Workshop about people-to-people projects in cross-borders contexts

- Rüdiger Kubsch, Euroregion Elbe/Labe (D/CZ)
- Toralf Schiwietz, Euroregion PRO EUROPA VIADRINA (D/PL)
- Pavel Branda, Euroregion Neiße-Nisa-Nysa (D/CZ/PL)
- Marcin Filip, Euroregion Beskidy (PL/SK/CZ)
- Michal Patúš, Region of Žilina (SK, PL/CZ)
Agenda

1. 10:00 – 10:15 Welcome
2. 10:15 – 10:45 History, purpose and structure of Euroregions – example of Euroregion Elbe/Labe
3. 10:45 – 11:30 Character and benefits of people-to-people projects in a cross-border context

coffee break

4. 12:00 – 12:15 Funding of people-to-people projects – current example of the Euroregion Elbe/Labe
5. 12:15 – 13:00 Different possibilities of funding people-to-people projects
6. 13:00 – 13:30 Open discussion

lunch buffet with more talks
1. Welcome – and where we come from

Rüdiger Kubsch
Euroregion Elbe/Labe (D/CZ)

Toralf Schiwietz
Euroregion PRO EUROPA Viadrina (D/PL)

Pavel Branda
Euroregion Neiße-Nisa-Nysa (D/CZ/PL)

Marcin Filip
Euroregion Beskidy (PL/SK/CZ)

Michal Patúš
Region of Žilina (SK, PL/CZ)
2. History, purpose and structure of Euroregions – example of Euroregion Elbe/Labe

Rüdiger Kubsch
2. History, purpose and structure of Euroregions – example of Euroregion Elbe/Labe

- about 1.3 Mio. inhabitants
  - D: 791,000
  - CZ: 500,000 (265,000 in 70 member municipalities)
- 4,800 km²
2. History, purpose and structure of Euroregions – example of Euroregion Elbe/Labe

• founded in 1992 on initiative from Czech side
• voluntary community of interests, no legal entity
• formed by two legal entities:
  – Kommunalgemeinschaft Euroregion Oberes Elbtal/Osterzgebirge e.V.
    • registered association (under private law)
    • City of Dresden, County of Sächsische Schweiz-Osterzgebirge, City of Pirna, City of Dippoldiswalde
    • annual budget of about 250,000 Euro
  – Euroregion Labe
    • municipalities association (public body)
    • 70 municipalities between 77 and 90,000 inhabitants
    • annual budget of about 30,000 Euro
2. History, purpose and structure of Euroregions – example of Euroregion Elbe/Labe

General purpose:
“propagation and promotion of international mindedness, tolerance and reconciliation on all areas,
of culture and the idea of international understanding
to preserve and stabilize the foundations of the community in the border areas”

(from statute of KG Euroregion)
2. History, purpose and structure of Euroregions – example of Euroregion Elbe/Labe

by means of:

- cooperation in **regional planning**
- preservation and improvement of **natural resources**
- increasing the **economic capacities** and equalizing the standards of living
- upgrading and adapting cross-border **infrastructure**
- cooperation in the areas of **fire brigades, disaster control and emergency response**
- improving cross-border **public transport**
- cooperation in the areas of **tourism** and **sport**
- cultural exchange and preservation of common **cultural heritage**
- improving the populations opportunities to **meet cross-border**
- cooperation in **humanitarian and social fields** as well as in **education**

(from statute of Euroregion Elbe/Labe)
2. History, purpose and structure of Euroregions – example of Euroregion Elbe/Labe

**EUROREGION ELBE/LABE**

- **Kommunalgemeinschaft Euroregion**
  - General Assembly
  - Executive committee
  - Board
  - 4 members

- **Euroregion Labe**
  - General Assembly
  - Executive committee
  - Board
  - 70 members

- **Joint council**
  - 7 bi-national expert working groups
2. History, purpose and structure of Euroregions –
example of Euroregion Elbe/Labe

What we actually do:

