

Complementarity of Funding

1. RATIONALE

The focus and aim of the work of sub-group 1 was to identify practices and procedures in EU Member States that facilitate better use of EU funding. We focussed on those funds where multi-level and/or multi-stakeholder partnership elements are applied, especially within Cohesion Policy (CPR) funds and other EU funds implemented together with ESI Funds. Practices have been scrutinised to discover mechanisms for inter-fund coordination or multi-fund one-stop shops that can serve as a blueprint for ESI fund implementation.

2. PROCESS

Our sub-group noticed quite early in the process that practices and procedures identified by members of the sub-group fall into two categories. The first category includes examples of a “downstream” dimension, i.e., the coordination of fund management where ministries, managing authorities and fund partners cooperate to make the use of the different funds available and transparent. The second category gathers practices of an “upstream” dimension that focuses on the coordination of local needs (that usually are topic specific) and facilitates the identification of the EU funding source that assists in meeting the identified development need.

The first task of the sub-group was to identify cases on the complementarity of funding, explore them and document these cases in standardised formatted fiches. During the initial round in August-September, four fiches were gathered which, coincidentally, represented two “upstream” and two “downstream” examples. Efforts to gather more cases continued until the end of November 2022 with 20 fiches gathered in total.

In order to obtain an efficient analysis base and in line with the proposed objective, the coordination/working team produced a communication plan, working on the templates format, uploading demos, creating a motivational / inspiration letter to make the participants complete the templates with the projects that have multi-funding components and to transmit ideas and recommendations. From December 2022 until June 2023 google drive was used for better transparency and participation on the final product.

The examples shared in the fiches were analysed and found to be roughly divided into 50/50 upstream and downstream examples. The coverage of the fiches was geographically balanced with good representation of New Member States and slightly weaker EU-12 coverage.

The 20 fiches were discussed in the sub-group plenary meeting at the end of November 2022 that was followed by two workshops in early December 2022 (one on upstream “fund management” and the other on downstream “beneficiary coordination”). Key recommendations were extracted from these two workshops. Following the presentation during the Second ECoPP meeting on 16 February 2023 a peer review process was conducted at which recommendations have been discussed in detail. The document was completed in June 2023.

3. OUTPUT/S

The main output of sub-group 1 work is a set of recommendations for the complementarity of funds. The recommendations are offered in an easily accessible format for other ECoPP members.

Recommendations for the wider implementation of multi-funded development programmes

Rationale: The added value of multi-funding

Throughout the work of the sub-group, it was confirmed that the complementarity of funds and – the next step – multi-funding mechanisms are of high added value. At the local level, citizens' daily life is not divided by sectors or policy themes. The division between the different EU funds, in particular the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF), is an operational but also an artificial one. From a citizen, community or municipality perspective, it makes more sense to think of sustainable local development in an integrated way bearing in mind the territorial cohesion and the special needs of less developed and outermost regions.

Complementarity of funds and multi-funding ensures the consistency of EU policies in a country and especially at the local level. In particular when looking beyond ESIF, for instance at the Recovery and Resilience Facility and the Modernisation Fund, there may be a risk of overlap, double funding or even contradictory approaches. Ensuring consistency and complementarity of EU funds and programmes is also a way to ensure the efficiency of EU policies. Complementarity of funds is relevant to the partnership principles such as ensuring trust, true dialogue and cooperation across stakeholders, ministries, government levels, etc.

At the local level, using multi-funding (such as that practised for Community-led local development (CLLD) or Integrated territorial investment (ITI)) is seen by our group as a promising way to better address the needs of the local communities, ensuring the involvement of all relevant stakeholders, public and private bodies and professionals.

In practice, however, it is not so easy to implement. For this reason, sub-group 1 looked at existing examples and gathered in this paper some ideas and recommendations to ensure better complementarity and facilitate the use of multi-funds. Therefore, we may divide the main findings into 4 topics, as follows:

1) Main challenges to overcome

- **Having different Managing Authorities for different funds with different sets of rules is a complication in multi-fund implementation.** Communication and

cooperation are even more challenging when dealing with different organisations or administrations, even in the same country. In addition, within the same country, some ESIF can be managed at the Ministerial level, some at regional level and others by national agencies.

- When existing delivery channels or strategies are used for additional or new funds, there are **risks of double funding actions**. Examples within the recovery fund (RRF) and other ESIF programming covering similar priorities. The remedy is better information flow and possible IT system collaboration to see project pipelines.

