Interreg
EUROPEAN UNION
Danube Transnational Programme

# Danube Transnational Programme 2021-2027

A stream of cooperation

# TEMPLATE FOR INTERREG PROGRAMMES[1]

| | |
|---|---|
| CCI | |
| Title | Interreg Danube |
| Version | IP Version 1 |
| First year | |
| Last year | |
| Eligible from | |
| Eligible until | |
| Commission decision number | |
| Commission decision date | |
| Programme amending decision number | |
| Programme amending decision entry into force date | |
| NUTS regions covered by the programme | |
| Strand | |

[1] According to the Annex of the Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL on specific provisions for the European territorial cooperation goal (Interreg) supported by the European Regional Development Fund and external financing instruments, 29.5.2018, COM(2018) 374 final, integrating the council amendments as agreed in the provisional common understanding and the proposed alignment with the CPR by the EC, outcomes of the technical meeting of 23 January 2020.

# 1. Programme strategy: main development challenges and policy responses

## 1.1 Programme area (not required for Interreg C programmes)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(a), Article 17(9)(a)*

*Text field [2 000]*

The programme area with a territory of 1 083 945km² consists of a total number of fourteen countries making the macro-region with the highest number of participating countries out of all the transnational programmes of the European Union. The area covers regions of EU Member States (Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia), Accession Countries (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia), as well as Neighbouring Countries (Moldova and Ukraine). Apart from Germany and Ukraine, all states are part of the programme area with their entire territory.

There are some special "Danubian" transnationally related territorial features that are major factors in the cohesion of the whole macro-region owing to being a macro-region of borders. Territorial, economic and social cohesion features create transboundary (functional) areas to be managed and developed jointly on macro-regional level. One of the most decisive is related to the Danube's river system since the macro-region is based on the Danube River Basin which calls for joint water, risk and habitat management within transnational river basins. Low share of renewables despite of energy dependency is a joint feature that unites the region. Along with high biodiversity the outstanding cultural diversity with ethnic, religious and language groups build strong intercultural links and people-to-people bridges across nations and countries creating a shared "Danubian" space. The weak inclusiveness and social innovation of the macro-region causes socio-economic challenges on transnational level. The influencing zone of many cities of the region is truncated by the administrative borders creating transboundary functional urban areas and networks. Still high inequalities in relation to economic development, labour market and education in particular encourages the emergence of new territorialities, intensifying transnational migration, and spatially different consequences of ageing, depopulation, brain-drain, poverty and economic transition with regard to capital city regions versus rural peripheries and border areas and western regions versus eastern regions.

## 1.2 Summary of main joint challenges, taking into account economic, social and territorial disparities as well as inequalities, joint investment needs and complementarity and synergies with other forms of support, lessons-learnt from past experience and macro-regional strategies and sea-basin strategies where the programme area as a whole or partially is covered by one or more strategies.

**First draft text subject to revision and inclusion of information on lessons learned, synergies, macro-regional startegies, Covid-19 pandemic effects**

*Reference: Article 17(4)(b), Article 17(9)(b)*

*Text field [50 000]*

**Sustainable economic development**

Danube Region is characterised by large competitiveness gaps between the old, the new Member States and the non-EU countries, including their status within the regional innovation ecosystem. In this context, large social and professional categories have been left out from current flows of information and knowledge exchange: students, researchers, teachers, businessmen and other professionals with direct interest in being part of innovation cycles. Across Danube Region, there is a low share of technology and knowledge-intensive activities. The RDI activities are overly concentrated within the western regions or the major urban hubs, including capital cities or university towns. Another main challenge derives from the non-matching innovation profiles of the DR countries e.g. there are heavily unbalanced RDI expenditures and knowledge management capacities. Current scientific and technological transnational cooperation are hindered by factors such as different levels of knowledge transfers and innovations capacities. This means that the ability to implement knowledge-based and technology-intensive policies and activities is still weak in many parts of the Danube Region. In addition, the spatially and structurally fragmented human resources and financial expenditures for innovation keep the transnational ecosystem badly functioning. Thus, the current system is still characterised by lack of joint and designated management, scientific research and valorisation environs. In this context, there is a need for strengthening the synergies and cross-relationships between quadruple innovation stakeholders in order to facilitate the uptake of innovative technologies across the region. Therefore, promoting RDI cooperation, experience exchanges and capacity building among innovation actors, hubs and RDI centres is of great significance for creating a well-functioning innovation ecosystem. In addition, the RDI sector, including its capacity to offer a functional environment for the valorisation and uptake of development technologies, is lagging behind in many states and regions. Thus, apart from research, it is of great significance to improve the speed of up-taking innovative technologies across the DR. Furthermore, considering the overall entrepreneurial sector and, in particular, the SMEs, the innovation levels are substandard which results in a share of innovative enterprises below the EU average. Consequently, the added value generated is unsatisfactory e.g. product and technological development and advancement of SMEs is below expectations. Because of this, structural problems arise, especially in regard to the development of hi-technology economic sectors or the level of ICT employment (below the targets). To overcome such bottlenecks, transnationally coordinated policy support for producing higher value-added products and services is needed, especially in the quest for intensifying the innovation uptake process. Also, generating support for transnational cooperation and capacity building within supplier networks and cluster

policies in order to integrate the SMEs into vertical and horizontal value chains can be seen important, especially towards the process of adopting new/advanced technologies across the macro-region.

Transport is one of the areas where the adoption of advanced technologies can benefit the region. The introduction of alternative fuels, next generation lithium-ion batteries, safer autonomous navigation systems or IoT (route planning, accident prevention) are just few examples which could contribute to the advancement of the region in terms of transport innovation. There is also a need for supporting smart regions/cities solutions as well as advanced technologies regarding circular economy. Therefore, there is space for supporting innovation partnerships and regional and urban platforms for regional research and technological development.

However, in other social and economic aspects e.g. developing skills for smart specialisation, [just transition], industrial transition, entrepreneurship, competitiveness, DR is still characterised by large cohesion gaps. The macro-region consists of various sub-regions of transnational importance in specific fields of actions such as agricultural (e.g. the Hungarian Great Plain, Wallachian Plain), industrial (e.g. Moravian-Silesian Region), service (e.g. Tyrol, Adriatic Croatia) and technology (e.g. Upper Bavaria). This is crucial also since the macro-region could capitalise from acting as a transit(ion) zone and a region of interaction for trans-European business relations including trade, FDI and technology transfer etc. To this end, solutions to the above cohesion gaps can be delivered through digitization and digitalization, industry 4.0 processes and or smart specialisation strategies and policies (S3) – with a special focus on SMEs. It is a real challenge that there are still insufficient measures to capitalize from comparative advantages and economic peculiarities on a transnational level in order to support more robust catching-up policies. There are large differences in S3 in terms of field of specialisation, sectors and territorial coverage. While some states have their own national plans as well as their regional economic administration, in some countries it is still considered as a new, emerging topic. Therefore the lack of related planning and management is quite common. Subsequently, support for transnational alignment of S3 strategies is of great importance.

The transition to a smarter economy is hindered by the current situation of the human capital. The employment in hi-tech sectors is very uneven across the Danube Region. With regard to 'The Skills Composite' of advanced industrial technologies, that captures the share of professionals with advanced technology skills within EU, the share of STEM graduates and firms with ICT skills, the value can be considered low across the macro-region. Only the westernmost and the metropolis regions tend to stand out in having sufficient people with adequate skills to be employed in advanced technological fields. By comparing the Danube Region average to the rest of the EU average, one may notice that there has been a decreasing - but still visible competitiveness gap - in favour of the European Union, especially in relation to the added value of SMEs. The share of the SME sector is lower compared to both EU15 and EU28.

In the very recent times the situation of entrepreneurship is heavily affected by COVID-19. With regard to the economic sentiment indicator, economic actors had a positive view in 2019. Due to the pandemic, the confidence of economic actors decreased seriously in 2020. The value of the economic sentiment indicator dropped by 11.2% (from 101.3 to 90) between September 2019 and September 2020 in the EU28. Based on the changes in the values of the above-mentioned indicator, the Danube Region was particularly affected by the negative economic effects of the

pandemic. Except for Germany (-2.9%) and Slovenia (-9.7%), all countries of the Danube Region have suffered an above average decrease in terms of economic confidence. Montenegro (-44.1%) has suffered an extraordinary decline, furthermore the values of the economic sentiment indicator have significantly dropped in the case of Croatia (-21.9%), Serbia (-19.2%), Hungary (-17.0%), Romania (-13.7%) and Slovakia (-13.6%) as well. The Danube Region was particularly affected by the economic consequences of the pandemic, thus the recovery of the region's economy requires increased attention.

All described challenges are based on the programme's Territorial Strategy and to be seen in the broader context of existing strategic frameworks such as the EUSDR (especially with regards to PA7, PA8 and partly PA9), the Territorial Agenda 2030, the New Leipzig Charter, the Recovery and Resilience Facility and the European Green Deal.

## Environment, energy and climate change

In the Danube Region the **share of renewable energy in gross final energy consumption** is low, and has never reached 50% in any countries. In the majority of the countries the shares of renewables were stagnating (e.g. Austria +0.2% points, Bulgaria -0.3% points) or even significantly decreased (Montenegro -3.7% points, Hungary -2.9% points). Increase worth mentioning occurred only in Germany (3.1%), Slovakia (1.4% points), and the Czech Republic (1% points). Notable shares can be mentioned in Montenegro (40%), Austria (32.6%) and Croatia (27.3%), while in Slovakia (11.5%), Hungary (13.3%), the Czech Republic (14.8%) and Germany (15.5%) renewables play minor role compared to traditional fossil fuels as well as nuclear energy.

Considering the EU2020 targets, the Member States are performing heterogeneously; in some countries the target was set low and thus it has already been reached (see Czech Republic or Hungary), while some countries still have to take steps to realise the targets set for 2020 (e.g. Slovenia, Germany).

Thus Danube Region still heavily relies on fossil fuels in relation to both production and consumption. Despite of significant favourable changes in many related states, the energy sector is very far from being a low-carbon economic field. Sustainable production and consumption would require significant decrease and a shift to renewables in all states since the share of fossil fuels in production is generally between 80 and 65%. The need for shift to renewables is also underlined by the inefficient technology and infrastructure related to the thermal power plant network, which has not been reconstructed, thus no major positive changes have taken place in recent years. The majority of economies still heavily relies on uncertain fuels from Russia (and by track Ukraine). This brings up the question of lack of energy security. This exposure to non-renewable sources results in energy dependency of the vast majority of the Danube Region to energy sources of external markets. Security of supply is not safeguarded, for which regional renewables available in the macro-region could contribute for transnational cooperation. In spite of having a large variety of renewable energy sources across the macro-region with a few similar and complementary endowments from region to region, the utilisation level of renewables in still low. Apart from some countries the share of renewable energy in gross final energy consumption is low in the Danube Region, and has never reached 50% in any countries. The production and consumption of renewables have similarities across the macro-region given that biofuels and hydropower are

having significant roles, and solar energy, wind, geothermal energy have changing utilisation levels. Another reason for a greener energy sector is the high and steadily increasing level of energy consumption paired with low energy efficiency. Therefore, the support for harmonised actions and transnational cooperation is required in order to decarbonise the energy and the related transport and building sector, especially considering the heating and cooling systems of buildings. Also, the still relatively high GHG emissions by the transport sector calls for increasing the utilisation of renewables. Introduction of alternative fuels and new technologies in transportation could be a field of joint measures and policies. High GHG emission is not caused only by transport, but also by the heating and cooling sector (e.g. burning of fossil fuels, especially coal), which is a significant factor in creating a greener energy mix. The sector is still characterised by low utilisation of RES, thus the sector requires a profound shift to a more environmentally friendly energy production and consumption. The identified challenges and actions, besides being fully in line with EUSDR PA2 objectives, are in line also with the key commitments of the European Green Deal in terms of Supplying clean, affordable and secure energy, with the Recovery and Resilience Facility by aiming to support green transition and environmental sustainability and with Territorial Agenda 2030.

Danube Region is predicted to be greatly exposed to climate change. None of the participating countries or regions can be independent from the effects of global warming in the Danube Region. The continental and mountainous bio-geographical regions, which make up the most extensive areas of the Danube Region, both have to tackle with increasing temperatures and population of invasive species, negative changes in forests, shrinking water supplies, and growing energy demands. The large heterogeneity of distinct habitat types is in danger across the region because of weak adaptation techniques and fragmentation. Despite of the recognised negative impacts of climate change, insufficient adaptation and mitigation can be observed. Weak adaptation techniques regarding many effects of climate change (e.g. floods, droughts, decreasing biodiversity) are a severe problem. Low climate change adaptation abilities call for the propagation of best practices in relation to climate change adaptation methods and strategies, as also emphasised by the EU Strategy on adaptation to climate change, or the European Green Deal. There is a growing need for tackling the increasing negative effects and impacts of climate change meaning that support for macro-regional initiatives that aim to decrease such effects by transnational actions (e.g. researches, policy recommendations, joint actions, territorial action plans, development/ improvement of forecasting tools, as well as operational cooperation) are important, which is also in line with the aims of the EU Territorial Agenda 2030. Taking into account one of the most apparent environmental risks, flood-related ones should be further emphasized. High risk of flood damage is a major challenge across transnational regions of the river Tisa and its tributaries in particular, but the Danube itself, the Drava, the Mura and the Sava River Basins are also flood prone areas having severe flood events in the recent years. All the related rivers of transnational character have riverside areas hit by large and frequent flood events, which need coordinated measures, contributing also to the Danube Flood Risk Management Plan, in line with the EU Floods Directive. Beside severe floods, the increase in the global surface temperature is expected to affect the frequency and intensity of heat waves, which can increase the frequency and intensity of heavy precipitation events, have strong direct impacts on human health and wellbeing, society, ecosystems and agriculture. Europe experienced 11 intense and long heat waves between 1950 and 2016, most of which occurred after 2000 and such extreme summer heat waves will become much more common in the future. The projected frequency of heat waves is strongest in

southern and south-eastern Europe. Increasing surface temperature supplemented by rain deficiency (meteorological drought) cause soil moisture drought, affecting plant and crop growth, which in turn deepen sometime into a hydrological drought affecting watercourses, water resources and groundwater-influenced natural ecosystems. The frequency and severity of droughts showed significant increases in recent decades in case of many Danube Region countries and regarding soil moisture droughts, south-eastern Europe is forecasted to be one of the most affected regions in Europe in the upcoming decades. Climate change is also expected to increase forest fire risk in Europe. Based on a set of regional climate models the potential forest fire risk will increase seriously in several European areas, notably in the Mediterranean and Central Europe covering a series of Danube countries also. Besides the climate change induced environmental disasters various sources of accidental pollution of rivers can lead also to major disasters of transnational scale especially in relation to the Danube and its tributaries. This was exemplified by the effects of the Baia Mare cyanide spill in Romania in 2000 that was spreading downstream along the Tisa. Operational industrial sites associated with a major risk of accidental pollution, due to the nature of the chemicals being produced, stored or used at the plants, can be considered widespread across the macro-region. Besides operational sites, old contaminated sites, including landfills and dumps, in potentially flooded areas are of great risk. Although the Accident Emergency Warning System is established and coordinated by ICPDR along the main transboundary rivers of the Danube River Basin, still, it is important to further coordinate and work on preventing accidental pollution, as well as on improving the response capabilities in the region. The above-mentioned climate change-related disasters and accidental pollution of rivers affect transboundary landscapes of several Danube Region countries and carry high risk at the level of the Danube River Basin. Hence, activities encouraging cooperation in integrated environmental risk management, research, forecasting, adaptation and mitigation are therefore of paramount significance. Transnational risk management plans for such areas exposed to climate change-related floods and natural, or accidental pollution disasters are also important to have and to be implemented.