• administration of funding of P2P projects
• promotion of cross-border projects by counseling players from very early stages up to final project settlements
• realizing own cross-border projects of the expert working groups
• providing information and news about the other country
• participation in INTERREG V A program (monitoring committee)
• lobbying for border regions on EU, national and state level
• provide cross-border expert input in many fields for different stakeholders
• promotion of and participation in international exchange of experiences
2. History, purpose and structure of Euroregions – example of Euroregion Elbe/Labe

Questions?
3. Character and benefits of people-to-people projects in a cross-border context

Toralf Schiwietz
Characters and benefits of people-to-people projects in a cross-border context
Agenda

1. Characters of P2P projects

2. Examples of P2P projects implemented during the program period 2007-3013 in the following Euroregions
   - Sønderjylland-Schleswig
   - Pomerania
   - PRO EUROPA VIADRINA (PEV)
   - Spree-Neiße-Bober (SNB)
   - Beskidy
   - Erzgebirge

3. Benefits of P2P projects
1. Character of people-to-people projects

**Quantity**

- **Number of participants** (all social groups and ages)
- **Number of different fields/subjects** (e.g. culture, sports, youth, tourism etc.)
- **Kind of beneficiaries** (self-governments, NGO`s)
- **Flexibility** of the instrument
- **Wide territorial reach**

**Quality**

- **Empowerment** for cross-border cooperation
- **Continuity** of cross-border cooperation
- **Creativity** in (rural) cross-border areas
2. Examples of P2P projects (2007-3013)
• Partners:
  ➢ Stadt Guben
  ➢ Dom kultury Gubin
• EFRD-Co-financing: 3.286 EUR
• 2013-2014

➢ 24 children discover their housing area and create flyers about interesting places in Guben and Gubin
Workshop on cross-border P2P projects, Brussels, 09.02.2017

**Empowerment**

- **Partners:**
  - Stowarzyszenie Szeroki Kąt Widzenia (NGO), Gorzów Wlkp.,
  - Schloss Trebnitz (NGO), Müncheberg
- **EFRD-Co-financing:** 11.908 EUR
- **2014**

- Seminars for adults and youths.
- Short film interviews.
- Poles and Germans who were relocated after World War II talk about their experiences.
Workshop on cross-border P2P projects, Brussels, 09.02.2017

• Partners:
  ➢ Stowarzyszenie Romów w Polsce (Roma-Assocation in Poland)
  • EFRD –Co-financing: 24.723 EUR
  • 2010

• Empowerment

  ➢ 5 meetings and 1 workshop
  ➢ young Poles, Roma and Slovakians
  ➢ culture, history and tourism in the Beskidy region
• Partners: Partners:
  ➢ Stiftung Europa Universität Viadrina
  ➢ Förderverein Schloß Trebnitz
  ➢ Collegium Polonicum, Słubice
• EFRD-Co-financing: 38.320 EUR
• 2010

- Intercultural trainings at 5 Universities in the region
- After the training students visit schools and share their competences
• Partners:
  ➢ Bürgerschule Husum
  ➢ Tønder Grundskole
• 2013

➢ Theater project
➢ Children from 4 classes sing and act together
➢ Languages of the play: German and Danish
• Partners:
  ➢ Ochotnicze Wodne Pogotowie Ratunkowe Woj. Zachodniopomorskiego (Freiwilliger Wasserrettungsdienst der Wojewodschaft Zachodniopomorskie)
  ➢ Deutsches Rotes Kreuz Anklam
• EFRD-Co-financing: 20.067 EUR

➢ Common trainings for lifeguards
➢ Baltic See
➢ 80 participants
• Partners:
  ➢ Beskidzkie Towarzystwo Cyklistów
  ➢ Turcanska Bicyklova Skupina JUS
  ➢ EFRD – Co-financing: 37,514 EUR

➢ Planning and building of cycle infrastructure (road signposts)
➢ cycle paths/tracks Bielska – Biała (Poland) - Martin (Slovakia) (140 KM).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Headquarters in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Frankfurt (Oder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Gorzów Wlkp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Szczecin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFRD Co-financing: 51.000 EUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Six 2-weeks seminars
- German and Polish lessons
- Workshops: specific legislation and regulations
- Common trainings
• Partners:
  - Kreisfeuerwehrverein Mecklenburgische Seenplatte e.V.
  - Ochotnicza Straż Pożarna Stanomino
• EFRD-Co-financing: 2.045 EUR
• 2014

