the Communication, the Commission highlighted the four key challenges that were identified: 1) the incompleteness and artificiality of the research & innovation sector in many regions; 2) the lack of investments in innovation across regions; 3) the issue of “middle-income trap” regions and regions in industrial transition; 4) need to promote synergies and enhance complementarities between EU policies and instruments.

The Commission stressed that smart specialisation was a suitable instrument to address the above challenges, and that it was a good example of participatory decision-making that could be scaled-up to the EU level.

Following the presentation, **EUA** announced that it was working on a position paper on smart specialisation, highlighting the importance of education in the context of research & innovation, and suggesting to introduce an ex-ante conditionality on synergies in multi-level governance; **CAAC** underlined the need to transfer knowledge and good practices to the local level, mentioning for example an Interreg project involving cross-border collaboration on smart specialization; **ERRIN** asked about the plans for improving smart specialisation, expressing their interest in regional innovation ecosystems and asking about the instruments to support cooperation between such ecosystems; **EAPN** stressed the need to direct innovation towards providing poor people and workers with new skills; **COPA COGEPA** suggested the Commission to improve timing of procedures.

The Commission reminded partners about the principle of subsidiarity and stressed that the monitoring of smart specialisation should be undertaken by regions. The Commission welcomed the good practice of applying smart specialisation in Interreg projects, and also agreed on the social dimension of innovation. Regarding timing issues, the Commission stressed that the EU was a democratic system, where procedures required consensus of a broad range of interested parties and stakeholders.

7. Any other business

ELARD made a short intervention to provide a feedback on the 3rd European Rural Parliament which took place in Venhorst (NL) in October (gathering representatives from some 40 countries), the outcome of which was the Venhorst Declaration. It addresses several issues: services and infrastructure needs across Europe (roads, broadband, etc.); poverty and

social inclusion; integration of refugees and economic migrants; youth issues. It also calls for the establishment of a separate fund for LEADER / Community-Led Local Development. This fund would be fed by all ESI Funds, allowing for better combinations. It would also ensure one set of rules for urban, rural and coastal communities. ELARD called participants to take this proposal into consideration.

EURAF announced a meeting on 29 November in the European Parliament devoted to agroforestry and recommendations for the future Common Agricultural Policy.

The Commission also provided information on the outcome of the General Affairs Council (GAC) dedicated to cohesion policy that took place on 15 November 2017. During this GAC, delegations expressed different views regarding the link of cohesion policy to structural reforms, as well as other sensitive topics such as the potential reduction in the EU co-financing rate and the rule of law which remains a key issue. In particular, several delegations (DE, BE, NL, IE, CY) supported better alignment with structural reforms and (SE, FI, LV, DK, SI) highlighted the importance to be accompanied with a reform of the country-specific recommendations governance. Some delegations (DE, FI, DK, NL) stressed that the increase national co-financing to offset cuts in EU funds availability post-Brexit will be necessary, while PL, CZ and HU argued that a lower EU co-financing is not the only way of ensuring ownership. A number of delegations (BE, NL, IT, DE, DK, SE, FI, FR) stressed the importance of respecting the rule of law principle as a basic conditionality for the use of any EU funding. For PL and HU this is an artificial link and the cohesion policy should stick to the EU Treaty. Commissioner Crețu stressed the need for policies that incentivise structural reforms and are closely linked to the European Semester. In this respect, she pointed out the need to reflect on whether the European Semester annual cycle and mid-term planning of cohesion policy could be better matched. She also underlined that the rule of law was a fundamental principle; however, she was not convinced about making a conditionality out of it, especially for cohesion policy. Such conditionalities should be discussed as part of the broader debate on the entire budget.

Then the Commission gave an outlook on the main Communications and consultations to come, including a Communication on modernising the common agricultural policy adopted at the end of November and would become a part of the discussion on the post-2020 MFF; a Strategic Report and Summary Report on ESIF implementation and ESIF contribution to Europe 2020 in mid-December, and a Communication on the Interim Evaluation of Horizon 2020. The Commission also announced that the legislative package post-2020 would be ready by mid-2018.