One of the basic joint features of the Danube Region is that it covers the water system of the Danube and its tributaries. Transboundary water bodies link the related regions, and transnational water catchment areas give special emphasis to cooperation in water management with transnational importance, and they connect the given upstream and downstream countries. This interconnectedness causes joint challenges and requires joint solutions, as defined. The complex functional areas of catchment areas and river basins call for territorially integrated actions in relation to PO2 SOiv, SOv and SOvii covering the topics related to negative changes in water quantity and quality parameters, water habitats as well as environmental, water and risk management activities. From quantity point of view increasing water use across the region, decreasing ground water levels and shrinking supplies has to be highlighted. They urgently call for measures for sustainable management of transboundary water abstraction together with water-saving and water retention solutions in agriculture and industry, and reducing groundwater overexploitation. Transboundary contamination and water pollution diffusion is a transnational challenge. Support for joint transboundary water management initiatives linked to joint water catchment areas including joint actions in monitoring, prevention and reduction of water pollution (organic, nutrient, hazardous substances, pharmaceutical, plastics) is therefore a very much needed field of cooperation, contributing also to the also by the Danube River Basin Management Plan, which is defining the main transnational challenges and proposed measures, in line with the EU

Water Framework Directive. At last but not least, weakening connections between wetland habitats can be listed as a challenge to extensive transboundary areas, so revitalization and rehabilitation of transboundary water streams and water systems in the Danube River Basin is worth noting. The identified challenges of the Danube Region and the related proposed actions are responding also to the aims of the European Green Deal aiming for zero pollution and preserving and restoring ecosystems that provide essential services such as fresh water, as well as the EU Territorial Agenda 2030 that stands for sustainably accessible water sources.

In Danube region there are extensive habitat types with transboundary nature as well as problems and potentials to deal with. Some habitat types are unique making them outstandingly valuable to protect and valorise their biodiversity. All biogeographical regions within the Danube Region have a transboundary nature. It means that both flora and fauna do not stop at the border, the artificial state borders are not aligned to the natural borders of environmental regions. The macro-region is rather a colourful mosaic of different biogeographical regions like the Pannonian, or the Alpine regions, that unite many areas across the state borders . The ecological picture of the Danube Region is heterogeneous, but there are several regions which create cohesion across the ecological geographies of the given states. Out of the 13 ecological regions formed in the macro-region all of them are transboundary in character. Pannonian mixed forests are autochthonous in as many as 10 countries. Other ecological regions with strong transboundary feature include Carpathian montane coniferous forests, Dinaric Mountains mixed forests and Illyrian deciduous forests, and East European forest steppe. This transboundary diversity gives special attention to the transnational protection and management of the ecological regions of the Danube Region, including also the habitats of certain, transnationally relevant umbrella (flagship) species, like the sturgeon populations, whose protection are considered as top priority in the Danube Region.

One of the main challenges is related to the interconnectivity of the elements of the ecological network. Fragmentation of transnational habitats and ecosystems, insufficient measures to secure biodiversity of the macro-region can be experienced. This calls for support for the improvement of ecological connectivity between habitats, nature protection areas along transnationally relevant ecological corridors. The Danube Region is rich in different categories of protected areas including transboundary regions of high biodiversity. There are several extensive such areas and many of them are situated along the state borders. It also means that there are territories with significant natural values which could be protected transnationally due to their exceptional flora, fauna and/or landscape shared by the neighbouring countries. However, the management of nature protection of these areas is challenged by the still low level of joint management and protection initiatives, furthermore by notable differences in the regulations, competences, human and financial resources etc. of the given protected areas. Despite of some cooperation, borders are barriers to effective nature protection on a transnational level, thus state borders fragment even the otherwise similar environments by hard artificial borders. Weak management capacities and skills for ecological regions of transnational relevance raise the question of development of transnational management schemes, creation of institutionalised forms of cooperation in relation to the ecological regions. Joint conservation and preservation techniques and planning schemes are needed. Institutionalised, long-term management network(s) of 'Danubian' transboundary ecological regions would create real transnational impact. Wetland habitats are of great significance in the Danube Basin, therefore their fragmentation, ecological status should be taken into account. As a

solution, revitalization and rehabilitation of transboundary water habitats and adjacent green infrastructure are very much needed in the macro-region. In relation to protected areas, in particular water habitats, invasive species endanger the ecological balance in many transboundary ecological areas. This urges nature protection stakeholders to come up with joint solutions considering the spread of invasive species. Furthermore, the valorisation of natural heritage, nature protection areas are on a low level. The sustainable economic utilisation of protected areas should be supported instead of irreversible exploitation of areas with high biodiversity. Finally, due to the transboundary nature of the habitats, the successful protection of flagship (umbrella) species along the Danube requires transnational cooperation keeping in mind the shrinking population of these species of great environmental value. The identified challenges and actions are in line with the key commitments of the European Green Deal, the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030, as well as the EU Territorial Agenda 2030, to reduce the loss of biodiversity, the integration of ecological corridors, to promote green and blue infrastructure; effective management of all protected areas and their networks, combatting invasive alien species, as well as sustainable soil management.

## Inclusive Labour Markets and Human Capital

The Danube Region's continuing socio economic progress is contingent on a well-functioning labour market, indeed a collective of labour markets, which are fundamental to providing employment and regional growth and which are rooted in society. By inclusive labour markets we refer to a concept whereby everyone of a working age can participate in paid work, especially the vulnerable and disadvantaged. Connected to this but also having a wider social and cultural value is the understanding of human capital as the knowledge, skills and experience possessed by an individual or population. In considering inclusive labour markets one of the core indicators to be looked at is the level of employment but it is fundamental also to understand the unemployment. Who forms this cohort, where are they and why?

Despite an overall improvement in employability across the majority of the macro-region following the economic crisis of 2008-2009. Unemployment, long-term unemployment in particular, remains as an ongoing challenge to be tackled within the macro-region. The recent pandemic Covid 19 has created marked changes with increased unemployment and whether this will become a longer term structural problem it's too early to say. In the EU27 countries employment decreased by 2.8% in the second quarter of 2020. To varying degrees, all European countries were affected by this decrease. Examples from the countries of the Danube Region, include Hungary (-4.5%), Austria (-4%) and Romania (-3.1%) which have suffered an above average decrease. As with cyclical economic downtowns experience has shown that those vulnerable groups already at a disadvantage tend to have a worsening situation. The consideration of inclusive labour markets and human capital will be important parts of the post Covid-19 Recovery and Resilience Facility. .

Pre-Covid-19, the reasons for unemployment and its large spatial inequalities included weakly developed local economies that cannot secure employment for certain groups who therefore remain excluded from regional labour markets. Significantly, as a result of restructuring and labour-intensive investment shortage, skills gaps, accessibility and inclusiveness of work places and exclusion from education and low levels of education attainment, low levels of alternative employment forms for example entrepreneurship, social enterprises or forms of working for

example, remote working and part-time employment.

In the Danube Region high unemployment is much more concentrated in rural and often depopulating/depopulated areas than in the rest of the EU. Areas characterised by employment possibilities tend to be concentrated on a small number of sectors excluding the more populous labour market groups. Where large numbers are employed these are often within the mono-functional employment structures which tend to be exposed to labour market crises, and employ large number of vulnerable ( low skilled, physical workers or people with specialised knowledge) employees. Restructuring and diversification of employment along with re-skilling to meet skills gaps is needed and it can be reached by the implementation of territorially integrated action plans for employment, with a special focus on enhancing the spreading of innovation structures targeting mono-functional (e.g. industrial, tourist) regions). This could also be important in contributing to the European Green Deal.

Inequalities and exclusion from the labour market is more of a severe problem for certain vulnerable groups of the labour market. These groups include the less educated, attainment levels which correlate to the widest strata of vulnerable groups on the labour market. Those of working age with lower secondary educational attainment suffer not just from higher unemployment but low income as well. Employability heavily depends on educational attainment; this is particularly relevant in Slovakia, the Czech Republic and Croatia. Less than a quarter of people with at most a lower secondary education level are employed in these parts. Other countries have major challenges in employment growth amongst the least skilled and qualified groups include Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and also some Romanian and Bulgarian regions.

It is not only low attainment which is the critical in the Danube Regions. Apart from in the metropolis and capital city regions, employment for those with a tertiary education attainment is limited .There are high levels of inequalities in terms of tertiary qualified employees; with the western region of the macro-region stronger in this respect, while on the eastern part only the capital regions tend to stand out in this respect. In addition, many western regions managed to increase employment for tertiary qualified people unlike the majority of eastern regions. Therefore, support for designating innovative policies to retain skilled labour and a more sustainable migration of educated people (e.g. by introducing transnational study and RDI programmes, promoting alternative, atypical employment schemes suitable for the needs of the tertiary educated living in rural regions) should be promoted.

Other vulnerable groups requiring more inclusive labour market solutions are ethnic minorities. In quite a few regions, especially where vulnerable populations are living (e.g. populous Roma minorities) the unemployment has not decreased significantly. There is a great overlap between regions battling with extreme poverty and having vulnerable social groups such as the Roma. Both the youth and the aged tend to be vulnerable to unemployment and there exists a need for re-skilling, vocational education and training, lifelong learning and inclusive education. Accessibility and inclusiveness for the disabled has not been fully tackled though there exists good practice in the region. Taking into consideration the unemployed by sex, there is still a lot to do with equal employment, since unemployed women outnumber men especially in heavily industrialised regions for example the Czech Republic, western Slovakia, western Hungary. In the Danube Region gender inequality is a real problem. In every country the employment rate of women is

notably lower than men. There are huge gaps between the two sexes in many countries. In Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Romania, Serbia, and Montenegro the gender gap is still significant in comparison with the EU average. Inclusivity and Equal Opportunity are key towards the Territorial Agenda 2030

Accessible and inclusive education, along with vocational education and training and life-long learning builds human capital which adds value to the economy and society. The currently applied and running learning structures tend to be rather rigid, and the majority of the educational infrastructure and services lack flexibility (in terms of responsiveness to labour market needs), competence orientation and openness (e.g. acknowledgement of informal education) and adequate governance structure.). Non-harmonised demand and supply concerning vocational education and training and vocational schools cause frictions in the labour market that result in exclusion. The development of proven labour market learning and training structures can efficiently contribute to a long-term unemployment reduction in the south eastern countries. The active adaptation of e.g. German or Austrian innovative solutions (e.g. work-based learning) and best practices particularly towards the countries of south-east is of great importance in reaching a more inclusive and accessible secondary and adult education. This focus is also coherent with the EUSDR and more especially the PA9 People & Skills.

Employment growth can be better addressed in the future by giving more focus on social economy and its job creation effects. Social entrepreneurship is not a commonly-used practice to find innovative solutions to employment and other social challenges. Capacity building for the civic sector would provide innovative solutions in the creation of more inclusive jobs in the labour market. As an example, with the involvement of the non-governmental organisations and the civil sector social challenges such as severe ageing can be better tackled. The innovative approach of to social challenges can contribute to job creation for people excluded from the highly competitive labour markets and serve social goals for the public good.

Migration which meets the needs of the Danube Region's labour markets and societies is critical. Migration processes, migration of (highly) skilled workforce towards the western and urban parts of the macro-region, have led to the intensification of spatial disparities resulting in decreasing economic and social cohesion amongst Danube Region states in many ways causing challenges in both the source and the target/receiving states and their labour markets. Areas hit by strong emigration are experiencing huge population loss especially in relation to skilled labour. The processes result in a massive depopulation and ageing of the population as well as a lack of qualified workforce capable of acting as the basis of prosperity. Since high inequalities in labour market are going to be present in a long run it is of major importance to tackle the challenges deriving from strong migration flows and changing population distributions affecting the labour market and its inclusive character.

## Heritage & Cultural Tourism and Community

Based on Eurostat findings, high tourist activity couples with lower regional unemployment rates. There is a great potential still very much left untapped in involving different vulnerable groups to these sectors which otherwise often face unemployment.

Besides the sector's direct contribution to GDP, tourism plays an important role in employment in

the EU. The share of tourism in the employment is above 10% as regards 15 of the 27 EU Member States. Amongst the Danube Region countries, the role of tourism is essential to employment, in Croatia (23%) and Austria (16%). The share of tourism in employment is relatively high in Slovenia (13%), Germany (12%) and Bulgaria (11%), and moderate in the case of Hungary (9%), Czech Republic (9%), Slovakia (6%) and Romania (6%).

However though up until Covid-19, a largely successful sector for the macro-region, the concentration on a relatively few traditional resorts limits cohesion and opportunity. There are insufficient interconnections and level of cooperation between destinations, services, products and related stakeholders. Tourist infrastructure displays large inequalities within the macro-region. The Danube Region has developed (accommodation) facilities in terms of quantity measures typically in capital cities, the Alps, the Adriatic, the Black Sea and a limited number of renowned destinations in each country. On the other hand, large areas suffer from poorly constructed and connected tourism infrastructure. Based on overnight stays the most popular tourist destinations are the high mountainous regions (Eastern Alps) and the seaside resorts (e.g. Dalmatia in Croatia, Sunny Beach in Bulgaria), in particular. There are severe differences in the distribution of tourist nights, with a strong east-west divide

The involvement of local heritage, culture and communities in the development of existing tourism hubs can add to the existing local offer but there also remains a vast array of heritage and culture throughout the region that can be recognized, understood, developed and valorised as part of the tourism sector offer. Connections can be made to existing or new tourist routes which have proved increasingly popular. In the Danube Region several cultural routes of the Council of Europe have been designated and certified in order to better connect the cultural and natural heritage sites and tourist attractions of Europe. It can be regarded as a development tool to support the transnational interconnection and management of the tourism products and services; thus, it is of transnational relevance to enhance the tourist valorisation of joint heritage. In order to strengthen the management of tourism related to the cultural routes, cultural tourism policies, recommendations and guidelines drafted in the framework of Routes4U are needed to be implemented. According to the designated Roadmap for the Danube Region the management structures of successful cultural routes in the Danube Region should be analysed to compile and share best practices on management structures and implementation of activities in the Danube macro-region. The main need in this respect includes: creation of cultural tourism products requiring the involvement at the local destination level of a wide range of private and public stakeholders from the cultural and tourism sectors. Well-established networks of key stakeholders at the destination level are a guarantee for developing networks and cooperation among the stakeholders along the cultural routes. In spite of the high number of designated EuroVelo routes across the Danube Region, there is still a large undeveloped part and the quality also differs along the built or planned sections of the given routes. In many cases the paths are paved and supplied with a hard surface but the adjacent infrastructure and services are missing (e.g. resting areas, rental services).

Social innovation can be a driver for new approaches and can lead to diversification thus creating jobs and alternative, additional income sources in areas where there is a lack of employment opportunity because of weak economic structures or bad accessibility. Furthermore, areas hit by depopulation can gain new development impetus by (re)integrating them to the socio-economic networks of tourism and cultural spheres.. Innovative solutions can open up new opportunities for

people with disabilities, the elderly, and excluded minorities. Often the given regions and strata of population possess outstanding cultural and natural heritage on which to innovate. ,

With the expansion heritage and culture tourism through the Danube Region, much of the knowledge will lie with the local communities and tourism management structures should be developed which recognise community involvement and is inclusive in terms of management from the community Therefore, the strong need for capacity building in management schemes should be mentioned in relation to the enhancement of the role of tourism in economic development.

This approach can be connected with the Recovery and Resilience Facility and potentially the European Green Deal.

Governance

The whole Danube space is suffering from its highly fragmented political and administrative feature with different roles and responsibilities given to the participating regions in distinct state models. This is a real hindering factor to cooperation and implies the need for better governance solutions and territorial strategies within the macro-region. The most striking challenges include cross-border hinterlands and urban networks, sending and receiving areas of internal (labour) migration, urban platforms and smart cities, ageing regions, and regions with weak accessibility due to major transport bottlenecks.

Owing to low fertility and high emigration one of the most common characteristic of the Danube Region is ageing. Excluding some north-eastern territories with historically high birth rates the whole macro-region has been getting older. The increase share of the elderly population compared to the young population has resulted in a state where there are almost no regions where the population under 15 years outnumber the population over 65 years.. In the most aging regions of Bulgaria, Serbia and Germany the indexes indicate that more than two time larger elderly people population is living in the most ageing part of the macro-region. The extreme level of ageing results in challenges which need to be solved in relation to population retention, local employment, social and health care services, silver economy since radical change in demographics has not been foreseen.