- Common firefighter trainings
- Structure of firefighter brigades
- Firefighting: Biogas und Photovoltaic Systems
• Partners:
  – Naturschutzpark Märkische Schweiz e.V.
  – Gimnazjum im. M. Kopernika w Witnicy
• EFRD Co-financing: 51,000 EUR
• 2010-2011

- German and polish children, 12-14 years old
- Creating of routs for cycling, walking, riding, canoeing
- GPS, internet, mobile
- 120 participants
- Partners:
  - Stadt Eberswalde - Kulturamt
  - Uniwersytet Szczecin
  - EFRD-Co-financing: 15,897 EUR

- New and wider offer in the museum in Eberswalde
- Possibilities to organize school classes at the museum
- Created by students
- Courses: history, sustainability, future
Partners:
- Euroregion Spree-Neiße-Bober e.V.
- Partner: Euroregion Sprewa-Nysa-Bóbr

EFRD-Co-financing: 14,875 EUR
2014-2015

- Analysis of consequences of the demographic changes in the Euroregion SNB
- Analysis of possibilities to react to the new situation in a cross-border region
• Partners:
  ➢ Fundacja Ludzie – Innowacje – Design
  ➢ Základná škola - Žilina
• EFRD-Co-financing: 48.025 EUR
• 2013-2014

➢ Pro ecological education programme
➢ Attractive and modern multimedia technics
➢ Using of renewable energy
• Partners:
  ➢ Stadt Frankfurt (Oder)
  ➢ Gmina i Miasto Słubice
• EFRD-Co-financing: 10,080 EUR
• 2012

➢ Support for establishing a cross-border bus route Frankfurt (Oder) - Słubice
➢ Intercultural trainings for bus drivers
➢ German-polish timetable
8 children from Germany and 8 children from Czechia
Rehearsing the play “Pippi Longstocking” by Astrid Lindgren
Play in both languages
Shown several times in Germany and Czechia
Continuity

• Partners:
  ➢ Verein für Freizeit und Breitensport Eisenhüttenstadt
  ➢ Klub Sportowy LKS "Alfa" Jaramirowice
• EFRD-Co-financing (2016): 2,535 EUR
• 2010-2016 (each year)

➢ Indoor football tournament for 4-8 teams
➢ Takes place every year since 2004
Example

Financial report

- Beneficiary: Verein für Freizeit und Breitensport Eisenhüttenstadt
- Indoor football tournament
- 2 days
- 200 participants
Example: Municipalities Brieskow Finkenheerd and Cybinka

- Location
- Historical background
- Budget
2007 - first edition of a common summer festival (without co-financing)

Continuation of the common summer festival (2010: EFRD-Co-financing: 3.295 EUR)

Continuation of the common summer festival (2015: EDRF-Co-financing: 7.000 EUR)

2009 – first festival with EU-Funding
• EFRD-Co-financing: 5.851 EUR
• Participants: 120

2010 – german and polish lessons for children at the age of 11-12 in schools in Ziltendorf and Cybinka,
• EFRD-Co-financing: 1.645 EUR
• Participants: 100

2013 – planning and building of cycle infrastructure
• EFRD-Co-financing: 27.225 EUR
• Participants: 100

2011 - camp for junior volunteer fire brigades
• EFRD-Co-financing: 3.007 EUR
• Participants: 60

2013 – feasibility analysis for a ferry between Aurith and Urad
• EFRD-Co-financing: 9.659 EUR
• Participants: 25
Example: Cities Friedland and Sulęcin

- Location
- Background
- Budget
2009 – polish partner-municipality takes part in “Friedland Meeting”
  • EFRD-Co-financing: 5.100 EUR
  • Participants: 250

2010 – a meeting for 9-11 years old children EFRD-Co-financing: 519 EUR
  • Participants: 50

Continuation of regular meetings of children, adults and seniors
  e.g.: 2011: establishing of a Information- and Documentary Center for Children and Youths
  • EDRF-Co-financing: 32.913 EUR
  • Participants: 180

2011: Analyses and documentation of the cycle paths/tracks between Friedland and Sulęcin
  • EDRF-Co-financing: 16.200 EUR
  • Participants: 90