Box 1. Guide for complementarity between RRF and Cohesion Funds in France

In France, the National Agency for Territorial Cohesion (ANCT) identified the challenges raised by RRF in ensuring that RRF would not be in position of “competition” with other Cohesion Policy funds for beneficiaries, especially as RRF and Cohesion Policy funds scope are similar but the RRF has to be implemented in a much more limited time period. Therefore, ANCT set up thematic working groups to identify the overlaps between Cohesion Policy (ERDF and ESF+ in particular) and RRF. They shared the information on risk of overlap with the Managing Authorities and finally published a guide to inform on the remaining risks and suggestions to avoid them (financer’s committee, phasing of projects, allocation of projects to funds by beneficiary or topics, etc).

Regular exchange with Managing Authorities on mechanisms implemented at regional and local level to avoid overlaps were also held after the publication of the guide, and the whole process contributed to better coordination and dialogue in the interest of final beneficiaries.

- Beyond administrative complexity, the relatively little use of multi-funding can also be explained by **lack of communication** between relevant stakeholders and Managing authorities, and by lack of knowledge of the different opportunities and possibilities available to fund integrated projects.

Box 2. Informal Sector Coordination for Multi-Level Governance Approach to the Migration Crisis 2015-2016

Member States are challenged by their identification of large sectoral needs and the limited earmarked funding to address these same needs. Thus, there are numerous examples of informal sectoral coordination between local, regional and national public authorities in Member States to efficiently use all available funding for the pressing concerns of the sector. The 2015-16 migration wave to the EU is just such a challenge, increasing migrants in Finland ten-fold. Authorities in **Finland** were determined to check all available EU funding options regardless of the programme to identify possible funding to enable migrant reception.

Intermittent national level meetings were jointly led by the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment with the additional objective of creating regional level ‘project mills’. These mills are run via regional ELY-centres which promote regional competitiveness, well-being and

sustainable development and work with local NGOs and governments to meet perceived needs during the migrant crisis and get high utilisation of diverse funds.

Likewise, **Croatian** authorities wished to utilise diverse national and EU funding more efficiently (ESF+, ERDF, EAFRD, AMIF, ISF) during the 2021-2027 programming period to address migration, social inclusion and security challenges, including border management in innovative ways.

- Remaining **complexity of ESIF rules** from both national laws' complexities and complexities inherent to the funds.
- Managing **authorities with low capacities** tend to prioritise fast and easy spending over result-oriented multi-fund approaches. Information tools, e.g., websites about energy efficiency and renewable energy support schemes, are organised according to funds (from the managing authority perspective) but not in a user-friendly way (from the beneficiaries' perspective).
- **The short-term and scattered approach used in many cases.** The combined use of different funds, involving different authorities and stakeholders, requires a long-term approach which allows for enough time to plan and implement the actions, as well as an integrated approach that goes beyond specific investment areas or funds. The short-term and scattered/not integrated approach used in many cases (e.g., calls for short periods of funds) does not facilitate or even prevent an effective combined use of the funds.

Box 3. Bottom-up multi-fund coordination via non-state actors

While not public sector-led, **Romania's** environmental NGOs used the EU macroregional Interreg project "SaveGREEN" to attain an overview of the vast sector needs in the Danube region, to match these needs with the funds available and to establish a clearinghouse for priority Green Infrastructure and biodiversity projects. The project was able to use 51 experts to compile a list of critical biodiversity needs often overlooked and connect them with funding opportunities from various EU programmes. This example shows how other stakeholders can take initiative to multi-fund coordination from the "bottom".

2) Possible solutions to improve complementarity and facilitate multi-funding

- Wherever possible, **simplify the architecture of ESIF management**, reduce the number of agencies, application forms and action plans. Stakeholders should have access to a "one-stop shop" at national level to understand how funds are managed, who and what is eligible.
- **Multi-funding process should be addressed at all governance levels: the national, regional and local levels** through the strategic planning process.

Sectoral national (and regional) strategies should include a precise model of the multi-funding process that is available.

- **Increase information flow** and the coordination between the funds' structures. When ESIF have a different management system (not the same Managing Authorities or Ministry responsible) it is even more important to set up regular exchange opportunities to ensure complementarity and consistency of funds (e.g., Joint Monitoring Committee overseeing both Cohesion Policy funds and RRF, or coordination group for the different ESI Funds).