Concerning migration patterns, it has to be noted that a large proportion of relocations takes place within the territory of the macro-region, though the directions and the results of migration are unbalanced.. Regions with positive migration balance are typically of two types of geographic areas; they are either the western(most) regions of the given countries or the whole Danube Region (e.g. Győr-Moson-Sopron County from Hungary, Timiș County from Romania, Istria County from Croatia) or capital regions (of Bratislava, Budapest, Bucharest, Vienna, Prague especially). Thus, there are huge differences in migration patterns within the Danube Region. In general, Germany and Austria has the highest share of regions with strong immigration, and the rest of the regions (except the capital regions) on macro-regional scope are areas with strong emigration. Germany, Austria and the Czech Republic stand out owing to the low number of regions affected by negative migration balance. Almost all the regions with significant immigration are from Germany.

In contrast, large parts of Croatia, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro have to cope with strong emigration. Croatia is in the worst situation in terms of emigration, except for Teleorman County

from Romania and Smolyan County from Bulgaria. Migration processes have led to the intensification of spatial disparities resulting in decreasing economic and social cohesion among Danube Region states in many ways. Areas hit by strong emigration are experiencing huge population loss especially in relation to skilled labour and younger generations. Because of long-term emigration several extensive peripheries have been emerging on the map of Europe characterised by low population retention force and weak economic structures. This all results in a massive depopulation, and fast ageing as well as lack of qualified workforce capable of acting as the basis of prosperity. On the other hand, in regions of high positive balance the integration of such large number of immigrants with various cultural and educational backgrounds can be challenging. Since high inequalities in labour market, income, quality of life is going to be present in a long run, it is of major importance to tackle the challenges deriving from strong migration flows and changing population distributions. The majority of the macro-region has to tackle with the intensifying westward and urban directions of migration. In the frames of the discussed movement of people both target and source areas are strongly interconnected to each other, thus the management of the given flows cannot be separated from either population loss or population gain regions.

There has been an increasing urban-rural divide in many aspects of cohesion (functions, economic growth, employment etc.) within the macro-region. When it comes to the degree of urbanisation, the Danube Region has been characterised by a strong urban-rural duality. This polarisation of the 'Danubian' settlement network has emerged in the form of two distinct development paths, which is reflected in various elements of economic and social cohesion as well calling for different transnational cooperation needs. This divide can be detected and is having demographic, migration, economic competitiveness, and environmental, etc. implications. Generally, urbanised areas have a wide range of public and private functions to offer, are often the core areas of socio-economic development as engines of growth, characterised by population increase, and are also targets to major business investments and migrants (including highly skilled and younger/active age population, labour and student migrants from the Danube Region), and have special challenges such as pollution, traffic congestions, urban sprawl, challenges of social integration etc. Rural areas are often having a small range of functions for public provision, emigration of intellectuals, young generations, depopulation effects, less educated, but more ageing and deprived population thus weak competitiveness as well as accessibility, less favourable situation for economy of scale and deploying new functions and institutions.

Urbanisation is not necessarily connected to administrative boundaries, and in the last years urbanisation processes created even more towns and suburbs as well as reinforced twin cities, created transboundary suburban areas (e.g. around Bratislava or Košice), transboundary (polycentric) metropolis regions as well (e.g. around Vienna, Bratislava, Brno and Győr) with special problems and potentials. Nowadays, transnational answers should be given to the challenges of the much urbanised as well as to the largely rural areas of the macro-region owing to many similarities and emerging urban structures across the borders.

The functional effects of urban agglomerations are crossing administrative boundaries especially in the 'Danubian' urban space which is fragmented by multiple state borders. The macro-region is covered by lots of urban hinterlands of transboundary (or even transnational) character overlapping each other and the state borders. Monocentric inland urban networks can be supplemented by the other side's urban centres. The state borders that became more open as a result of European

integration created an opportunity for networking of bordering settlements that in many case had been almost hermetically separated from each other for decades. The spatial organizing power of cities can be re-established by organizing transboundary metropolitan areas, agglomerations, twin cities and town twinning cooperation. With the transformation of spatial organization, the provision of public services and other central functions of the cities will result in newly strengthening types of functional urban areas and settlements. The coordinated development of urban functions based on joint and complementary features and the management of the centres and their hinterlands creates a new situation in terms of international city competition. Thus, encouraging transnational cooperation between municipalities in functional urban areas separated by state borders should be supported especially in terms of policy co-ordination for the planning and operational efficiency of these zones and functional developments (preparation of integrated development plans, joint transboundary management and governance).

Apart from the aforementioned governance challenges of transnational character also relate to the field of transport and accessibility. The lack of sufficient institutional cooperation, missing forms of governance and planning has led to extensive areas of weak accessibility. Therefore, there is a need for capacity building for better embedding transport and accessibility aspects into integrated transnational governance schemes.

All described challenges are to be seen in the broader context of existing strategic frameworks such as the EU Strategy for the Danube Region Action Plan (especially with regards to Priority Area 10), the Territorial Agenda 2030, the New Leipzig Charter, the Recovery and Resilience Facility and the European Green Deal.

## Programme mission statement

***"From a region of barriers to a region of flows"***

*Mission Statement of the Danube Transnational Programme*

**The Danube macro-region is a region of barriers, due to its highly fragmented status in political, socio-economic and administrative aspects as well. The effects of such fragmentation are decisive for the development of the whole region; therefore, the related border effects should be tackled and mitigated.** It has the highest number of countries – and at the same time the highest share of border regions – compared to other macro-regions or even parts of the world. The whole Danube space is suffering from its highly fragmented political and administrative character, which is further complicated by the extreme economic diversity of its countries and regions. The European measures for a stronger cohesion along with the accession and neighbourhood policies create a new, unique historic situation for the better integration of the Danube space. Creating a better institutional platform and transnational cooperation environment for the territorial, economic and social integration should be the main mission of the new Danube Transnational Programme.

The main focus of the new programme should be along those thematic areas where the overall

measures for better integration could be linked to those relevant and specific needs, which can be effectively addressed by transnational projects. In this very heterogeneous and diverse region, a specific emphasis is to be given to ensure that the different needs of the countries (given their different political and economic status) are considered in a fairly balanced and well-integrated manner. Thus, measures supporting the overcoming of barrier effects by targeting territorially more integrated actions and more institutionalised cooperation are well advised instead of dot-like and temporal developments and connections.

There are **strong but unbalanced migration links** within the region mainly because of the huge inequalities in income levels; the mass outmigration from the eastern part to the western has to be taken into account just like temporal cross-border employment. **Ageing** is a severe issue across the region similarly to depopulating rural areas and growing major urban regions. The **integration of immigrants, national minorities and Roma people** has been problematic across the macro-region despite of the **outstanding cultural diversity** (only in Vojvodina, Serbia 6 official languages exist) of the Danube citizens and the potentials in heritage valorisation.

Despite of catching-up processes which made the formerly strong east-west divide less vivid, huge inequalities in terms of economic development persist, creating manoeuvres for better integration. The macro-region is characterised by three distinct groups of countries; old Member States, new Member States, and non-Member States, with different development paths, convergence potentials and links to European policies. However, in spite of the convergence of some national level economies, the spatial pattern became more fragmented owing to the growing gap between urban regions as engines of growth and rural regions as peripheries still lagging behind. The region consists of economies with **many common and complementary endowments** (e.g. regarding RDI potentials, economic and employment structures) in several fields to be utilised jointly. Altogether, these economies are heavily based on strong manufacturing, trade and capital ties with Germany. Instead of high unemployment, the phenomena of **labour shortage** emerged across the macro-region. Regardless Germany and Austria mostly, the Danube Region is still considered as a **labour-intensive, technology-follower** area with dual economy. The Danube Region is still characterised by large gaps between the old and the new Member States as well as the associated countries in relation to economic competitiveness and social well-being (e.g. in relation to innovation ecosystem, income level). **Energy dependency**, still low utilisation level of renewables, lack of high energy safety and still missing interconnections characterise the macro-region. The majority of economies still heavily relies on uncertain fossil fuels from Russia (and by track Ukraine).

In the Danube Region, there are both internal and external borders in relation to Schengen Zone. The rate of border areas is 44.7% (these territories are closer than 30 km to at least one state border). Compared to Western Europe the density of border crossings in overall is low, and there are still **major bottlenecks and uncoordinated development in the field of infrastructure**, especially transport links which would create north-south connections. This is crucial since the macro-region could capitalise from acting as a **transit(ion) zone** and a region of interaction for trans-European business relations including trade, FDI and technology transfer etc. owing to its geographic position between western economies and eastern markets with many TEN-T and Pan-European corridors.

One of the basic joint features of the macro-region is that the Danube Region **covers the water**

**system of the Danube** and its tributaries. There are shared water bodies and water catchment areas with transnational importance, and they connect the given upstream and downstream countries. The majority of the macro-region is predicted to be greatly **exposed to climate change**. The Continental and Mountain bio-geographical regions, which make up the most extensive areas of the Danube Region, both have to tackle increasing temperatures and population of invasive species, declining forests, water supplies, and energy demands. The large heterogeneity of distinct habitat types is in danger across the region because of **weak adaptation techniques** and fragmentation. For a more efficient management of the emerging transnational cooperation needs of the Danube Region inter-institutional relations need to be encouraged along with the *establishment of joint institutions and support for such long-term governance* structures.

To sum up, the future programme should take advantage of the outstanding heterogeneity of the macro-region. Strengthening cohesion to overcome the current fragmentations (region of barriers) towards a region of exchange and "unity in diversity" (region of flows) is what the whole programme should support.

*Therefore, the Territorial Strategy of the next Danube Transnational Programme is conducted, in order to serve as a guideline of vindicating the above aspects of territoriality during the programming process. Majority of the elements of this document are also directly applicable for the programme template.*

## 1.3 Justification for the selection of policy objectives and the Interreg specific objectives, corresponding priorities, specific objectives and the forms of support, addressing, where appropriate, missing links in cross-border infrastructure