IV. CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS/OPINIONS

The Commission thanked participants for their helpful and thought-provoking input as well as active participation in discussions.

Partners were encouraged to share with the Commission any findings, studies and experiences with the implementation of cohesion policy and the partnership principle. They were also called to take a pro-active role in disseminating the results of exchanges in the framework of the ESIF Structured Dialogue. The Commission informed partners that the minutes from the meeting would be shared within a month.

V. NEXT STEPS

The minutes will be forwarded to the European Parliament and the Council in order to fulfil the requirement of Article 5(6) of the CPR. They will also be forwarded for information to the European Economic and social Committee and the Committee of the Regions.

VI. NEXT MEETING

The Commission informed partners that the next Structured Dialogue would be held late March or early April 2018. Partners were asked to submit their proposals (if any) regarding the agenda until the mid of January 2018.

VII. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ARCO LATINO
BUSINESSEUROPE
CAPITAL CITIES AND REGIONS NETWORK (CCRN)
CEE BANKWATCH NETWORK
CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK (CAN) EUROPE
CONFERENCE OF ATLANTIC ARC CITIES (CAAC)
CONFERENCE OF PERIPHERAL MARITIME REGIONS (CPMR)
COUNCIL OF EUROPEAN MUNICIPALITIES AND REGIONS (CEMR)
EUROCITIES
EUROPEAN ANTI POVERTY NETWORK (EAPN)
EUROHEALTHNET
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY ORGANISATIONS (EARTO)
EUROPEAN FEDERATION OF NATIONAL ORGANISATIONS WORKING WITH THE HOMELESS (FEANTSA)
EUROPEAN ANTI-POVERTY NETWORK (EAPN)
EUROPEAN NETWORK OF SOCIAL INTEGRATION ENTERPRISES (ENSIE)
EUROPEAN ANTI-POVERTY NETWORK (EAPN)
EUROPEAN NETWORK OF CITIES AND REGIONS FOR THE SOCIAL ECONOMY (REVES)
EUROPEAN NETWORK OF INDEPENDENT LIVING (ENIL)
EUROPEAN CITIES ASSOCIATION (EUA)
EUROPEAN NETWORK ON ROMA INCLUSION AND ESI FUNDS (EUROMA NETWORK)
GOVERNMENT SUPPORTING COMMUNITIES – IRELAND (POBAL)
EUROPEAN TRADE UNION CONFEDERATION (ETUC)
EUROCHAMBERS
EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE (EESC)
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC BANKS AND FUNDING AGENCIES (EAPB)
EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY ASSOCIATION (EUA)
EUROPEAN ORGANISATION OF AGRICULTURAL, RURAL AND FORESTRY CONTRACTORS (CEETAR)

EUROCHILD
EUROPEAN SMALL ISLANDS FEDERATION (ESIN)
EUROPEAN REGIONS RESEARCH AND INNOVATION NETWORK (ERRIN)
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF SERVICE PROVIDERS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES (EASPD)
EUROPEAN DISABILITY FORUM (EDF)
EUROPEAN FARMERS (COPA)
EUROPEAN AGRI-COOPERATIVES (COGECA)
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES (EURADA)
EUROMONTANA
EUROPEAN AGROFORESTRY FEDERATION (EURAF)
EUROPEAN LEADER ASSOCIATION FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT (ELARD)
EUROPEAN COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS
EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE
FUNDACIÓN SECRETARIADO GITANO
HOUSING EUROPE
LUMOS
MEDCITIES
OCEAN ENERGY EUROPE
PREPARE PARTNERSHIP FOR RURAL EUROPE (PREPARE)
SOCIAL PLATFORM
UNION EUROPEENNE DE L'ARTISANAT ET DES PETITES ET MOYENNES ENTREPRISES (UEAPME)