Continuation of regular meetings of children, adults and seniors
  e.g.: 2015: Workshop “10 years of partnership”
  • EDRF-Co-financing: 2.218 EUR
  • Participants: 50

2014 – planning and building of a cycle way between Pieskow, Niewisch, Friedland and Sulęcin
  • EFRD-Co-financing: 500.000 EUR
Municipality partnerships
Regular and people-to-people projects
(Evaluation report OP PL-BB 2007-2013)
3. Benefits of P2P projects

- Building up partnerships
- Maintaining a reliable and ongoing cross-border cooperation
  - Continuity of municipal partnerships
  - Support for local ideas and NGO’s
- Promoting intercultural competences
  - Advertising the principle of tolerance
  - Trust building
  - Overcoming prejudices
- Promoting the European idea
- Forming the people’s own present and future without political dictation
- Developing chances / Implement common visions / solutions to reduce deficits
  - Exchange of experiences (within and between cross-border regions)
  - Efficient development of large-scale projects / investments (INTERREG and others)
- Addressed to all people / whole program region
- Flexible funding instrument
3. Character and benefits of people-to-people projects in a cross-border context

Questions?
Coffee break
4. Funding of people-to-people projects – current example of the Euroregion Elbe/Labe

Rüdiger Kubsch
4. Funding of people-to-people projects – current example of the Euroregion Elbe/Labe

- project „Kleinprojektfonds in der Euroregion Elbe/Labe“ (small project fund)
- funded by INTERREG V A Saxony-Czech Republic and some national supplements
- under thematic objective 11
- Lead partner: Kommunalgemeinschaft Euroregion (D)
- Project partner: Euroregion Labe (CZ)
- equal projects in all Saxon-Czech Euroregions
4. Funding of people-to-people projects – current example of the Euroregion Elbe/Labe

- started in October 2015
- runs until 31.12.2022
- P2P projects can run until 30.06.2021
- output indicator: 260 institutions participated in funded projects
### 4. Funding of people-to-people projects – current example of the Euroregion Elbe/Labe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EU funding</th>
<th>National funding</th>
<th>Own share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.005.328,00 €</td>
<td>70.750,00 €</td>
<td>283.131,41 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG Euroregion (D)</td>
<td>(85%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.750,00 €</td>
<td>283.131,41 €</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.831.311,40 €</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euroregion Labe (CZ)</td>
<td>1.442.516,50 €</td>
<td>38.184,26 €</td>
<td>216.377,47 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(85%)</td>
<td>(2,25%)</td>
<td>(12,75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.184,26 €</td>
<td>216.377,47 €</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2,25%)</td>
<td>(12,75%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.480.700,76 €</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12,95%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.447.844,50 €</td>
<td>108.934,26 €</td>
<td>499.508,88 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(85%)</td>
<td>(2,7%)</td>
<td>(12,3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108.934,26 €</td>
<td>499.508,88 €</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2,7%)</td>
<td>(12,3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.198.438,14 €</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13,4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**equal funding in all 4 Saxon-Czech Euroregions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administration (max.)</th>
<th>Project funding (min.)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>712.150,59 €</td>
<td>1.647.058,82 €</td>
<td>2.359.209,41 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG Euroregion (D)</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(70%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>712.150,59 €</td>
<td>1.647.058,82 €</td>
<td>2.359.209,41 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(70%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.359.209,41 €</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euroregion Labe (CZ)</td>
<td>261.404,35 €</td>
<td>1.435.673,88 €</td>
<td>1.697.078,23 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td>(85%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>261.404,35 €</td>
<td>1.435.673,88 €</td>
<td>1.697.078,23 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td>(85%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.697.078,23 €</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>973.554,94 €</td>
<td>3.082.732,70 €</td>
<td>4.056.287,64 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24%)</td>
<td>(76%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>973.554,94 €</td>
<td>3.082.732,70 €</td>
<td>4.056.287,64 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24%)</td>
<td>(76%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.056.287,64 €</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Funding of people-to-people projects – current example of the Euroregion Elbe/Labe

Funded activities:

• seminars, conferences, informational events
• meetings, exchange of experiences, cultural and sport events
• exchange activities, esp. for children, teenagers, pupils and students
• educational activities, incl. modules for language skills improvement
• PR for the border region, multilingual publications and information material
• analyses in preparation of large projects in the INTERREG V A program
• development of information and communication systems for the border region
4. Funding of people-to-people projects –
current example of the Euroregion Elbe/Labe

Prerequisites:

• two project partners from the INTERREG V A SN-CZ program region (can be from different Euroregions)
  – D: legal entity of public or private law
  – CZ: public administration, educational institutions, NGOs, chambers, professional and enterprise associations

• common personnel, planning and realization

• no common financing

• max. total costs: 30,000 €

• min. total costs: 3,000 € (D), 1,500 € (CZ)
4. Funding of people-to-people projects – current example of the Euroregion Elbe/Labe

Eligible costs:

• direct costs
  – services (long detailed list)
  – PR material
  – websites, IT systems
  – costs for participating in events
  – equipment (if necessary)

• personnel: 20% of sum of all costs above

• administration: 15% of personnel costs
4. Funding of people-to-people projects – current example of the Euroregion Elbe/Labe

Funding:

• 85%, max. 15.000 €

• revenues can be used to cover the own contribution
4. Funding of people-to-people projects – current example of the Euroregion Elbe/Labe

Application process:

- Optional consultation (LP, PP, Euroregion)
- Online and paper application (LP, PP)
- Formal and functional examination (Euroregion, D or CZ)
- Decision about funding (local committee)
- Funding contract (LP, Euroregion)
4. Funding of people-to-people projects – current example of the Euroregion Elbe/Labe

Project realization

P2P project is being realized (LP, PP)

On-site controlling in 10% of all P2P projects (Euroregion)
4. Funding of people-to-people projects – current example of the Euroregion Elbe/Labe

Accounting process

1 mo. Submitting final settlement and bills (LP)

2 wk. Short formal review (Euroregion, D or CZ)

1 mo. In-depth checks (INTERREG V A, D or CZ)

max. 3 mo. Information about result to Euroregion

Quarterly disbursement request (Euroregion D)

max. 3 mo. Disbursement of admin and project funding to Euroregion (D)

Transfer to beneficiary (Euroregion D)

Happy beneficiary (LP)

corrections

additional notes

with cuts

max.
4. Funding of people-to-people projects – current example of the Euroregion Elbe/Labe

What could be improved?

1. pre-financing

2. less bureaucracy, faster processes

3. common standards of interpreting regulations (reliability)

4. monitoring and evaluation
4. Funding of people-to-people projects – current example of the Euroregion Elbe/Labe

Questions?
5.
Different possibilities of funding people-to-people projects

Toralf Schiwietz
5. Different possibilities of funding P2P projects

1. Short history of implementation
2. Comments to alternative possibilities
3. Summary / Conclusions
Implementation P2P-Projects - Administrative Structure (D / PL; BB – Woj. Lubuskie)

1997 - 2004

Level

Program:
- 2 structures

P2P-Project:
- 4 Projects
- 4 Beneficiaries

Germany
Rules:
- EU
- Program (EU + D; INTERREG)
- National (D)

Poland
Rules:
- EU
- Program (EU + PL; Phare/ CBC)
- National (PL)

Benefits

Operation

1997 - 2004
Implementation P2P-Projects - Administrative Structure (D / PL; BB – Woj. Lubuskie)

**2004 - 2006**

**Level**

**Program:**
- 2 structures

**P2P-Project:**
- 4 Projects
- 4 Beneficiaries

**Germany**
**Rules:**
- EU
- Program (EU + D; INTERREG)
- National (D)

**Poland**
**Rules:**
- EU
- Program (EU + PL; INTERREG)
- National (PL)

**Operation**
- Beneficiary
- MA
- FLC
- MC

**Beneficiary**
- Operation
- MA
- FLC
- MC

**Operation**
Implementation P2P-Projects - Administrative Structure (D / PL; BB – Woj. Lubuskie)

2007 - 2013

Level

Program:
- 1 structure

Germany
Rules:
- EU
- Program (EU + D; INTERREG)
- National (D)