*Reference: Article 17(4)(c)*

Table 1

| Selected policy objective or selected Interreg-specific objective | Selected specific objective | Priority | Justification for selection |
|---|---|---|---|
| PO1 – A smarter Europe | (i) enhancing research and innovation capacities and the uptake of advanced technologies | Priority 1 | The majority of the Danube Region is still considered as a technology-follower area, and characterised by large gaps between the old and the Member States as well as the associated countries in relation to innovation ecosystem. This is reflected in indicators including GERD, expenditure on RDI, RDI share in GDP, patent applications, share of ICT in employment.<br><br>The Danube Region consists of both RDI leaders and followers, which gives potential to breaking down the hindering factors in knowledge production and transfer. The macro-region is a mix of the most innovative regions of Europe including Austria (GERD: 1279.6 EUR) and Germany (1121.7), the "transition zone" of East-Central European countries (Slovenia 393.4, Czech Republic 280.8, Hungary 139.5, and Slovakia 118.1) and economies with low investment in knowledge and technology advancement (Bosnia and Herzegovina 9.4, Ukraine 10, Montenegro 20.6, Romania 41.4, Serbia 43.6).<br><br>The uptake of innovative technologies is moderately slow. Considering employment in ICT, compared to European-scale changes, the Danube Region exceeded (increase by 0.31% point between 2008 and 2018) the growth of the EU15 (increase by 0.26% point) but failed to catch up with the development pace of the EU28 (0.36% point). The reason behind this is the low advancement in non-Member States of the macro-region in particular.<br><br>Thus, mostly the westernmost economies are well integrated into the European level of RDI, while the latter group of countries are almost excluded from |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | effective RDI cooperation.<br><br>Knowledge-intensity shows large territorial differences, while there are uncoordinated profiles and capacities, overly concentrated RDI activities. The mediocre performance is partly owing to the weak knowledge links bringing stronger cohesion across the macro-region. Consequently, RDI activities represent a high potential in joint knowledge management and valorisation initiatives covering joint knowledge production and transfer. |
| | (iv) developing skills for smart specialisation, [just transition], industrial transition and entrepreneurs hip | Priority 1 | The macro-region consists of economies with many common and complementary features related to economic structure to be utilised jointly. They give place to capitalise from the comparative advantages on transnational level. The Danube Region is still characterised by large gaps in relation to economic competitiveness and catching-up. The region could capitalise from acting as a transit(ion) and interaction zone for trans-European business relations owing to its geographic position.<br><br>The macro-region builds up of diverse economies with different fields of excellence and specialisation. Large inequalities (calculated by the shares of the added value of the given activities in GDP) lie in all sectors including agriculture (e.g. Moldova 10.2%, Ukraine 10.1% and Montenegro 6.8% against Germany 0.7%, Austria 1.2%, Slovenia 1.9%, or the Czech Republic 2%) or services (e.g. Austria 62.7%, Germany 61.5%, Croatia 58%, and Moldova 53.3%, Ukraine 51.3% and Serbia 51% on the other hand).<br><br>Industry has larger proportion (28.25% in 2018) in the related economies compared to EU28 (21.9%). Unpreparedness for the challenges related to Industry 4.0 can cause severe loss in competitiveness since many economies are heavily based on industry (e.g. Czech Republic 32.7%, Germany 28%, Slovakia 31.3%, Romania 29%, Slovenia 28.9%).<br><br>Slow transition is a common problem. Except for capital city regions mostly (e.g. Budapest, Bratislava Region 10.2% of total employment) hi-tech sectors are weakly developed (e.g. in Sud-Vest Oltenia 1% from Romania, Šumadija and Western Serbia 1.1%, |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Yugoiztochen 1.1% from Bulgaria).<br><br>Weak entrepreneurship is reflected in that while in the EU28 47.6 SMEs per 1000 inhabitants are operating, the Danube Region had 39.2. The share of the SME sector in the value added of enterprises (53.8%) is lower compared to EU28 (55.5%). Except for Germany and Austria low proportion of enterprises are innovative in terms of organisation/marketing and product/process type of innovation. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| PO2 A greener, low-carbon Europe | ii. promoting renewable energy | Priority 2 | There are several factors that support the promotion of renewable energy.<br><br>All power systems are based on fossil fuels which reach at least 60% in each country. The efficiency of thermal power stations is low since only Austria (64.6%) surpasses the EU average (50.5%) significantly.<br><br>The energy dependence in several countries is higher than the EU average (53.6%), such as in Germany (63.5%), Austria (62.5%), Slovakia (59%) and Hungary (55.6%). Apart from Slovenia (-2.8% points) and Austria (-2% points) the rate has not decreased notably, or even increased between 2012 and 2016.<br><br>The share of renewables in gross final energy consumption is low, and has never reached 50% in any countries. In the majority of the countries the share was stagnating (e.g. Austria +0.2% points, Bulgaria -0.3% points) or significantly decreased (Montenegro -3.7% points, Hungary -2.9% points). Increase worth mentioning occurred only in Germany (3.1%), Slovakia (1.4% points), and the Czech Republic (1% points). Notable shares can be mentioned in Montenegro (40%), Austria (32.6%) and Croatia (27.3%), while in Slovakia (11.5%), Hungary (13.3%), the Czech Republic (14.8%) and Germany (15.5%) renewables play minor role compared to fossil fuels and nuclear energy.<br><br>There is a huge variety in the energy mix of the macro-region by region and source. Biofuels responsible for more than 50% in all countries except for Germany (36%, while EU28 average is 49%), and represent the highest rates in Hungary (87%) and Ukraine (79%). Hydropower (EU28 11%) in Serbia (41%), Austria (34%), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Slovenia (32% each) and Montenegro (29%) is by far the second most utilised source. Wind, solar energy, municipal waste and geothermal energy are less preferred, but altering DR countries have specialised in them.<br><br>As a result of underutilised renewables, energy dependency, lack of high energy safety characterises the DR that still heavily relies on fossil fuels. Thus, the shift towards renewables is crucial. |
| | iv. promoting | Priority 2 | The macro-region is greatly exposed to climate change, thus CC adaptation can be regarded as a horizontal issue that |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | climate change adaptation, and disaster risk prevention, resilience, taking into account ecosystem-based approaches | | should be taken into consideration in any actions within SO iv. The transnational Continental and Carpathian/Alpine Mountain bio-geographical regions covering multiple countries in the Danube Region both have to tackle with increasing extremities in relation to environmental disasters caused by climate change. Out of these, extreme amount of water as well as intensifying water scarcity, droughts are considered the main challenges.<br><br>Extensive parts of the Danube Region are heavily exposed to large floods. Owing to having both upstream and downstream areas with a transboundary character, the Danube Region experiences frequent floods risking large transboundary riverside areas. Neighbouring regions with high number of floods (over 16 between January 1985 and September 2019) are part of the catchment area of the Upper Tisa and the Dniester in particular. These regions incorporate the joint border areas of Ukraine (e.g., Zakarpattia Oblast), Romania (e.g., Maramureș County) Slovakia (e.g., Prešov Region), Hungary (Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg County) and Moldova. Other highly flood hazardous regions with extreme flood levels from the last ten years can be found on the Tisa and its tributaries, the Sava, the Mura-Drava as well as the Danube river. There is a need for a more efficient coordination of river basin management with emphasis on flood risk, and joint actions in disaster prevention, forecast and response. Given the basin and transnational character of the river system within the Danube Region, apart from natural disasters such as floods, risk prevention, emergency response and disaster management especially concerning the water-related man-made catastrophes (e.g. cyanide, heavy metal or salt pollution) should also be better addressed. Climate change related environmental risks and disasters like droughts, forest fires or heat waves are becoming more frequent issues season after season in many different parts of the Danube Region. Although these phenomena don't have transnational impacts, it is important to harmonise and standardise the preparation of response authorities and organisations and their related procedures at transnational scale for a more effective preparedness and response in case of emergency situations. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | (v) promoting access to water and sustainable water management | Priority 2 | One of the basic joint features of the macro-region is that the Danube Region covers the water system of the Danube and its tributaries, i.e. the Danube Basin. There are shared water bodies and water catchment areas of transnational importance. Joint river sections, surface and underground water bodies also mean that both the quantity and the quality of such waters, e.g. contamination and water pollution or increasing water use, decreasing ground water levels, shrinking supplies across borders is a real threat to tackle jointly. Climate change is forecasted to affect both the quantity, as well as quality of transnational water bodies in the Danube River Basin that requires joint solutions. Regarding the chemical status of the Danube Region rivers, transnational intervention would be needed in the case of Tisza and many of its transboundary tributaries (Someș, Körös) in particular. The chemical status of the Danube is failing on long shared border sections in Serbia, Romania and Bulgaria. The chemical status requires joint measures on the east of the Budapest–Sarajevo line. There is a need for better coordination between water management and certain economic activities such as agriculture, navigation, hydropower and flood protection, which are strongly influencing water quantity and quality quite often.<br><br>Transnational coordination in the field of water supply management in the frames of a river basin management system is required in relation to groundwater. Such bodies cover almost the same size of area as Bulgaria (106 883 $km^2$). As many as 11 groundwater bodies exist which have a transnational relevance. The protection and usage of these water bodies are relevant since many of them act as major source for e.g. drinking, agriculture or industry. SOiv SOv and SOvii are needed to manage territorially integrated and therefore effective actions within transnational functional areas of catchment areas, river basins. |
| | vii. enhancing biodiversity, green infrastructure in the urban environment, and | Priority 2 | The macro-region is a colourful mosaic of different regions resulting in high biodiversity, which is in danger also because of weak adaptation techniques to climate change that comes with e.g. invasive species or fragmenting habitats. All the 7 biogeographical regions within the Danube Region have a transboundary nature. including Continental as the most widespread region. The Pannonian region unites many regions of Hungary, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Ukraine, Romania and Serbia, while Alpine covers various territories |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | reducing pollution | | in Austria, Slovakia, Ukraine, Romania, Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro and Bulgaria.<br><br>Out of the 13 ecological regions formed in the Danube Region all of them are transboundary in character. Pannonian mixed forests are autochthonous in as many as 10 countries. Other ecological regions with strong transboundary feature include Carpathian montane coniferous forests (Czech Republic, Slovakia, Ukraine, Romania), Dinaric Mountains mixed forests and Illyrian deciduous forests (Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro) and East European forest steppe (Ukraine, Moldova, Romania, Bulgaria).<br><br>The high diversity is reflected in high number of transboundary protected areas from wetland habitats (e.g. the Danube Delta) to hilly and mountainous landscapes (e.g. Carpathians, Dynaric Alps, Czech Forest-Bavarian Forest). There are territories with significant natural values which could be protected transnationally due to their exceptional diversity shared by the neighbouring countries. Nature protection is challenged by the still low level of joint management and protection initiatives, furthermore by notable differences in the policies, competences, and human and financial resources of the given protected areas. Despite of some cooperation (e.g. Mura-Drava-Danube Transboundary Biosphere Reserve), borders are barriers to effective nature protection on transnational level.<br><br>Apart from the ecological corridors and regions, the protection of umbrella species is also of great significance. Therefore enhanced transnational cooperation is needed with regard to safeguarding the transboundary habitats of indigenous animal population including e.g. wild sturgeons.<br><br>The ratio of Natura 2000 areas in the Danube Region is significantly higher in almost all states compared to the EU average (18%) with the exception of Germany (15%), Austria (15%) and Czech Republic (14%). |
| PO4 A more social Europe | (i) enhancing the effectiveness and inclusiveness of labour | Priority 3 | The Danube Region is affected by interconnected challenges of high (long-term) unemployment, profound income inequalities, intensifying westward labour migration and weak social economy. Employment is a field where increasing socio-spatial disparities in the Danube Region can |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | markets and access to high quality employment through developing social infrastructure and promoting social economy | | be found causing severe weakening of cohesion.<br><br>The strong persisting north-west versus south-east divide in spatial inequalities on the labour markets results in depopulation, ageing, unfavourable economic structure, low population retention force in often transboundary peripheries. The Danube Region is a part of Europe where large shares of population are currently living abroad partly because of differences in employment conditions. Since high inequalities are going to be present in a long run, it is of major importance to tackle the challenges deriving from westward migration flows.<br><br>The pattern and the high level of long-term unemployment (e.g. in Severozapaden 76.8% from Bulgaria, Montenegro 75.2%, central Slovakia 67.1%, Sud-Vest Oltenia 56.7% from Romania, Southern and Eastern Serbia 55.1%) have not changed significantly, especially where vulnerable population is living. There is a great overlap between regions battling with extreme poverty and having vulnerable social groups such as the Roma. High unemployment is much more concentrated in rural areas.<br><br>In all countries the highest employment rates are for the most educated active age population, and are the lowest for the least educated. The biggest gap in every country can be found between the people with the lowest and the people with the highest educational attainment.<br><br>Alternative, innovative and part-time job opportunities, workplaces have been largely missing to support the inclusiveness of the labour markets. As a result of COVID-19, 36.5% of EU27 employees started working from home, but the transition rate to remote working was much more modest in Southeast European countries. Regarding remote working, less developed countries and regions with a great number of vulnerable people, performed less successful. Consequently, significant progress could be reached in the field of remote working in the context of just transition and social inclusion. Social entrepreneurship is still not a commonly-used practice to find innovative solutions to employment and other social challenges. Taking into account the profound gaps and inequalities in employment, the methods of social innovation should be promoted across the macro-region. With the help of developing and adapting social innovation both the best- and worst-performing |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | regions can capitalise from knowledge generation and transfer in the form of alternative, new and digital forms of employment opportunities |
| | ii. improving equal access to inclusive and quality services in education, training and lifelong learning through developing accessible infrastructure | Priority 3 | Exclusion from education and thus from the labour market and social mobility is a major challenge.<br><br>The ratio of early leavers (percentage of population aged 18-24) is high in the macro-region since from the western border of Hungary towards the east large cross-border areas are known for values between or surpassing 10-15%, while on the western parts the ratio is lower, averaging around 7.5-10%. A deteriorating tendency is observable especially on the eastern regions, which usually contain rural areas with high share of disadvantageous population, but weak integration of the children into the school system.<br><br>People with tertiary education are increasingly concentrated to capital regions (e.g. Bratislava 60%, Prague 57%, Bucharest 51% and Vienna 48% of population aged 30-34). In the western Germany and Austria, but also Croatia and Slovakia to a lesser degree there are no regions with a ratio below 30%, while e.g. the majority of Romania or Bulgaria has less than 20% of population with tertiary education.<br><br>While in the majority of the Danube Region the economy and the current business cycle would require more human resources in manufacturing, ICT and services, most students opt for studying business, administration and law, social sciences or journalism which results in labour shortage in critical fields simultaneously with unemployment among the highly educated young people. This results in skills mismatch. The non-harmonised educational offers with the labour market needs lead to increasing student and labour migration, brain drain, tertiary unemployment among the graduated. There is a loss of the skilled and young intellectuals because of unfavourable/non-established higher education at certain regions.<br><br>Owing to having best-performing internationally renowned institutions and specialisations in education, capacity building and networking have great potential to create accessible educational services and to use infrastructures jointly. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | v. enhancing the role of culture and tourism in economic development, social inclusion and social innovation | Priority 3 | The macro-region incorporates large number of transnational cultural and natural heritage sites on which the development of joint tourism and cultural products and services, destination management can be based on for the sake of job creation in areas with vulnerable population and areas of depopulation.<br><br>High potentials lie in the cultural diversity. The valorisation can have direct socio-economic impacts, such as the preservation of cultural heritage and the development of creative industries.<br><br>The outstanding diversity is underlined by the coexistence of 30 ethnic groups, many as national minorities. Groups can function as connecting links. Interethnic and P2P relations could tear down xenophobic, nationalist voices and Eurosceptic political forces across the whole Danube Region.<br><br>7 EuroVelo routes and 19 Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe have been certified to better connect heritage sites from the Iron Curtain across Roman and Jewish heritage to Art Nouveau and viniculture.<br><br>Tourism is one of the most relevant economic activities by significantly contributing to employment and added value in many regions, but is concentrated on few mountainous and seaside resorts (Eastern Alps, Dalmatia, Sunny Beach in etc.), both having strong macro-regional tourist flows. There are severe differences in attractiveness based on tourist nights (E.g. Adriatic Croatia 59.005, Tyrol 50065, Prague 14.100 or Yugoiztochen 9.529 compared to Sud-Muntenia 681, Severozapaden 728, Republika Srpska 689 or Moldova 545). Weak interconnectedness and management of destinations hinders a more balanced and synergic development in the Danube Region.<br><br>Valorisation of joint heritage can support job creation, which can support anti-poverty measures and better integration of vulnerable groups, the elderly, people with disabilities, the Roma. Social innovation has an important role owing to the fact that the macro-region incorporates several regions with high share of population at risk of poverty (e.g. Nord-Est 33.4%, Sud-Vest Oltenia 33.4%, Serbia 25.7%, Severozapaden 32.8%, and Montenegro 23.6%). |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ISO1: A better cooperation governance | SO i. enhance institutional capacity of public authorities and stakeholders to implement macro-regional strategies and sea-basin strategies, as well as other territorial strategies | Priority 4 | The Danube Region is a macro-region of borders: 44.7% of its territories are situated closer than 30 km to at least one state border. Consequently, no major developments can be carried out without having at least indirect transboundary impacts covering several national territories.<br><br>The Danube Region is heterogeneous in terms of level of European integration. It consists of old and new Member States, candidate countries, a potential candidate and countries targeted by mostly the Eastern Partnership. There is still a lot of room to cooperate in breaking down administrative and legal obstacles within the Danube Region to serve the four freedoms.<br><br>Good governance and regional policy can also function as a prime tool for increasing the level of trust towards the EU. The DTP can support the EU integration, strengthen the visibility and close-to-people character of the Regional Policy.<br><br>Except for Germany (E-Government Development Index: 0.88), Austria (0.83) and Slovenia (0.77) the macro-region has less developed e-governance structures compared to the European average of UN states (0.77).<br><br>The countries differ in their political-administrative systems. Subsequently, there is no homogeneity between the countries which can render regional cooperation challenging and at the same time offer room for enhancing legal harmonisation. Hence, high diversity in public administration and governance can be challenging to overcome, and efficiency of public administration regarding cooperation on a transnational level.<br><br>The political fragmentation and the challenges of transnational character (e.g. aging, transport bottlenecks) calls for better and new models of governance, inter-institutional cooperation and transnational institutions to manage functional areas (e.g. cross-border functional urban areas, areas affected by labour migration). |

## 2. Priorities

*Reference: Article 17(4)(d) and (e)*

### 2.1 Title of the priority (repeated for each priority)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(d)*

*Text field: [300]*

**Priority 1: A Smarter Europe**

☐ This is a priority pursuant to a transfer under Article 17(3)

### 2.1.1. Specific objective (repeated for each selected specific objective, for priorities other than technical assistance)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)*

**PO1 – (i) enhancing research and innovation capacities and the uptake of advanced technologies**

#### 2.1.1.1 Related types of action and their expected contribution to those specific objectives and to macro-regional strategies and sea-basis strategies, where appropriate

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(i), Article 17(9)(c)(ii)*

*Text field [7000]*

Based on the territorial findings, the Danube Region (DR) inovation performance is charactherised, to a large extent, by outdated labour-intensive, technology-follower type of workflows and processes. Additionally, Danube Region is affected by large economic competitiveness and social gaps among old, new Member States and the non-member states part of the DR area (ENI and IPA countries), with direct impact on the region's capacity to cooperate, especially when it comes to RDI developments such as the uptake of innovation (technological and non-technological innovation). Thus, joint measures to support the better share of innovation capacities and the joint uptake of innovation and advanced technologies are of high relevance. Such actions should result from new, RDI related policies and furthered throught quadruple helix approaches. Therefore, promoting RDI cooperation, exchanging experiences and capacity building between innovation actors such as industrial hubs, private enterprises, professional clusters, universities, RDI centres, NGOs, local, regional and national policy makers (e.g. administrations, agencies) is of great significance for crearting a well-functioning DR innovation ecosystem and increasing regional capacity for absorbing innovation. Complementary, support for transnational cooperation able to stimulate vertical and horizontal development of thematic value chains across DR is important. Direct actions in regard to circular economy or environment-

friendly and low-carbon transport systems are needed. Circular economy interventions should focus on the sectors that use most resources and where the potential for circularity and transnationality is high: electronics and ICT, batteries and vehicles, packaging, plastics, textiles, construction and buildings, food and nutrients. Transport related interventions should strive for proposing and developing smart, sustainable and green transport technologies and networks, as well as e-mobility solutions e.g. the introduction of alternative fuels, next generation lithium-ion batteries, safer autonomous navigation systems (route planning, accident prevention, electrified highways). Furthermore, slow integration of innovative regional and urban technologies in the planning, management and development of DR regions and cities can be addressed by stimulating partnerships among regions and cities coming from countries with different innovation performance levels (see the annual EC Innovation Scoreboard). For all the above, digitalization and digitization should act as RDI cross-sectoral, horizontal enablers. In addition, the future interventions should be aligned to the targets and actions of EUSDR PA7 and PA8 as described in the Territorial Strategy and to the other policy documents mentioned there e.g. Territorial Agenda 2030, EU Grean Deal, etc. To conclude with, the focus of the proposed intervention should be on the followings:

*Focus 1*. RDI related transnational policies and processes for moving past labour-intensive, technology-follower type of workflows and processes and towards the uptake of innovation and advanced technologies e.g. nanotechnologies, advanced materials, advanced manufacturing and processing (production technologies) and biotechnology.

*Focus 2.* Transnational RDI related activities for capacity building along thematic value chains.

*Focus 3.* Technology transfer and technology uptake towards and from SMEs and improved access to quadruple transnational innovation networks

*Focus 4.* Circular economy policies and processes in specific related domains e.g. electronics and ICT batteries and vehicles, packaging, plastics, textiles, construction and buildings, food and nutrients.

*Focus 5.* Developing smart, sustainable and green transport technologies and networks, as well as e-mobility solutions.

*Focus 6.* Integration of regional and smart cities solutions in the planning, management and development of DR regions and cities.