Box 4. Joint planning, drafting process and Monitoring Committee for Recovery and Resilience Facility and Cohesion Policy funds in Estonia

Separate planning for each different EU fund can create excessive bureaucracy and lead to non-complementary or even contradicting investments between funds. The planning and allocation of the RRF and Cohesion Policy funds in Estonia was a joint process to maximise the coherence and utility of finances. All EU funds were treated as a single pot of money to minimise the risk of different ministries and stakeholders proposing contradicting investments in different funds. For example, the ministry explained that they would not invest in nature conservation or biodiversity measures from the RRF, as those investments were to be made from Cohesion Policy funding to avoid fragmentation and simplify the bureaucracy. A variety of stakeholders were also involved in the financial allocation planning process during a week of consultations, where measures were divided into issues and topics rather than into different funds. Drafting different funds jointly also helps ensure better transparency of public investments.

When it comes to monitoring, Estonia also set up a joint Monitoring Committee (MC) overseeing both RRF and Cohesion Policy funding, which means that the use of different funding streams will have joint supervision, making the monitoring across funds more efficient and coherent. The MC will work simultaneously on 2021-2027 period implementation, and on closing of the 2014-2020 funding period, until all the projects finish, to reduce the overlapping tasks and administrative burden. The MC is composed of a wide variety of stakeholders representing different groups in society, such as Estonia's Human Rights Association, Estonia's Social Work Association, The Estonian National Youth Council, Estonian Union for Child Welfare, Gender Equality and Equal Treatment Commissioner, Network of Estonian Nonprofit Organizations, and the Estonian Chamber of People with Disabilities.

- Having **stakeholders fully informed about funding opportunities** can also be key to ensuring that they make the most of the various opportunities available to them, especially at the local level. For this, European Commission services together with relevant national authorities and Managing Authorities could organise yearly (or more) info meetings targeted to the partners identified in the European Code of Conduct on Partnership (local and regional governments, economic and social partners, civil society) to present, and increase understanding of EU funds, how they are implemented and how to apply to potential calls while ensuring the information reaches minorities and disadvantaged population groups. On the other hand, involvement of relevant

financing beneficiaries at local and regional level in the design of funding instruments, relying on previous experience (difficulties in accessing funding, obstacles in implementation, results obtained not matching with initial forecasts) could help in enhancing the efficiency of multi-funding. Moreover, this information should be aggregated at Commission level through a working group involving representatives of all funding branches in order to eliminate overlapping aspects or conflicting issues for the final beneficiaries.

- **Simple and harmonised rules and guidelines.** These should be provided to Managing authorities and beneficiaries sufficiently in advance of programming. Harmonisation of IT systems and clear evaluation procedures would also greatly facilitate integration or combination of ESIF. In this respect a common platform for accessing funding as well as for implementing would support an integrated approach, providing real-time assistance while also allowing the Managing Authorities or Commission bodies to oversee the development of the funding in all Member states. The Jems platform (application platform for Interreg) could serve as an example here.

Box 5. Aligning the rules and combining different CPR funds

For the 2021-2027 period, the regional and national levels in **Austria** worked together to improve consistency of the Cohesion Policy funds delivery system and to enable a minimum of fund-based specificities (for instance on eligibility rules).

In **Poland**, the Lower Silesia region is attempting to implement ERDF, ESF+ and the Just Transition Fund (JTF) through a single regional programme. This is quite a challenge not only because JTF is a new fund and therefore there is no previous experience to build on but also because it is the first time Poland will implement a three-fund programme. But this approach makes sense given the complementarity between JTF with ERDF for infrastructure investments on the one hand and with ESF+ for “soft investments” (e.g., skills, labour) on the other hand. In order to achieve this a group composed of various stakeholders was set up including local and regional authorities, government representatives, social partners, civil society, business institutions, universities, associations with diverse experience with the implementation of ERDF and ESF. The members of this group have been supporting the regional authorities in the preparation of the regional plan for just transition.

- **Reducing the number of programmes** through integration of different funds at Member State or regional levels. If programmes have the same geographic coverage, multi-fund coordination is made easier. The [Programme in Slovakia](#) or in Estonia are examples of this.
- **Aligning the timelines** of the different funds. Often programme periods leave time gaps during which partnerships are not active, making inter-fund coordination in the early and end phases difficult. In case of exceptional circumstances (e.g., Next Generation EU), overlap with ESIF should be avoided.