Poland
Rules:
- EU
- Program (EU + PL; INTERREG)
- National (PL)

P2P-Project:
- 4 Projects
- 4 Beneficiaries
- Leadpartner-principle

FLC

MA (PL; D)

FLC

MC

Beneficiary

Operation

Beneficiary

Operation

Workshop on cross-border P2P projects, Brussels, 09.02.2017
Implementation P2P-Projects - Administrative Structure (D / PL; BB – Woj. Lubuskie)

2014 - 2020

Level

Program:
- 1 structure

P2P-Project:
- 2 Projects
- 2 Beneficiaries
- Leadpartner-principle
- Flat rates

Germany
Rules:
- EU
- Program (EU + D; INTERREG)
- National (D)

Poland
Rules:
- EU
- Program (EU + PL; INTERREG)
- National (PL)

FLC

MA (D; PL)

MC

Beneficiary

P-Partner

Operation

Operation
Implementation P2P-Projects – comments to alternative possibilities (f.e.: D / PL; BB – Woj. Lubuskie)

2021+

Level

Program:
- 1 structure

P2P-Project:
- 2 Projects
- 2 Beneficiaries
- Leadpartner-principle
- Flat rates

Germany
Rules:
- EU
- Program (EU + D; INTERREG)
- National (D)

Poland
Rules:
- EU
- Program (EU + PL; INTERREG)
- National (PL)

FLC
MA (D; PL)
FLC

MC

Beneficiary
P-Partner

Operation
Operation

MA as EGTC:
- new structure
- national rules will be kept valid
- little advantage (FLC)
- less advantage in communication

ER (P2P) as Intermediate body:
- less advantage (FLC; procedures)
- technical assistance

P2P as EGTC:
- voluntarily build up
- 1 more structure on regional level beside ERs
- less advantage (FLC; procedures, communication)
„Life-Cycle“ of P2P projects

Applicant

Operation

ER

Idea ➔ Workshop ➔ Application ➔ Project duration ➔ Workshop ➔ Financial report ➔ Continuation / new idea

- Finding and convincing project partners
- Developing the project idea
- Studying application rules
- Writing application
- Making adjustments
- Preparing project start

- Managing project activities
- Acting on funding-rules (f.e. information and promotion duties)
- Pre-financing
- Taking part in workshops (financial report)

- Preparing the financial report
- Meeting with the project partner
- Developing projects / new ideas
- Continuing partnership

- Managing project activities
- Pre-financing
- Taking part in workshops (financial report)

Support in preparing the financial report
- Check of the financial report
- Preparing financial report for First-Level-Control

- Empowerment: intercultural understanding; proj.-management
- Support in finding project partners
- Support in qualifying project
- Organization of workshops to develop projects
- Formal and content check
- Preparing of the funding-decision
- Organizing the Decision-Committee

- Support in managing the project activities
- Support in information and promotion duties
- Visit projects
- Organizing of workshops (financial report)
3. Summary / conclusions

P2P projects
- Empowering people to build up / maintain cross-border cooperation
- Promoting intercultural competences (tolerance; trust; overcoming prejudices)
- Forming the people’s own present and future without political dictation
- Develop chances / implementing common visions / solutions to reduce deficits
- Know-how-transfer / exchange of experiences (within / between CB regions)
- Efficient development of large-scale projects (INTERREG and others)
- Adressed to all people / whole program region / flexible funding instrument
- Promoting the European idea / cohesion policy of EU

Conclusions
- Current structures / procedures are running
- P2P projects under thematic objective 11 should be possible all over Europe
- P2P should be open for all thematic fields
- Trust to ER (mediator, manager, coach, …)
- Bottom up principle: regions should be able to build up suitable structures, procedures, to choose their regional objectives
Thank you very much for your attention!

Rüdiger Kubsch, Euroregion Elbe/Labe (D/CZ)
Toralf Schiwietz, Euroregion PRO EUROPA VIADRINA (D/PL)
Pavel Branda, Euroregion Neiße-Nisa-Nysa (D/CZ/PL)
Marcin Filip, Euroregion Beskidy (PL/SK/CZ)
Michal Patúš, Region of Žilina(SK, PL/CZ)