Related types of possible actions**:**

- Support for other relevant and innovative, advanced technologies by transnational technology generation cooperation (e.g. in the field of nanotechnologies, advanced materials, advanced manufacturing and processing (production technologies) and health industry (e.g. establishing joint medicine research clusters/centres, usage of digitalisation and artificial intelligence in medicine/health care, analysing big data sets in medicine, biotechnology), optimising test bed functionality and synergies (e.g. by conducting joint tests at the test bed facilities with a view to defining, adopting and promoting best practices in utilisation of such infrastructures or to link capabilities of several test bed facilities and

establishing common practices among them)

- Support for transnational uptake of technologies along thematic value chains: specialisation in transnational Danube Region clusters for emerging industries, support for a higher level and new forms of collaboration within the quadruple helix to encourage co-inventions and innovation cooperation as well.
- Support for transnational circular economy collaboration forms, harmonisation of related policies and uptake of technologies in specific related domains (e.g. electronics and ICT batteries and vehicles, packaging, plastics, textiles, construction and buildings, food and nutrients);
- Support for technology generation and uptake of related technologies regarding smart, sustainable and green transport technologies and networks, as well as e-mobility solutions in relation to transnational transport networks and transboundary functional urban areas;
- Support for the uptake of advanced technologies in relation to smart infrastructure in Danube Region cities: integration of smart cities solutions in the planning, management and development of the Danube Region cities;

**Expected results**

***For INTERACT and ESPON programmes:***

*Reference Article 17(9)(c)(i)*

*Definition of a single beneficiary or a limited list of beneficiaries and the granting procedure*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| *N/A* |

### 2.1.1.2 Indicators (preliminary indicators subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(ii), Article 17(9)(c)(iii)*

Table 2: Output indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID [5] | Indicator | Measurement unit [255] | Milestone (2024) [200] | Final target (2029) [200] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | SO 1.1 | RCO 83 | Strategies and action plans jointly developed | No. of strategy/action plan | | |
| 1 | SO 1.1 | RCO 84 | Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in | No. of pilot action | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | projects | | | |
| 1 | SO 1.1 | RCO90 | Projects for innovation networks across borders | No. of projects | | |
| 1 | SO 1.1 | RCO 116 | Jointly developed solutions | No. of solutions | | |

Table 3: Result indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID | Indicator | Measurement unit | Baseline | Reference year | Final target (2029) | Source of data | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | SO 1.1 | RCR 79 | Joint strategies and action plans taken up by organisations | No. of joint strategy/ action plan | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |
| 1 | SO 1.1 | RCR 104 | Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | No. of solutions | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |

### 2.1.1.3 The main target groups (preliminary indicators subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iii), Article 17(9)(c)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| Target groups of funded operations include all public and private institutions and stakeholders that will be involved or use/ benefit from the project outputs/ results. Target groups are according to their legal form local, regional and national public authorities/institutions, bodies governed by public law, EGTC, international organisations and private bodies.<br><br>Target groups comprise according to their thematic scope among others local, regional and national public authorities and organisations established and managed by public authorities responsible for research, innovation, technology transfer institutions, sectoral agencies and regional development agencies, networks, clusters and associations, research and development institutions, universities with research facilities, business support organisation (e.g. chamber of commerce, business innovations centres, technology information centres), higher education, education/training centre and school, NGOs, private enterprises including SME. |

### 2.1.1.4 Identification of the specific territories targeted, including the planned use of ITI, CLLD or other territorial tools (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| The Danube Transnational Programme (DTP) will not use specific instruments for integrated territorial development offered by the EU regulations such as Community Led Local Development (CLLD) and Integrated Territorial Investment (ITI). However, the DTP supports an integrated territorial approach which is mainly understood as a comprehensive and coordinated approach to planning and governance and territorial coordination of policies in specific territories. |

### 2.1.1.5 Planned use of financial instruments

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(v)*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| *N/A* |

### 2.1.1.6 Indicative breakdown of the EU programme resources by type of intervention

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(vi), Article 17(9)(c)(v)*

Table 4: Dimension 1 – intervention field

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 5: Dimension 2 – form of financing

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 6: Dimension 3 – territorial delivery mechanism and territorial focus

| Priority No | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

### 2.1.2. **Specific objective** (repeated for each selected specific objective, for priorities other than technical assistance)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)*

## PO1 - (iv) Developing skills for smart specialisation, industrial transition and entrepreneurship

#### 2.1.2.1 Related types of action and their expected contribution to those specific objectives and to macro-regional strategies and sea-basis strategies, where appropriate

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(i), Article 17(9)(c)(ii)*

*Text field [7000]*

Danube macro-region is characterised by countries with different economic and social development paths, performance convergence potentials or links to the European economic market. More exactly, in spite of the notable elements of convergence across some national level economies, one may notice that the spatial pattern is quite fragmented, especially due to growing gaps between urban regions as engines of growth and rural regions as peripheries. The latter, in most cases, are lagging behind. Whilst some regional economies of the Danube Region are heavily industrialized (or significant reindustrialisation has taken place), most economies seem too be unprepared for the challenges arising from transitioning to industry 4.0. (i4.0). Such developed vs undeveloped, integrated versus isolated, urban versus periphery, industrial vs non-industrial (or deindustrialized) clivages can be mitigated by implementing i4.0 processes (including skills) and working towards harmonised smart specialisation strategies (S3) and policies. Within this specific objective, future interventions must prove their capacity to act as territorial catalyst by capitalizing on past thematic experiences and achievements. Support for transnational knowledge transfer, S3 and policy harmonization and i4.0 technologies testing is needed in order to restore and gain competitiveness both at transnational and national level. This calls for a tighter cooperation in the framework of S3 and policies with a special focus on SMEs, industrial transition and related professional skills. It has to be noted that there are large differences among S3 and policies in terms of field of specialisation, sectoral focus or territorial outreach. While some states have their own national S3 and policies, including alignment of regional economic administration, in some countries it is still considered as a new, emerging topic. Therefore, the lack of related S3 and policies transnational planning and management is a common thing. Consequently, support for transnational alignment of S3 and policies is of great importance. A smart networking combination of business, educational, scientific knowledge and infrastructure is fundamental for creating products and services with transnational impact. For all the above, digitalization and digitization should act as cross-sectoral, horizontal enablers. In addition, the future interventions should be aligned to the targets and actions of EUSDR PA8 and partially PA9 as described in the Territorial Strategy and to the other policy documents mentioned there e.g. Territorial Agenda 2030, EU Grean Deal, etc. To conclude with, the focus of the proposed intervention should be on the followings:

*Focus 1*. Skills development for and of joint advancement of smart specialisation strategies and

policies inlcuding a special focus on less advanced regions.

*Focus 2*. Skills development for industrial transformation and transition towards industry 4.0, robotisation, mechatronics, digital technologies (including Internet of things, Artificial Inteligence)

*Focus 3*. Skills development for delivering products and services with transnational impact.

Related types of possible actions:

- Enhancing cooperation related to entrepreneurial skills in advanced technologies, industries of high Danube Region importance (i.e. owing to social impacts, market needs) to better combine existing capacities and competences;
- Building cooperation structures to obtain innovation capacity needed to be competitive at regional and EU level, identify niches within the EU market and become attractive as a partner within the Danube Region or towards other EU regions;
- Establishing platforms enabling transfer of knowledge and skills and building inter-regional synergies for the development of regional smart specialisation strategies and policies with a special focus on the involvement of entrepreneurial actors and existing networks in discovering and exploiting promising areas of specialisation;
- Setting up and piloting measures for regions allowing for exchange of experience on implementation of smart specialisation strategies, e.g. networking of regions specialised in the field of industry 4.0 and related professional skills, support for related knowledge exchange between model regions and regions lagging behind in terms of elaborating and implementing industry 4.0 planning schemes.

**Expected results**

***For INTERACT and ESPON programmes:***

*Reference Article 17(9)(c)(i)*

*Definition of a single beneficiary or a limited list of beneficiaries and the granting procedure*

*Text field [7000]*

*N/A*

### 2.1.2.2 Indicators (preliminary indicators subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(ii), Article 17(9)(c)(iii)*

Table 2: Output indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID [5] | Indicator | Measurement unit [255] | Milestone (2024) [200] | Final target (2029) [200] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | SO 1.2 | RCO 83 | Strategies and action plans jointly developed | No. of strategies/action plans | | |
| 1 | SO 1.2 | RCO 84 | Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | No. of pilot action | | |
| 1 | SO 1.2 | RCO85 | Participations in joint training schemes | No. of participants | | |
| 1 | SO 1.2 | RCO 116 | Jointly developed solutions | No. of solutions | | |

Table 3: Result indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID | Indicator | Measurement unit | Baseline | Reference year | Final target (2029) | Source of data | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | SO 1.2 | RCR 79 | Joint strategies and action plans taken up by organisations | No. of joint strategies/ action plans | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |
| 1 | SO 1.2 | RCR81 | Completion of joint training schemes | No. of participants | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |
| 1 | SO 1.2 | RCR 104 | Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | No. of solutions | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |

### 2.1.2.3 The main target groups (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iii), Article 17(9)(c)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

Target groups of funded operations include all public and private institutions and stakeholders that will be involved or use/ benefit from the project outputs/ results. Target groups are according to their legal form local, regional and national public authorities/institutions, bodies governed by public law, EGTC, international organisations and private bodies.

Target groups comprise according to their thematic scope among others both public and private actors such as enterprises, (future) entrepreneurs, cluster organisations, public authorities, intermediaries, education and training organisations, private and public research institutions,

regional development agencies, chambers of commerce, technology transfer institutions, NGOs, innovation agencies, business incubators.

### 2.1.2.4 Identification of the specific territories targeted, including the planned use of ITI, CLLD or other territorial tools (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

The Danube Transnational Programme (DTP) will not use specific instruments for integrated territorial development offered by the EU regulations such as Community Led Local Development (CLLD) and Integrated Territorial Investment (ITI). However, the DTP supports an integrated territorial approach which is mainly understood as a comprehensive and coordinated approach to planning and governance and territorial coordination of policies in specific territories.

### 2.1.2.5 Planned use of financial instruments

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(v)*

*Text field [7000]*

*N/A*

### 2.1.2.6 Indicative breakdown of the EU programme resources by type of intervention

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(vi), Article 17(9)(c)(v)*

Table 4: Dimension 1 – intervention field

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 5: Dimension 2 – form of financing

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 6: Dimension 3 – territorial delivery mechanism and territorial focus

| Priority No | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

2.2 Title of the priority (repeated for each priority)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(d)*

*Text field: [300]*

**Priority 2: A greener, low- carbon Europe**

☐ This is a priority pursuant to a transfer under Article 17(3)

### 2.2.1. **Specific objective** (repeated for each selected specific objective, for priorities other than technical assistance)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)*

**PO2 - (ii) Promoting renewable energy**

### 2.2.1.1 Related types of action and their expected contribution to those specific objectives and to macro-regional strategies and sea-basis strategies, where appropriate

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(i), Article 17(9)(c)(ii)*

*Text field [7000]*

The Danube Region still heavily relies on fossil fuels in relation to both production and consumption. Despite significant favourable changes in many related states, the energy sector is very far from being a low-carbon economic field. A shift to renewables in all states is necessary since the share of fossil fuels in production is generally between 80 and 65%. The need for shift to renewables is also underlined by the inefficient technology and infrastructure related to the thermal power plant network, which has not been reconstructed, thus no major positive changes have taken place in recent years. The majority of economies still heavily relies on uncertain fuels from Russia (and by track Ukraine). This brings up the question of lack of energy security. This exposure to non-renewable sources results in energy dependency of the vast majority of the Danube Region to energy sources of external markets. Security of supply is not safeguarded, for which regional renewables available in the macro-region could contribute for in transnational cooperation. In spite of having a large variety of renewable energy sources across the macro-region with a few similar and complementary endowments from region to region, the utilisation level of renewables in still low. Apart for somecountries, the share of renewable energy in gross final energy consumption is low in the Danube Region, and has never reached 50% in any country. The production and consumption of renewables have similarities across the macro-region given that biofuels and hydropower are having significant roles, and solar energy, wind, geothermal energy have changing utilisation levels. Another reason for a greener energy sector is the high and steadily increasing level of energy consumption paired with low energy efficiency. Therefore, the support for harmonised actions and transnational cooperation is required in order to decarbonise the energy and the related transport and building sector, especially considering the heating and cooling systems of buildings' heating and cooling systems. Also, the still relatively

high GHG emissions by the transport sector calls for increasing the utilisation of renewables. Introduction of alternative fuels and new technologies in transportation could be a field of joint measures and policies. High GHG emission is not caused only by transport, but also by the heating and cooling sector (e.g. burning of fossil fuels, especially coal), which is a significant factor in creating a greener energy mix. The sector is still characterised by low utilisation of RES, thus the sector requires a profound shift to a more environmentally friendly energy production and consumption.

The programme main goal is to contribute to the reduction of region's dependency on imported fossil fuels by facilitating a better integration of renewable energy sources and consequently greening the energy and transport sectors.

*Focus 1:* Increassing the share of renewable energy in the Danube region

*Focus 2:* Decreasing carbon intensity in the power and transport sectors

Related types of possible actions:

- Strategy making and policy support in reaching low-carbon energy production and supporting the decrease of energy dependency in countries and regions most dependent on fossil fuels and resources from external (non-macro-regional) energy markets;
- Capacity building for sustainable energy planning especially in regions with high share of non-RES energy production or consumption;
- Support for harmonised actions and transnational cooperation in the buildings' heating and cooling sector (e.g. decreasing carbon intensity in heating, RES integration in building sector combining it with storage and charging solution systems for e-mobility) in countries and regions where heating and cooling sector has outstanding share in energy consumption;
- Reduction of GHG emissions in the transport sector: introduction of alternative fuels and new technologies (e.g. electric vehicles) in transportation, support shift to more environmentally friendly means of transportation, especially in public transport and freight transport, coordination between energy providers in relation to infrastructure elements of Danube Region relevance;
- Joint planning of infrastructure for the utilisation of renewable energy sources with the facilitation of knowledge exchange between regions of the lowest and the highest share of RES in the energy mix;
- Development of incentive policies to encourage the renewable energy production based on the Danube Region available resources.

**Expected results**

***For INTERACT and ESPON programmes:***

*Reference Article 17(9)(c)(i)*

*Definition of a single beneficiary or a limited list of beneficiaries and the granting procedure*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| *N/A* |

### 2.2.1.2 Indicators (preliminary indicators subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(ii), Article 17(9)(c)(iii)*

Table 2: Output indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID [5] | Indicator | Measurement unit [255] | Milestone (2024) [200] | Final target (2029) [200] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SO 2.1 | RCO 83 | Strategies and action plans jointly developed | No. of strategies/action plans | | |
| 2 | SO 2.1 | RCO 84 | Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | No. of pilot actions | | |
| 2 | SO 2.1 | RCO 116 | Jointly developed solutions | No. of solutions | | |

Table 3: Result indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID | Indicator | Measurement unit | Baseline | Reference year | Final target (2029) | Source of data | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SO 2.1 | RCR 79 | Joint strategies and action plans taken up by organisations | No. of joint strategies/ action plans | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |
| 2 | SO 2.1 | RCR 104 | Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | No. of solutions | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |

### 2.2.1.3 The main target groups (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iii), Article 17(9)(c)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| Target groups of funded operations include all public and private institutions and stakeholders that will be involved or use/ benefit from the project outputs/ results. Target groups are according to their legal form local, regional and national public authorities/institutions, bodies governed by public law, EGTC, international organisations and private bodies. |

Target groups comprise according to their thematic scope among others local, regional and national public authorities and related entities, regional development agencies, energy suppliers, energy management institutions and enterprises, regional associations, regional innovation agencies, NGOs, financing institutions, education and training centres as well as universities and research institutes.

### 2.2.1.4 Identification of the specific territories targeted, including the planned use of ITI, CLLD or other territorial tools (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

The Danube Transnational Programme (DTP) will not use specific instruments for integrated territorial development offered by the EU regulations such as Community Led Local Development (CLLD) and Integrated Territorial Investment (ITI). However, the DTP supports an integrated territorial approach which is mainly understood as a comprehensive and coordinated approach to planning and governance and territorial coordination of policies in specific territories.