Answering emergencies should be complementary and not detrimental to long term objectives of the Cohesion Policy and the priorities already identified in Partnership Agreements.

- **Take into account the time needed to develop partnerships:** Often calls are short-sighted regarding the time they allow for building projects and implementing partnerships. There should be continuity with partners throughout the funding periods.
- **Clear and transparent processes** in the allocation of funds (e.g., clear scoring of applications through calls for proposals, detailing evaluation criteria, make applications and rejections transparent).
- Further develop **capacity building** on solving multi-funding challenges for both Managing Authorities who implement the programmes and of beneficiaries, local stakeholders and administrations who will receive multi-funding. The Estonian example where the Ministry of Finance in co-operation with the National Association of Municipalities initiated a process of central coordination of municipal human resources can be seen as an effort to create additional capacities at the local level for efficient and strategic use of multiple funds (see Annexes for additional information).

Box 6. Strengthening capacities of local governments through coordination of training activities in Estonia

Human resources of local authorities play a vital role in achieving governmental strategic goals and implementing activities funded by the EU during the upcoming programming period. However, every responsible ministry or Managing Authority tends to have a separate approach on how to involve and capacitate local authorities. In order to increase effectiveness and find synergies in the field of capacity development of human resources in municipalities, Estonia developed a coordination plan, covering the following aspects:

- Development of an institutional framework for the central coordination of local government training activities
- Defining priorities across ministries and related activities
- Development of an inter-ministerial coordination model
- Establishing a link with national central training planning
- Development of the Association of Estonian Cities and Municipalities (AECM) competence and local government network
- Stakeholder mapping and analysis (role of private sector and university partners in implementing the business model)
- Establishing central coordination in the planning of horizontal priority areas in the development of local government human resources (three priority areas: (1) managing quality, (2) professional staff, (3) development of HR managers)
- Central training of public sector managers + development of development programs
- More systematic assessment and planning of training needs in policy development (and SF

measures)

- Supporting the network of local governments' HR managers (in AECM)

Box 7. Strengthening the capacity of Monitoring Committee members in Hungary

In Hungary, the Central coordination of EU funds developed a series of workshops entitled 'Development Academy evaluation workshops' for the benefit of Monitoring Committee (MC) members involved in different operational programmes (different funds) and for Managing Authorities. Through exchanges between MC members and MAs involved in different funds and operational programmes, the Academy allowed for sharing of experience, developing synergies, improving design of the programmes as well as improved implementation and evaluation of the funds.

MC members can discuss this information at the workshop and hopefully use this information to enhance their MC work. Evaluators and commissioners of evaluations (central coordination) benefit from learning about different evaluation methods applied by the various funds e.g., impact monitoring which has been used in the evaluation of the Rural Development Programme, and would be useful to be applied in the evaluation of other funds to provide useful evidence throughout the programming period.

- Multi-funding should be **legally possible** in all EU MS. MS hence should be encouraged to apply multi-funding wherever possible.
- **Promote a long-term and integrated approach in the use of the funds** that allow the effective use of funds in a combined manner (within the same programme or between different programmes), reflecting and taking advantage of the opportunities offered by the seven-year long CPR funds framework.

Box 8. Regional multi-fund informal coordination in Sweden

Bridging the gaps between regional- and national-level partnerships, several regions have tested informal gatherings of the key actors in ESF, ERDF, EAFRD and EMFAF funding. The informal meetings of key actors in the MAs of the different funds allow for a flexible and agile guidance on the utilisation of these funds to meet local needs. In a similar manner to what has been done in West Sweden, Upper Norrland Region facilitates joint meetings of the various EU funds under the leadership of the County Administrations (County Administrations of Norrland and Västerbotten). The practice makes possible the geographic coordination of various actors, funds and partnerships to enable ad hoc multi-fund implementation.

In order to cooperate between funds and programmes, a fund coordination group, called Fondsamordning Övre Norrland (FÖN) was constituted jointly between Norrbotten and Västerbotten counties. Both administrative authorities at regional level, as well as regional development officers participate. Joint training is conducted, and joint meetings are held 2-3 times a year where operational managers and administrators meet for learning and to exchange experiences. Synergies at a regional level between programmes and better flow of information of funding opportunities is the result.