### 2.2.1.5 Planned use of financial instruments

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(v)*

*Text field [7000]*

*N/A*

### 2.2.1.6 Indicative breakdown of the EU programme resources by type of intervention

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(vi), Article 17(9)(c)(v)*

Table 4: Dimension 1 – intervention field

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 5: Dimension 2 – form of financing

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 6: Dimension 3 – territorial delivery mechanism and territorial focus

| Priority No | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

### 2.2.2. **Specific objective** (repeated for each selected specific objective, for priorities other than technical assistance)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)*

**PO2 - (iv)promoting climate change adaptation, and disaster risk prevention, resilience, taking into account ecosystem-based approaches**

#### 2.2.2.1 Related types of action and their expected contribution to those specific objectives and to macro-regional strategies and sea-basis strategies, where appropriate

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(i), Article 17(9)(c)(ii)*

*Text field [7000]*

The Danube Region is forecasted to be exposed to climate change greatly by increasing annual mean temperatures, the wet regions becoming wetter, while the dry regions drier in general, as well as increase is expected in the intensity and frequency of hot days, heat waves, dry periods, as well as of heavy rainfalls on local, regional level. Accordingly the frequency and severity of environmental disasters like floods, droughts, or forest fires are predicted to increase in the next decades. As the impacts of the changing climate and of the more frequent and extreme related disasters affect the Danube Region in many fields, its ecosystem, economic sectors and human life, climate change adaptation in general shall be a horizontal issue to be taken into consideration in each Priority of the Danube Transnational Programme, while the limited resources of PO2 / SO2.2 (iv) is to be focused on harmonised, joint capacities in forecasting and vulnerability assessment to support policy making and awareness raising in different sectors; transboundary disaster management, emergency response in relation to floods, droughts, forest fires and in addition accidental pollution along main transnational river(-basin)s of the region. Water scarcity aspect of CC adaptation affecting the balanced use and the quality of water, avoiding overexploitation is to be addressed in SO2.3 (v), while biodiversity related CC adaptation, especially in relation to protected area and forestry management are to be addressed in SO2.4 (vii). Flood risk, droughts and the related disasters are major challenges across the Danube Region. The main transboundary rivers, the Tisa River and its tributaries in particular, but the Danube River, the Mura-Drava, and the Sava River Basins as well are flood prone areas having severe flood events in the past years that emphasise the necessity of transnational cooperation in joint, integrated flood risk management and preparedness for disasters of key actors in this field. The operation of the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR) as policy platform for coordinating water related issues, including floods, of the Danube River Basin countries is a great value for the Danube Region, in which framework the first basin-wide Danube Flood Risk Management Plan (DFRMP) was developed and adopted by the member countries. Actions to be supported by the Danube Transnational Programme can have relevant contribution to the implementation of the DFRMP. The transboundary network of rivers in the Danube River Basin, considering the potential impact and damage that accidental pollutions can cause along these major rivers across countries make also necessary of coordinated, harmonised approaches of emergency response in this field. Flood management and accidental pollution management actions supported in the frame of SO iv shall focus on the main transboundary river(-basin)s of the DRB, following a territorially integrated, cross-sectoral approach. Climate change related

environmental risks and disasters like droughts, forest fires or heat waves are becoming more frequent issues season after season in many different parts of the Danube Region. Although these phenomena don't have transnational impacts, it is important to harmonise and standardise the preparation of response authorities and organisations and their related procedures at transnational scale for a more effective preparedness and response in case of emergency situations.

Supported projects shall take into consideration the existing policy frameworks, mechanisms (e.g. EU Civil Protection Mechanism; or Accident Emergency Warning System of ICPDR, etc.), solutions in the targeted thematic fields, as well as building on the results of previously implemented projects and initiatives in order to gain synergies and avoid duplication of the efforts.

Focus 1: Supporting harmonised, joint capacities and data availability in Danube Region scale climate change forecasting and vulnerability assessment to support policy making and awareness raising

Focus 2: Supporting harmonised, coordinated, joint disaster prevention, preparedness and response activities on environmental risks, on floods, droughts, or accidental pollution of rivers on transnational river(-basin) scale and climate-change related other disasters (e.g. wildfires, heat waves)

Focus 3: Strengthen the preparedness and adaptive capacity of the society (including also disaster management organisations, volunteer rescue teams), economy and nature to cope with impacts of climate change and establish climate services to foster the resilience

Related types of possible actions:

- Harmonised, jointly developed and tested tools, solutions and measures for climate change modelling, forecasting and vulnerability assessment on Danube Region / River Basin scale ensuring their application at policy and, or operational level;
- Integration of new research results into the climate change adaptation practice for different types of territories in targeted thematic fields (e.g. floods, droughts) and improving skills and competences for policy makers and stakeholders;
- Developing and testing coordinated, harmonised, integrated strategies and tools on transnational river(basin) scale to prevent flood risks, or drought, including application of nature-based solutions;
- Elaborating harmonised, joint strategies, action plans, contingency planning, developing and testing monitoring and alert systems, decision support tools, improving operational cooperation, interoperability, institutional and technical capacities of emergency response authorities and non-governmental organisations to combat environmental risks, such as flood, drought or accidental pollution of transboundary river(-basin)s, or wildfires and climate-change related other disasters;
- Developing and implementing regional level climate change, environmental risks related disaster preparedness activities and establish standardised minimum requirements for disaster responders in the Danube Region to achieve better and more effective transnational

disaster response in the region.

**Expected results**

***For INTERACT and ESPON programmes:***

*Reference Article 17(9)(c)(i)*

*Definition of a single beneficiary or a limited list of beneficiaries and the granting procedure*

*Text field [7000]*

*N/A*

### 2.2.2.2 Indicators (preliminary indicators subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(ii), Article 17(9)(c)(iii)*

Table 2: Output indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID [5] | Indicator | Measurement unit [255] | Milestone (2024) [200] | Final target (2029) [200] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 83 | Strategies and action plans jointly developed | No. of strategies/action plans | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 84 | Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | No. of Pilot actions | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO85 | Participations in joint training schemes | No. of participants | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 116 | Jointly developed solutions | No. of solutions | | |

Table 3: Result indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID | Indicator | Measurement unit | Baseline | Reference year | Final target (2029) | Source of data | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR 79 | Joint strategies and action plans taken up by organisations | No of joint strategy/ action plan | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR81 | Completion of joint training schemes | No. of participants | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR 104 | Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | No. of solutions | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |

### 2.2.2.3 The main target groups (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iii), Article 17(9)(c)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

Target groups of funded operations include all public and private institutions and stakeholders that will be involved or use/ benefit from the project outputs/ results. Target groups are according to their legal form local, regional and national public authorities/institutions, bodies governed by public law, EGTC, international organisations and private bodies.

Target groups comprise according to their thematic scope among others of public sector including local, regional and national authorities, policy makers, research institutions in the field of water-flood management, hydro-meteorological services, disaster management, regional development agencies, associations, special interest groups, professional and volunteer civil protection and rescue organisations, NGOs, education and training organisations, financing institutions and the private sector.

### 2.2.2.4 Identification of the specific territories targeted, including the planned use of ITI, CLLD or other territorial tools (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

The Danube Transnational Programme (DTP) will not use specific instruments for integrated territorial development offered by the EU regulations such as Community Led Local Development (CLLD) and Integrated Territorial Investment (ITI). However, the DTP supports an integrated territorial approach which is mainly understood as a comprehensive and coordinated approach to planning and governance and territorial coordination of policies in specific territories.

### 2.2.2.5 Planned use of financial instruments

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(v)*

*Text field [7000]*

*N/A*

### 2.2.2.6 Indicative breakdown of the EU programme resources by type of intervention

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(vi), Article 17(9)(c)(v)*

Table 4: Dimension 1 – intervention field

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 5: Dimension 2 – form of financing

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 6: Dimension 3 – territorial delivery mechanism and territorial focus

| Priority No | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

### 2.2.3. **Specific objective** (repeated for each selected specific objective, for priorities other than technical assistance)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)*

**PO2 - (vi) *Promoting access to water and sustainable water management***

#### 2.2.3.1 Related types of action and their expected contribution to those specific objectives and to macro-regional strategies and sea-basis strategies, where appropriate

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(i), Article 17(9)(c)(ii)*

*Text field [7000]*

One of the basic features of the Danube Region that it covers almost the entire water system of the Danube River and its tributaries, the Danube River Basin (DRB). Beyond the Danube River there are shared water bodies and water catchment areas of transnational importance, like the Tisa (TRB), Sava (SRB), Mura-Drava River Sub-basins. Pressures affecting both the quantity and the quality of these transboundary rivers, river basins, surface and underground water bodies like contamination and water pollution or increasing water use, decreasing ground water levels, shrinking supplies can have serious impacts beyond country borders that make necessary the cooperation of key actors from upstream and downstream countries to tackle such significant issues by coordinated, harmonised, joint solutions. It is a great advantage of the region that the policy framework for transboundary cooperation in the field of water management exists for many years and facilitated on the DRB level by the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR), but also on the SRB by the International Sava River Basin Commission (ISRBC), or on the TRB coordinated by the Tisza Group of the ICPDR. Respective transnational river basin management plans (RBMP) were elaborated and regularly updated on the basis of these platforms and adopted by the member countries, identifying the Significant Water Management Issues and the necessary measures on transnational level. Actions to be supported by the Danube transnational Programme can have relevant contributions to the implementation of the DRBMP and of the other sub-basin RBMPs. Despite the considerable improvements achieved in previous years by the coordinated efforts of these countries, for good chemical and ecological status of the transnational water bodies of DRB, further cooperation is needed to tackle pollution (organic, nutrient, hazardous substances, pharmaceuticals, plastics) affecting quality of water in transboundary river systems and groundwater bodies. Emergency response to accidental pollution of these river systems are however to be addressed in connection to SO2.2 (iv). Hydromorphological alterations may impact the status of transboundary surface and ground water systems. The negative effects are mainly related to flood protection measures, hydropower projects, watersupply and navigation alterations. As the DTP is not financing investments of major infrastructures, support can be made for integrated, transnational river(-basin) scale efforts for harmonising management practises between water management, agriculture, environment, navigation, hydropower and flood protection to improve the quality and quantity of water in relevant river systems. Challenges of hydromorphological alterations in relation to interruption of river continuity can be addressed in the context of connectivity within ecological corridors in SO2.4 (vii). Transnational coordination in the field of water supply management in the frames of a river basin management system, including basin-wide importance of groundwater bodies, is

required, . The protection and usage of these water bodies are relevant since many of them act as major source for e.g. drinking, agriculture or industry. Water management actions supported in the frame of SO2.3 (v) shall focus on the main transboundary river(-basin)s of the DRB, following a territorially integrated, cross-sectoral approach and shall take into consideration the potential negative effects of climate change (e.g. water scarcity affecting quantity, or quality of these waters).

Focus 1: Strengthening capacities for prevention and mitigation of water pollution or for restoration of good quality of transnational water bodies including hazardous and emerging substances pollution and waste water treatment

Focus 2: Harmonising management practises between water management, agriculture, environment, navigation, hydropower and flood protection to improve the quality and quantity of water in transnational river systems.

Focus 3: Transnational coordination of water supply management, especially in relation to basin-wide importance of groundwater bodies.

Related types of possible actions:

- Developing and testing coordinated, harmonised, joint solutions, and tools for more effective monitoring and modelling to ensure harmonised data availability, as well as for improved management measures to prevent and mitigate water pollution or to restore good quality of water, with special regard to hazardous and emerging substances pollution and waste water treatment, taking also into account the possible impacts of climate change on the quality of water;
- Development, testing and/ or implementation of harmonised strategies, management solutions and toolsfor improving sediment balance, or reconnection of adjacent floodplains / wetlands to improve water quality, in transnational water bodies;
- Developing harmonised, joint monitoring and modelling sytem(s) in order to better understand the transboundary groundwater systems of Danube River Basin;
- Defining joint strategies and harmonised measures, elaborating and adopting innovative solutions in relation to water exploitation and protection ensuring balanced use of water, taking also into account the impacts of climate change for future water demand.

**Expected results**

***For INTERACT and ESPON programmes:***

*Reference Article 17(9)(c)(i)*

*Definition of a single beneficiary or a limited list of beneficiaries and the granting procedure*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| *N/A* |

### 2.2.3.2 Indicators (preliminary indicators subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(ii), Article 17(9)(c)(iii)*

Table 2: Output indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID [5] | Indicator | Measurement unit [255] | Milestone (2024) [200] | Final target (2029) [200] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 83 | Strategies and action plans jointly developed | No. of strategies/action plans | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 84 | Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | No. of Pilot actions | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO85 | Participations in joint training schemes | No. of participants | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 116 | Jointly developed solutions | No. of solutions | | |

Table 3: Result indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID | Indicator | Measurement unit | Baseline | Reference year | Final target (2029) | Source of data | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR 79 | Joint strategies and action plans taken up by organisations | No of joint strategy/ action plan | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR81 | Completion of joint training schemes | No. of participants | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR 104 | Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | No. of solutions | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |

### 2.2.3.3 The main target groups (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iii), Article 17(9)(c)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

Target groups of funded operations include all public and private institutions and stakeholders that will be involved or use/ benefit from the project outputs/ results. Target groups are according to their legal form local, regional and national public authorities/institutions, bodies governed by public law, EGTC, international organisations and private bodies. Target groups comprise according to their thematic scope among others local, regional and national public authorities and organisations established and managed by public authorities responsible for water management, or environmental issues, hydro-meteorological services, infrastructure and (public) service providers (e.g. for water supply, waste water treatment, hydro power plants), interest groups including NGOs (e.g. international organisation, environmental organisations, farmer associations, voluntary association, etc.), research and development institutions, universities with research facilities, higher education, education/training centre and school.

### 2.2.3.4 Identification of the specific territories targeted, including the planned use of ITI, CLLD or other territorial tools (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

The Danube Transnational Programme (DTP) will not use specific instruments for integrated territorial development offered by the EU regulations such as Community Led Local Development (CLLD) and Integrated Territorial Investment (ITI). However, the DTP supports an integrated territorial approach which is mainly understood as a comprehensive and coordinated approach to planning and governance and territorial coordination of policies in specific territories.

### 2.2.3.5 Planned use of financial instruments

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(v)*

*Text field [7000]*

*N/A*

### 2.2.3.6 Indicative breakdown of the EU programme resources by type of intervention

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(vi), Article 17(9)(c)(v)*

Table 4: Dimension 1 – intervention field

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 5: Dimension 2 – form of financing

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 6: Dimension 3 – territorial delivery mechanism and territorial focus

| Priority No | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

### 2.2.4. **Specific objective** (repeated for each selected specific objective, for priorities other than technical assistance)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)*

**PO2 - (vii) Enhancing biodiversity, green infrastructure in the urban environment, and reducing pollution**

#### 2.2.4.1 Related types of action and their expected contribution to those specific objectives and to macro-regional strategies and sea-basis strategies, where appropriate

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(i), Article 17(9)(c)(ii)*

*Text field [7000]*

The Danube Region is a colourful mosaic of different biogeographical regions resulting in high biodiversity, the Danube river and its tributaries being the veins of the region with its riverine and wetland habitats (e.g. the Danube and its Delta, the Mura-Drava-Danube TBR) to hilly and mountainous landscapes (e.g. Carpathians, Dynaric Alps, Czech Forest-Bavarian Forest) framing the territory. The major rivers and mountain ranges are also important transnational ecological corridors providing connectivity between key habitats. This richness of the region is also reflected by the high number of protected areas, the ratio of Natura 2000 areas being significantly higher in almost all DR states compared to the EU average (18%). However this richness of biodiversity is endangered by many factors, by human interventions, the spreading of invasive alien species and the climate change impacting the conditions of ecosystems, which need solutions in the field of nature protection and restoration with often on a broader territorial level in which transnational coordination and cooperation is essential and can make real difference. One of the main challenges is related to the interconnectivity of the elements of the ecological network. Fragmentation of transnational habitats and ecosystems, insufficient measures to secure biodiversity of the macro-region can be experienced. This calls for support for the improvement of ecological connectivity, tackling fragmentation between habitats, nature protection areas along transnationally relevant ecological corridors. Despite of existing initiatives and cooperation frameworks of protected areas (DANUBEPARKS, Carpathian Network of Protected Areas, Mura-Drava-Danube Transboundary Biosphere Reserve) weak management capacities and skills for ecological regions of transnational relevance (e.g. Carpathian Mountains, Pannonian landscapes, transnational river habitats) raises the issue of development of transnational management schemes, establishing and strengthening the cooperation frameworks in relation to the ecological regions and protected areas in an integrated territorial approach involving other key sectors (e.g. transport, agriculture, forestry, navigation, water management, spatial planning). Joint conservation and preservation techniques and planning schemes are needed, including protecting the quality of soils to enhance biodiversity of the targeted eco-regions. Institutionalised, long-term management network(s) of 'Danubian' transboundary ecological regions would create real transnational impact. The ecological balance of ecosystems in the Danube Region, the protected areas are endangered also by invasive alien species. This urges nature protection stakeholders to deal with joint solutions in prevention and control of IAS and management of their priority pathways within targeted ecological regions of transnational relevance. On the other hand, joint and harmonised measures for preserving the dynamics of key habitats of umbrella / flagship

species (e.g. sturgeons) of the transnational ecological regions within the Danube Region are also very important as such measures can contribute to the protection of many other species within that territory as well. As climate change is more and more affecting the biodiversity in the Danube Region, efforts shall be made to address such risks by coordinated and harmonised measures within trasnationaly relevant ecological regions, but also projects addressing other key issues within SO2.4 (vii) to sustainably manage and restore biodiversity, shall take into account the potential climate change effects and plan activities that can ensure stronger resilience and adaptation to the changing conditions. Projects in general are expected to address transnationally relevant geographic areas, distinct biogeographic regions, ecological corridors, ecoregions and depending on the thematic focus, they shall strive for an integrated territorial approach involving other key sectors beyond environmental and nature protection relevant in the specific context and area.

Focus 1: Transnational cooperation for the improvement of ecological connectivity between habitats, nature protection areas along transnationally relevant ecological corridors of the Danube Region and for the development and implementation of transnational conservation action plans and management plans for endangered umbrella species as well.

Focus 2: Creation and strengthening of networks of cooperation in relation to the ecological regions and among protected areas

Focus 3: Coordinated and harmonised measures within trasnationaly relevant ecological regions ensuring resilience and adaptation to climate change to reduce its impacts on biodiversity

Related types of possible actions

- Developing and testing harmonised strategies and joint solutions to improve, restore and manage ecological connectivity along transnationally relevant ecological corridors, including preparation of green and blue infrastructure developments;
- Actions in revitalisation and rehabilitation of water habitats along major transnational river (systems), exploring the potentials of restoration and reconnection of floodplains and adjacent areas;
- Establishing (institutionalised) management and cooperation network(s) of 'Danubian' transboundary ecological regions, including development and testing of harmonised management strategies and solutions, conservation and preservation techniques, toolkits ensuring also sustainable use of natural resources;
- Joint, harmonised strategic planning and solutions for transboundary ecological regions increasing the resilience of habitats and ecosystems and their ability to adapt to climate change impacts by development of eco-friendly land use systems, landscape management and soil protection measures;
- Coordinated, joint solutions in prevention and control of IAS and management of their priority pathways.
- Joint and harmonised development and implementation of transnational conservation action plans and management plans for endangered umbrella species of the Danube Region.

**Expected results**

***For INTERACT and ESPON programmes:***

*Reference Article 17(9)(c)(i)*

*Definition of a single beneficiary or a limited list of beneficiaries and the granting procedure*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| *N/A* |

### 2.2.3.2 Indicators (preliminary indicators subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(ii), Article 17(9)(c)(iii)*

Table 2: Output indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID [5] | Indicator | Measurement unit [255] | Milestone (2024) [200] | Final target (2029) [200] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 83 | Strategies and action plans jointly developed | No. of strategies/action plans | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 84 | Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | No. of Pilot actions | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO85 | Participations in joint training schemes | No. of participants | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 116 | Jointly developed solutions | No. of solutions | | |

Table 3: Result indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID | Indicator | Measurement unit | Baseline | Reference year | Final target (2029) | Source of data | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR 79 | Joint strategies and action plans taken up by organisations | No of joint strategy/ action plan | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR81 | Completion of joint training schemes | No. of participants | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR 104 | Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | No. of solutions | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |

### 2.2.4.3 The main target groups (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iii), Article 17(9)(c)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| Target groups of funded operations include all public and private institutions and stakeholders that will be involved or use/ benefit from the project outputs/ results. Target groups are according to their legal form local, regional and national public authorities/institutions, bodies governed by public law, EGTC, international organisations and private bodies. Target groups comprise according to their thematic scope among others local, regional and national public authorities and organisations established and managed by public authorities responsible for environmental and nature protection issues, agriculture (farming, forestry, fishery), spatial planners, infrastructure and (public) service providers (e.g. water management, transport, hydropower), interest groups including NGOs (e.g. international organisation, environmental organisations, voluntary association, etc.), research and development institutions, universities with research facilities, higher education, education/training centre and school. |

### 2.2.4.4 Identification of the specific territories targeted, including the planned use of ITI, CLLD or other territorial tools (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| The Danube Transnational Programme (DTP) will not use specific instruments for integrated territorial development offered by the EU regulations such as Community Led Local Development (CLLD) and Integrated Territorial Investment (ITI). However, the DTP supports an integrated territorial approach which is mainly understood as a comprehensive and coordinated approach to planning and governance and territorial coordination of policies in specific territories. |

### 2.2.4.5 Planned use of financial instruments

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(v)*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| *N/A* |

### 2.2.4.6 Indicative breakdown of the EU programme resources by type of intervention

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(vi), Article 17(9)(c)(v)*

Table 4: Dimension 1 – intervention field

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 5: Dimension 2 – form of financing

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 6: Dimension 3 – territorial delivery mechanism and territorial focus

| Priority No | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

### 2.3Title of the priority (repeated for each priority)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(d)*

*Text field: [300]*

**Priority 3: A more social Europe**

☐ This is a priority pursuant to a transfer under Article 17(3)

### 2.3.1. **Specific objective** (repeated for each selected specific objective, for priorities other than technical assistance)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)*

**PO4 - SO1(i) Enhancing the effectiveness and inclusiveness of labour markets and access to high quality employment through developing social infrastructure and promoting social economy**

### 2.3.1.1 Related types of action and their expected contribution to those specific objectives and to macro-regional strategies and sea-basis strategies, where appropriate

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(i), Article 17(9)(c)(ii)*

*Text field [7000]*

The Danube Region is affected by the interconnected challenges of high long-term unemployment, profound income inequalities, intensifying westward labour migration and a weak social economy. Employment is a field in which increasing socio-spatial disparities in the DR can be found causing severe weakening of cohesion.

Prior to the pandemic there had been significant improvements in overall National employment rates in parts of the Danube region, particularly in large urban conurbations However, there exist patterns of entrenched long term unemployment throughout the Danube region which have not changed significantly. It can be observed that these patterns are mostly evident amongst vulnerable groups, which include ethnic minorities, the aged and those persons with dissabilities. It is also generally observed that the vulnerability is enhanced in rural areas and amongst those with relatively low levels of education. This is compounded in certain regions who have historically relied on employment in mono functional industrial and agricultural production facilities which over time have been subject to closure, downsizing or re-purposing.

The persisting north-west versus south-east divide in spatial inequalities on the labour markets is resulting in depopulation, ageing, unfavourable economic structures, low population retention, often transboundary peripheries. The Danube Region is a part of Europe where large shares of population are currently living abroad partly because of differences in employment conditions. Since high inequalities are going to be present in a long run, it is of major importance to tackle the challenges deriving from westward migration flows. The challenge is exacebated in rural areas

with migration internally to the larger conurbations and also towards the West.

It can be observed that the social economy is relatively weak in large parts of the region and the development of the social economy alongside traditional employment support measures can potentially provide innovative approaches in tackling the long term unemployment challenge. In addition, capacity building across the region towards producing and managing information flows on employment, vulnerability and migration trends can help guide understanding towards the development of effective policy, planning and initiatives.

*Focus 1:* The integration of vulnerable groups into the labour market, with special attention on regions that display high proportions of disadvantaged.

*Focus 2:* Retaining skilled labour and developing a more sustainable migration of educated people.

*Focus 3*: Capacity building for employment support bodies (information and data systems; coordination; training e.g. social economy).

Types of actions:

- Joint coordination of policies and planning aimed at integrated vulnerable groups (elderly people, people with disabilities, ethnic minorities, rural people etc.) to support inclusive employment in regions that display high proportions of disadvantaged populace;
- Support for designing innovation-led policies and planning to retain skilled labour and a more sustainable migration of educated people (e.g. by introducing transnational study and RDI programmes, promoting innovative employment schemes suitable for the needs of the tertiary educated living in rural regions or regions significantly affected by this type of migration );
- Creation of an information system and support for the provision of information and data about live events connected to periodic and permanent migration of workforce, caused by labour market inequalities; between the Eastern and the Western part of the macro region;
- Coordinated policies and strategies to tackle active ageing (e.g. by social entrepreneurship) in regions and cities of the macro region affected by a high level of ageing;
- Developing cooperation and innovative planning between bodies responsible for labour market integration and the private sector towards enhancing the inclusion of the disabled in the labour market;
- Build-up of a "Danube observatory system" about labour migration and its impacts on cohesion; involving public bodies responsible for monitoring & evaluation, academia and civil society;
- Developing models to explore and demonstrate the effectiveness of remote working towards developing employment inclusiveness and meeting regional social and economic goals;
- Restructuring and diversification of employment by the implementation of territorially integrated action plans for employment with special focus on enhancing the spreading of innovative structures targeting mono-functional (e.g. agricultural, industrial) regions

**Expected results**

***For INTERACT and ESPON programmes:***

*Reference Article 17(9)(c)(i)*

*Definition of a single beneficiary or a limited list of beneficiaries and the granting procedure*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| *N/A* |

### 2.2.3.2 Indicators (preliminary indicators subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(ii), Article 17(9)(c)(iii)*

Table 2: Output indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID [5] | Indicator | Measurement unit [255] | Milestone (2024) [200] | Final target (2029) [200] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 83 | Strategies and action plans jointly developed | No. of strategies/action plans | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 84 | Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | No. of Pilot actions | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO85 | Participations in joint training schemes | No. of participants | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 116 | Jointly developed solutions | No. of solutions | | |

Table 3: Result indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID | Indicator | Measurement unit | Baseline | Reference year | Final target (2029) | Source of data | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR 79 | Joint strategies and action plans taken up by organisations | No of joint strategy/ action plan | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR81 | Completion of joint training schemes | No. of participants | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR 104 | Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | No. of solutions | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |

### 2.3.1.3 The main target groups (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iii), Article 17(9)(c)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| Target groups of funded operations include all public and private institutions and stakeholders that will be involved or use/ benefit from the project outputs/ results. Target groups are according to their legal form local, regional and national public authorities/institutions, bodies governed by public law, EGTC, international organisations and private bodies. Target groups comprise according to their thematic scope among others local, regional and national public authorities and organisations established and managed by public authorities, social services providers, labour market organisations, non-governmental organisations, research and development institutions, universities with research facilities, higher education, education/training institutions. |

### 2.3.1.4 Identification of the specific territories targeted, including the planned use of ITI, CLLD or other territorial tools (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| The Danube Transnational Programme (DTP) will not use specific instruments for integrated territorial development offered by the EU regulations such as Community Led Local Development (CLLD) and Integrated Territorial Investment (ITI). However, the DTP supports an integrated territorial approach which is mainly understood as a comprehensive and coordinated approach to planning and governance and territorial coordination of policies in specific territories. |

### 2.3.1.5 Planned use of financial instruments

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(v)*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| *N/A* |

### 2.3.1.6 Indicative breakdown of the EU programme resources by type of intervention

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(vi), Article 17(9)(c)(v)*

Table 4: Dimension 1 – intervention field

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 5: Dimension 2 – form of financing

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 6: Dimension 3 – territorial delivery mechanism and territorial focus

| Priority No | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

### 2.3.2. **Specific objective** (repeated for each selected specific objective, for priorities other than technical assistance)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)*

## PO4 - SO2(ii) Improving access to inclusive and quality services in education, training and lifelong learning through developing infrastructure, including by fostering resilience for distance and on-line education and training

### 2.3.2.1 Related types of action and their expected contribution to those specific objectives and to macro-regional strategies and sea-basis strategies, where appropriate

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(i), Article 17(9)(c)(ii)*

*Text field [7000]*

The integration of an individuial into the labour market, their socio-economic well being, ongoing development and value to their society is highly dependent on their education and skills developed through vocational education and training and lifelong learning. It is fundamental therefore that the provider systems are accessible and inclusive and tailored to the level and background of the individual.

The ratio of early leavers from education is significant through most parts of the region, with the majority failing to meet the 2020 targets. A deteriorating tendency is observable especially in the eastern regions, which usually contain rural areas with a high share of disadvantaged population and with a weak integration of the children into the school system. Minority groups and rural disadvantage is also apparent in terms of those benefitting with a tertiary education.

The currently applied and running learning structures tend to be rather rigid, and the majority of the educational infrastructure and services lack flexibility (in terms of responsiveness to labour market needs), competence orientation and openness (e.g. acknowledgement of informal education) and adequate governance structure.). Non-harmonised demand and supply concerning vocational education and training and vocational schools cause frictions in the labour market that result in exclusion. The development of proven inclusive labour market vocational education and training structures can efficiently contribute to inclusion, cohesion and long-term unemployment reduction in the South Eastern countries.

Though more difficult in rural areas organised vocational training has an established history in the region which can be built upon. However, supportive independent lifelong learning is below the EU average in all countries of the region but Austria and Slovenia.

*Focus 1*: Developing innovative educational models, programs, practical tools and materials for disadvantaged learners

*Focus 2*: Maximising the use of existing knowledge and experience to develop best practices in inclusive education policy and advancing education and policy reform

*Focus 3*: Innovative approaches to encourage and improve inclusive vocational education and

training

Types of actions:

- Development of joint innovative educational models, programs, practical tools and materials to support inclusive education for disadvantaged learners.The expected approach to develop on from model regions within the Danube region and with mutual learning developed from pilot regions;
- Developing best practices in education policy, gathering and disseminiating kowledge and advancing education and policy reforms at the National and Regional level across the Danube Region;
- Establishment or development of existing scientific and educational networks to combat brain drain, whereby educated and skilled individuals leave regions for better prospects.. Networks should bring existing knowledge and research together and develop concrete ouputs;
- Innovative digital and remote education with e-solutions to mitigate rural disadvantage, provide employment related training and combat brain drain;
- Knowledge exchange and the sharing of experience in elaborating and developing inclusive vocational education and training models and systems. This should lead to concrete outputs e.g. the development of work based training schemes which better support relevant skills development to match the needs of the labour market.

**Expected results**

***For INTERACT and ESPON programmes:***

*Reference Article 17(9)(c)(i)*

*Definition of a single beneficiary or a limited list of beneficiaries and the granting procedure*

*Text field [7000]*

*N/A*

### 2.2.3.2 Indicators (preliminary indicators subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(ii), Article 17(9)(c)(iii)*

Table 2: Output indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID [5] | Indicator | Measurement unit [255] | Milestone (2024) [200] | Final target (2029) [200] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 83 | Strategies and action plans jointly developed | No. of strategies/action plans | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 84 | Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in | No. of Pilot actions | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | projects | | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO85 | Participations in joint training schemes | No. of participants | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 116 | Jointly developed solutions | No. of solutions | | |

Table 3: Result indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID | Indicator | Measurement unit | Baseline | Reference year | Final target (2029) | Source of data | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR 79 | Joint strategies and action plans taken up by organisations | No of joint strategy/ action plan | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR81 | Completion of joint training schemes | No. of participants | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR 104 | Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | No. of solutions | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |

### 2.3.2.3 The main target groups (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iii), Article 17(9)(c)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

Target groups of funded operations include all public and private institutions and stakeholders that will be involved or use/ benefit from the project outputs/ results. Target groups are according to their legal form local, regional and national public authorities/institutions, bodies governed by public law, EGTC, international organisations and private bodies. Target groups comprise according to their thematic scope among others local, regional and national public authorities and organisations established and managed by public authorities, social services providers, labour market organisations, non-governmental organisations, research and development institutions, universities with research facilities, higher education, education/training institutions.