3) The case of CLLD (Community-led local development) and ITI (Integrated Territorial Investments)

CLLD and ITI are two mechanisms developed to improve coordination and more targeted use of ESIF. CLLD is a specific method for the local level, based on community initiatives, it is by nature bottom-up and aims at strengthening synergies between local actors, both public and private and to address the specific needs of the local area.

ITI is another tool suited for local level integrated development through simplified financing. It is traditionally – but not exclusively – used in more urban areas. With ITI, the Managing Authority can (not mandatory) designate intermediary bodies which can be a local authority or a non-governmental organisation.

Both approaches are, in principle, facilitating the combination of different ESIF targeted local actions and present a number of added values, some listed below. In practice, the combination of funds is still relatively rare due to several remaining difficulties, for which we suggest the following recommendations:

- **CLLD and ITI should have more independence from national public administration.** Local initiatives, projects, problems, etc. can be easily managed in the community. Therefore, CLLD and ITI mechanisms should be independent enough to address the challenges using a specific approach.
- Strengthen **empowerment of stakeholders.** With both ITI and CLLD, local stakeholders, local and regional governments and communities are empowered to act and decide on development and investment priorities for the territory they live in. The tools help strengthen the administrative capacities of the local stakeholders, promote social inclusion and combat poverty, climate crisis, support SMEs and contribute to investing in education, skills and lifelong learning. Local stakeholders also might need guidance, which clearly explains EU long-term priorities, i.e., energy efficiency and renewable energy instead of fossil fuels.
- **Acting locally is better.** ITI and CLLD make it easier for smaller or rural municipalities and communities or to less developed regions to access EU fundings which are otherwise more targeted at larger scale projects. Since they are implemented at the local level and involve various stakeholders, they are in

general highly appreciated by the stakeholders and contribute to bringing EU policies closer to the citizens.

- **Deeper focus on social economy.** Building on local communities, ITI and CLLD should foster the development of social economy enterprises, especially with CLLD in rural areas.
- **Multi-funding possibility of ITI and CLLD should be further exploited.** Multi-funding used through ITI and CLLD allows for de facto stronger coordination between the different fund managing authorities. Moreover, CLLD and ITI need a clear, simple and feasible legal framework to address different funds and create synergies, so that a multi-funding approach is not only possible but recommended.
- Some of the remaining difficulties for implementation of ITI CLLD are often related to heavy administrative burden at national levels (e.g., IT systems are not always adequate to implement the EU funding) but there are also **remaining complexities of Cohesion Policy funds in general**. In addition, sometimes the investment and policy priorities in the country (guided by thematic concentration) do not fit with local and regional stakeholders' needs which actually limits the possibilities of addressing the specific local priorities.

Box 9. Integrated and cross-sectoral approach in Tyrol (AT) through CLLD multi-funding

For successful green and digital transformations there is a strong need for coordination between funds on all levels and also for strong commitment at the local level. The local level is one major driver of the transformation and with CLLD they have a relevant tool, where the local level can decide on their own. Tyrol region in Austria is combining the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) to finance through CLLD cross-sectoral development at the local level. To avoid double structure for the local stakeholders, the region put in place a “one-stop-shop”, allowing for the use of synergies between programmes and projects. In view of alleviating the administrative burden with two different funds, Tyrol is using the “Lead-Fund” approach, in this case, CLLD follows the rules and procedures of EAFRD even though also using ERDF funding, but this was facilitated by the fact that ERDF and EAFRD rules were already similar at national level.

4) Complementarity of funds and the Partnership Principle

- Partnership Agreements are a useful tool to ensure complementarities and the absence of overlaps between the funds. When new funds are created, either within the ESIF (e.g., Just Transition Funds) or outside (e.g., Recovery and Resilience Fund), the Member States and the Commission should ensure the programming of new funds is consistent with what was already agreed in the Partnership Agreement.
- Partnership Agreements must be drafted following an effective consultation of all “Code of Conduct” partners and the agreement signed with the European Commission should reflect this consultation process.

Box 10. Developing flagship projects through multi-stakeholder and multi-level partnerships for Business Development

In **Denmark**, the elaboration of flagship projects is done through partnerships, gathering four categories of stakeholder from both public and private sectors:

- The relevant ministries
- The local business hub
- The Danish Board of Business development
- And a broad consortium responsible for carrying EU-funded activities

The partnerships meet usually twice a year to discuss and monitor the progress of the flagship projects.

Similarly, **Romania** took action to promote business development by making EU funding more accessible regardless of the specific funds involved. In 2017, the country was severely behind the rest of the EU on SME development, especially in its underdeveloped regions. The Ministry of Business, Trade and Entrepreneurship Environment together with other stakeholders created the “Start Up Nation” programme. Credit and knowledge on SMEs were made available to SMEs via commercial banks. A national Credit Guarantee Fund made it possible to get loans to SMEs. SMEs received a critical boost thanks to the action.

- Implementing the Partnership Principle is a long-term process, it doesn't stop with the signing of the Partnership Agreement. This means that regular exchanges should happen between all relevant actors throughout the implementation process to ensure funds are used in a complementary manner (e.g., ensuring various calls within each programme are consistent, do not overlap in terms of both timeline and content).
- Communication and transparency towards stakeholders and beneficiaries (equal standards for all funds) is crucial especially with regard to transparency in decision making, the taking up (or not) of feedback from stakeholders when writing the programmes, etc.
- The ideal form is a systematic support (from Technical Assistance) for coordination, capacity-building, networking, and financial support of socio-environmental partners' participation on programming, monitoring and supporting synergies, i.e. [Project Partnership in Slovakia](#) is an example of good practice.
- The Partnership Principle should apply to all EU funds (CPR and non-CPR) and policies which are, at the end of the day, implemented at the local and regional level. This is particularly true for investments and reforms related funds that have impact at the local level on local administrations (cities and municipalities) or business such as the Recovery and Resilience Fund, the European semester process or the upcoming reform of EU economic governance.

Code	Title	Region	Issue/Challenge	Submitter
AT01	Integrated, cross-sectoral approach in Tyrol through CLLD-Multifund (LEADER/EAFRD], IGJ/ERDF and ETC/ERDF)	Tyrol	CLLD-Multi-fund approach effects good governance not only horizontally but also vertically between EU, national, regional and local level. It enables to bring Europe closer to the citizens and to empower local actors.	Martin Traxl, Department Landesentwicklung ("EU regional policies"), Austria/Tyrol, 17th November 2022
DK01	Partnership Development for Flagships, Case Business Lighthouses	National	Partnership agreements between stakeholders	
EE01	Central coordination of local government training activities	National	Human resources in local authorities play a vital role in achieving governmental strategic goals and implementing activities funded by EU during the upcoming programming period. However, every responsible ministry/MA tends to have a separate approach how to involve and capacitate local authorities.	Kadri Tillemann, Saue Municipality, 13.09.2022
EE02	Joint planning and drafting process for Recovery and Resilience Facility and MFF 2021-2027	National	Separate planning for each different EU fund can create excessive bureaucracy and lead to non-complementary or even contradicting investments between funds	Johanna Kuld, Estonian Green Movement, Estonia, 18th November 2022
EE03	Joint monitoring committee for 2021-2027 cohesion policy (ERDF+CF+JTF) & Recovery and Resilience Facility (RRF)	National	Different ministries and institutions are responsible for carrying out and monitoring the implementation of various EU-funded programmes and projects.	

FI01	Coordination group for funding authorities (in the field of migration and integration)	National	Initially the need for the group was based on the migration situation in 2015-2016 and the need to coordinate the funding for asylum, migration and integration measures, and to ensure synergies.	Kristiina Mauriala, Ministry of the Interior, Finland, 11.11.2022
FI02	Regional Project Mills	Various regions	Promoting synergies and aligning EU and national funds with regional needs and interests, including with the needs of migrant communities.	Kristiina Mauriala, Ministry of the Interior, Finland, 11.11.2022
FR01	Guide for complementarity between RRF and cohesion funds	Various regions	Cohesion funds: End of 14-20 programming period and obligation to use the funds before 2023. RRF: Same topics as those of cohesion funds to be used in a limited time period. Same beneficiaries between these funds.	
HR01	AMIF/ESF+ integration process, ISF/ERDF – Security in public spaces, BMVI/ERDF – Border management, CP funds/other funds (EAFRD)	National	Potential partnership between EU funds in MS to coordinate projects on the beneficiary level in order to achieve the highest possible level of synergy.	Terezija Gras, State Secretary, Ministry of the Interior/Croatia, November 2022
HU01	Development Academy evaluation workshops (as part of series of similar events) and related coordination among ESF, ERDF, CF and Rural Development	National	Evaluation findings, recommendations and methodological solutions (monitoring of impacts) need to be shared by the various experts of Funds and OPs so as to learn good practices in terms of OP design and implementation and evaluation of OPs. This partnership event aims at developing synergies, better design, implementation and	Henriette Kiss, Dept for Monitoring & Evaluation, Prime Minister's Office, Hungary, 14 November 2022

	Programme		evaluation of OPs and Funds, as well as enhance MC members' work quality.	
PL01	Working Group on the Just Transition Fund	Lower Silesia	JTF is a new fund that aims to mitigate the effects of the energy transformation. It can support both infrastructural investments (ERDF) and soft investments (ESF+). Since the support and the nature of the fund is new and there is no experience in its implementation, it is necessary to exchange experiences and cooperate with all interested parties in the programming of support and, later, at the implementation stage, coordination of activities, monitoring and evaluation. The experience of various partners in the field of ERDF and ESF+ will certainly be helpful in launching support from the new JTF fund.	Łukasz Kasprzak, Marshal's Office of Lower Silesia, Poland/Lower Silesia, 18 November 2022
RO01	Complementarity of partnerships through LEADER financing mechanisms 2014-2020	National	The partnership through LEADER programme assumed the existence of the following entities: Local Public Administrations (rural, and by exception urban) which can form a homogeneous territory and SMEs/NGOs from the territory. The objective of the partnership was to analyse and identify the local needs of the territory and also to ensure the financing mechanism of the projects necessary to ensure the development of the territory through projects.	Oana Cătălina ȚĂPURICĂ, Romania/București, 2nd of October, 2022

RO02	Complementarity of funds through CLLD 2014-2020	National	The partnership to form a CLLD assumed the existence of the following entities: a Local Public Administrations (urban only) and local representative/relevant institutions (like social assistance departments, hospitals, museums, schools, and so on).The objective of the partnership was to analyse and identify the local needs of the territory, especially in marginalized and underdeveloped areas, and also to ensure the financing mechanism of the projects necessary to ensure the development of the territory.	Oana Cătălina ȚĂPURICĂ, Romania/București, 2nd of October, 2022
RO03	Complementary of funds through R&D knowledge transfer activities	National	Case study of complementary of funds from national programmes to international financing programmes used for R&D knowledge transfer activities in a research institute from Romania	Oana Cătălina ȚĂPURICĂ, Romania/București, 2nd of October, 2022
RO04	“RENASC – National Network for the Promotion of Reproductive Health through Integrated Public Policies”	National	The project's mission was to develop a network through a partnership between public and private stakeholders in order to actively involve various and relevant actors in the Reproductive health field with the mission to monitor and evaluate existing public policies.	PhD. Associate Prof. Iolanda Mihalache, President of PartNET Association - Partnership for Sustainable Development, Romania, September 14, 2022
RO05	Szekler Product Brand	Harghita County	The main reason for choosing this good practice is that meanwhile several investments and funding were supported on mostly national and urban level, the focus from the less developed regions slowly started to fade away in priorities during the years.	Csaba Borboly, President, Harghita County Council, Romania

RO06	Green Infrastructure (GI) funding measure/ interventions elaborated in the SaveGREEN project1 https://www.inter-reg-danube.eu/approved-projects/savegreen/section/transnational-experience-exchange-workshops	Macro-regional	An Inter-reg project's proposal for Green Infrastructure funding interventions has been developed, as a response to the fact that while sufficient EU funding is often allocated to biodiversity conservation and Green Infrastructure, specific measures under the respective funding programmes are missing as a prerequisite for opening calls.	Antoanela Costea & Andreea Danciu, WWF Romania, Romania/Europe 18.11.2022
RO07	Start Up Nation – The beginning	National	In 2017, Romania had a low density of SMEs compared to its population, less than half than the average from European Union, the main issue being the lack of capital required to start a business.	
SE01	Multi-funded CLLD/LEADER experiences 2014-2020	National	The triple-partnerships of the LAG and CLLD project level is considered the programme's key to success. However, SME involvement in community projects remains difficult without EU or national state aid business investment grants.	Robert Hall, RELEARN Suderbyn, Sweden/Gotland, 30 August 2022
SE02	Upper Norrland Fund Coordination Group, FÖN	Upper Norrland	The group in two adjacent counties creates synergistic effects at a regional level between the efforts in the four funding programmes. The funds involved have different geographic areas for their partnership.	Robert Hall, RELEARN Suderbyn, Sweden/Gotland, 30 August 2022