### 2.2.3.4 Identification of the specific territories targeted, including the planned use of ITI, CLLD or other territorial tools (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

The Danube Transnational Programme (DTP) will not use specific instruments for integrated territorial development offered by the EU regulations such as Community Led Local Development (CLLD) and Integrated Territorial Investment (ITI). However, the DTP supports an integrated territorial approach which is mainly understood as a comprehensive and coordinated approach to planning and governance and territorial coordination of policies in specific territories.

### 2.3.2.5 Planned use of financial instruments

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(v)*

*Text field [7000]*

*N/A*

### 2.3.2.6 Indicative breakdown of the EU programme resources by type of intervention

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(vi), Article 17(9)(c)(v)*

Table 4: Dimension 1 – intervention field

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 5: Dimension 2 – form of financing

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 6: Dimension 3 – territorial delivery mechanism and territorial focus

| Priority No | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

## 2.3.3. **Specific objective** (repeated for each selected specific objective, for priorities other than technical assistance)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)*

### PO4 - SO2(v) Enhancing the role of culture and tourism in economic development, social inclusion and social innovation

### 2.3.3.1 Related types of action and their expected contribution to those specific objectives and to macro-regional strategies and sea-basis strategies, where appropriate

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(i), Article 17(9)(c)(ii)*

*Text field [7000]*

The Danube Region is characterised by an outstanding cultural diversity that over the centuries has left a rich legacy of intangible and tangible heritage that is often not recognised for its potential towards economic development, social inclusion and social innovation. Generally, major cities have, to varying degrees, acknowledged and sought to use this value, whilst smaller communities in rural and remote areas have not, even though they have a great potential in valorising their diverse heritage towards increasing the well-being of their communities.

Many of the remote, rural areas and smaller settlements are confronted with a lack of in depth recognition of the heritage and clutural assets value potential that they miss inclusive strategic planning to guide and coordinate its valorisation. Furthermore, even where initiatives exist, their implementation is often hindered by the skepticism of the local communities.

Part of the problem lies in the historically limited access to cultural and heritage assets and initiatives, both in a geographical sense and a socially inclusive sense in the Danube region. Efforts should therefore be made to make these assests and initiatives available to all, even if this can be a challenging process for minorities and rural and remote areas. With experience across 14 countries, transnational cooperation can support this with jointly developed valorisation and touristic models and solutions in rural, remote areas and smaller cities. This based on the existing heritage and culture and underpinned from the strong involvement of all parts of the local community.

The consideration of heritage and culture, its valorisation and inclusive accessible development is multifaceted and necessitates the bringing together of partnerships of public and private actors along with social, culutral actors and local communities. Such partnerships can create strategic frameworks and planning towards sustainable valorisation of the heritage and culture, creating and sustaining in particular, community led tourism. Understanding the potential of existing assets will require the consideration of supportive infrastructure, and partnerships may consider how to maximise the use of existing supportive infrastructure but also to plan future investments which support accessibility for all. Social innovation is strongly encouraged, which can provide a more inclusive and effective approach in meeting the needs of local communities and provide sustainable impact.

Focus 1: Valorisation of local cultural and natural heritage for the development of sustainable

tourism products and tourism services in order to increase regional value-added and employment

Focus 2: Improvement of accessibility of cultural and natural heritage for all, among others for youth and vulnerable groups in order to promote social inclusion

Focus 3: Promoting community led natural and cultural heritage management and cultural tourism in rural areas and small cities

Types of actions:

- Improving the accessibility of tourism and culture infrastructure, products and services for vulnerable groups, such as people with disabilities, the elderly and minorities in regions with high proportion of these disadvantaged groups;
- Valorisation of joint natural and cultural heritage and cultural activities through the elaboration of new or improved thematic initiatives for example cultural, hiking, cycling or other thematic routes and initiatives across the macro-region with a special focus on rural or less visited areas;
- Capacity building and development of innovative models for community based tourism to better secure the engagement of host communities by involving them in the planning, management and implementation tourism development in their respective regions;
- Capacity building in social innovation to better support valorisation of joint cultural and natural heritage, in particular for tourism and their heritage management schemes (study, collection, preservation, digitalisation, exhibition and re-interpretation of joint tangible and intangible elements);
- Promoting quality products, services and transnational infrastructure in the tourism and culture sector to support the social inclusion of disadvantaged people via new employment forms and job opportunities. This especially in relation to regions with a high share of minorities, areas with a large share of population at risk of poverty including the youth, elderly or disabled;

- Promote sustainable and slow tourism concepts, planning methodologies, model regions, and management tools in the Danube Region, in regions of mass tourism as well as in regions having a weakly developed tourism sector. Actions should promote and safeguard employability and employment possibilities to vulnerable groups of host communities, and capitalise on EUSDR projects in the interconnected areas of culture, nature and tourism.

**Expected results**

***For INTERACT and ESPON programmes:***

*Reference Article 17(9)(c)(i)*

*Definition of a single beneficiary or a limited list of beneficiaries and the granting procedure*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| *N/A* |

### 2.3.3.2 Indicators (preliminary indicators subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(ii), Article 17(9)(c)(iii)*

Table 2: Output indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID [5] | Indicator | Measurement unit [255] | Milestone (2024) [200] | Final target (2029) [200] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 83 | Strategies and action plans jointly developed | No. of strategies/action plans | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 84 | Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | No. of Pilot actions | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO85 | Participations in joint training schemes | No. of participants | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 116 | Jointly developed solutions | No. of solutions | | |

Table 3: Result indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID | Indicator | Measurement unit | Baseline | Reference year | Final target (2029) | Source of data | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR 79 | Joint strategies and action plans taken up by organisations | No of joint strategy/ action plan | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR81 | Completion of joint training schemes | No. of participants | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR 104 | Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | No. of solutions | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |

### 2.3.3.3 The main target groups (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iii), Article 17(9)(c)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

Target groups of funded operations include all public and private institutions and stakeholders that will be involved or use/ benefit from the project outputs/ results. Target groups are according to their legal form local, regional and national public authorities/institutions, bodies governed by public law, EGTC, international organisations and private bodies. Target groups comprise

according to their thematic scope among others local, regional and national public authorities and organisations established and managed by public authorities responsible for environmental, tourist and cultural issues, sectoral agencies, regional development agencies, social enterprises, employment organisations, tourist operators, tourist information centres (points), regional tourism boards and museums, research and development institutions, universities with research facilities, business support organisation (e.g. chamber of commerce, business innovations centres), higher education, education/training centre and school, NGOs, private enterprises including SME.

### 2.3.3.4 Identification of the specific territories targeted, including the planned use of ITI, CLLD or other territorial tools (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

The Danube Transnational Programme (DTP) will not use specific instruments for integrated territorial development offered by the EU regulations such as Community Led Local Development (CLLD) and Integrated Territorial Investment (ITI). However, the DTP supports an integrated territorial approach which is mainly understood as a comprehensive and coordinated approach to planning and governance and territorial coordination of policies in specific territories.

### 2.3.3.5 Planned use of financial instruments

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(v)*

*Text field [7000]*

*N/A*

### 2.3.2.6 Indicative breakdown of the EU programme resources by type of intervention

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(vi), Article 17(9)(c)(v)*

Table 4: Dimension 1 – intervention field

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 5: Dimension 2 – form of financing

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 6: Dimension 3 – territorial delivery mechanism and territorial focus

| Priority No | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

### 2.4 Title of the priority (repeated for each priority)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(d)*

*Text field: [300]*

**Priority 4: A better cooperation governance**

☐ This is a priority pursuant to a transfer under Article 17(3)

### 2.4.1. Specific objective (repeated for each selected specific objective, for priorities other than technical assistance)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)*

**ISO 1 - enhance the institutional capacity of public authorities, in particular those mandated to manage a specific territory, and of stakeholders**

#### 2.4.1.1 Related types of action and their expected contribution to those specific objectives and to macro-regional strategies and sea-basis strategies, where appropriate

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(i), Article 17(9)(c)(ii)*

*Text field [7000]*

Comprising 14 countries - old and new Member States, candidate countries, a potential candidate and neighbourhood countries - the Danube Region is characterized by distinct administrative fragmentation and low level of institutional integration. Lagging behind legal harmonization and limited capacities of public bodies, especially on sub-national levels, are substantially hindering integrated territorial developments along shared functional ties.

Strengthening multi-level governance in the Danube Region is, therefore, much more than in other parts of Europe a precondition for enabling sectorial developments and territorial cohesion as such.

*Focus 1:* Transnational cooperation is needed to address major territorial governance-challenges like demographic change, severe urban-rural discrepancies or fostering the close-to-people character of regional policy. For achieving a high leverage effect a clear focus should be put on promoting truly integrated approaches under strong involvement of civic and local actors, fostering inter-institutional relations along functional areas and strengthening capacities of public

bodies in selected fields. The integrative character shall be reflected not only by the integration of different administrative levels but also through connecting sectorial aspects like transport or accessibility to major territorial governance challenges. All measures shall substantially take into account, moreover, existing main territorial/spatial development frameworks such as the Territorial agenda 2030 or the New Leipzig Charter.

Related types of possible actions:

- Integrated governance models for addressing challenges arising from demographic change (e.g. aging, depopulation, brain drain);
- Integrated urban-rural governance models including specific territorial development strategies for rural/remote areas as well as accessibility aspects and transport bottlenecks;
- Support for more and stronger inter-institutional relations for the integrated development of transboundary functional areas;
- Capacity building considering especially a better involvement of local and regional public bodies as well as civic actors in transnational policy making, territorial development frameworks and governance models;
- Support for the monitoring and analysis of territorial processes affecting the cohesion and cooperation of the Danube Region to assist capacity building and institutional capacity.

**Expected results**

*Focus 2: Support for the governance of the EUSDR.*

***For INTERACT and ESPON programmes:***

*Reference Article 17(9)(c)(i)*

*Definition of a single beneficiary or a limited list of beneficiaries and the granting procedure*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| *N/A* |

### 2.3.3.2 Indicators (preliminary indicators subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(ii), Article 17(9)(c)(iii)*

Table 2: Output indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID<br>[5] | Indicator | Measurement unit<br>[255] | Milestone (2024)<br>[200] | Final target (2029)<br>[200] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 83 | Strategies and action plans jointly developed | No. of strategies/action plans | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 84 | Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects | No. of Pilot actions | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO85 | Participations in joint training schemes | No. of participants | | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCO 116 | Jointly developed solutions | No. of solutions | | |

Table 3: Result indicators

| Priority | Specific objective | ID | Indicator | Measurement unit | Baseline | Reference year | Final target (2029) | Source of data | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR 79 | Joint strategies and action plans taken up by organisations | No of joint strategy/ action plan | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR81 | Completion of joint training schemes | No. of participants | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |
| 2 | SO 2.2 | RCR 104 | Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations | No. of solutions | 0 | 2021 | | Programme monitoring system | |

### 2.3.3.3 The main target groups (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iii), Article 17(9)(c)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

Target groups of funded operations include all public and private institutions and stakeholders that will be involved or use/ benefit from the project outputs/ results. Target groups are according to their legal form local, regional and national public authorities/institutions, bodies governed by public law, EGTC, international organisations and private bodies. Target groups comprise according to their thematic scope among others local, regional and national public authorities and organisations established and managed by public authorities, research and development institutions, universities with research facilities, business support organisation (e.g. chamber of commerce, business innovations centres), higher education, education/training centre and school, civil society organizations, expert bodies or networks (in fields such as urbanism) private enterprises including SME.

### 2.3.3.4 Identification of the specific territories targeted, including the planned use of ITI, CLLD or other territorial tools (preliminary text subject to revision)

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(iv)*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| The Danube Transnational Programme (DTP) will not use specific instruments for integrated territorial development offered by the EU regulations such as Community Led Local Development (CLLD) and Integrated Territorial Investment (ITI). However, the DTP supports an integrated territorial approach which is mainly understood as a comprehensive and coordinated approach to planning and governance and territorial coordination of policies in specific territories. |

### 2.3.3.5 Planned use of financial instruments

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(v)*

*Text field [7000]*

| |
|---|
| *N/A* |

### 2.3.2.6 Indicative breakdown of the EU programme resources by type of intervention

*Reference: Article 17(4)(e)(vi), Article 17(9)(c)(v)*

Table 4: Dimension 1 – intervention field

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 5: Dimension 2 – form of financing

| Priority no | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

Table 6: Dimension 3 – territorial delivery mechanism and territorial focus

| Priority No | Fund | Specific objective | Code | Amount (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

**The following chapters will be completed in the future versions of IP**

# 3. Financing plan

*Reference: Article 17(4)(g)*

## 3.1 Financial appropriations by year

*Reference: Article 17(4)(g)(i), Article 17(5)(a)-(d)*

Table 7

| Fund | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ERDF (territorial cooperation goal) | | | | | | | | |
| ERDF programmed under Article 17(3) (Investments for Jobs and Growth goal) | | | | | | | | |
| IPA III CBC[2] | | | | | | | | |
| Neighbourhood CBC[3] | | | | | | | | |
| IPA III[4] | | | | | | | | |
| NDICI[5] | | | | | | | | |
| OCTP[6] | | | | | | | | |
| OCTP[7] | | | | | | | | |
| Interreg Funds[8] | | | | | | | | |

2 *Interreg A,, external cross-border cooperation*

3 *Interreg A, external cross-border cooperation*

4 *Interreg B and C*

5 *Interreg B and C*

6 *Interreg B and C*

7 *Interreg C and D*

8 *ERDF, IPA III, NDICI or OCTP, where as single amount under Interreg B and C*

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | | | | | | | | |

## 3.2 Total financial appropriations by fund and national co-financing

*Reference: Article 17(4)(g)(ii), Article 17(5)(a)-(d)*

Table 8

| PO No or TA | Priority | Fund (as applicable) | Basis for calculation EU support (total or public) | EU contribution (a) | National contribution (b)=(c)+(d) | Indicative breakdown of the national counterpart | | Total (e)=(a)+(b) | Co-financing rate (f)=(a)/(e) | Contributions from the third countries (for information) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | National public (c) | National private (d) | | | |
| | Priority 1 | ERDF[9] | | | | | | | | |
| | | IPA III CBC[10] | | | | | | | | |
| | | Neighbourhood CBC[11] | | | | | | | | |
| | | IPA III[12] | | | | | | | | |
| | | NDICI[13] | | | | | | | | |
| | | OCTP Greenland[14] | | | | | | | | |
| | | OCTP[15] | | | | | | | | |
| | | Interreg Funds[16] | | | | | | | | |
| | Priority 2 | (funds as above) | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | All funds | | | | | | | | |
| | | ERDF | | | | | | | | |
| | | IPA III CBC | | | | | | | | |
| | | Neighbourhood CBC | | | | | | | | |
| | | IPA III | | | | | | | | |
| | | NDICI | | | | | | | | |
| | | OCTP Greenland | | | | | | | | |

[9] When ERDF resources correspond to amounts programmed in accordance with Article 17(3), it shall be specified.

[10] Interreg A, external cross-border cooperation

[11] Interreg A, external cross-border cooperation

[12] Interreg B and C

[13] Interreg B and C

[14] Interreg B and C

[15] Interreg C and D

[16] ERDF, IPA III, NDICI or OCTP, where as single amount under Interreg B and C

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **OCTP** | | | | | | | | |
| | | **Interreg Funds** | | | | | | | | |
| | **Total** | **All funds** | | | | | | | | |

4. **Action taken to involve the relevant programme partners in the preparation of the Interreg programme and the role of those programme partners in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation**

*Reference: Article 17(4)(h)*

*Text field [10 000]*

5. **Approach to communication and visibility for the Interreg programme (objectives, target audiences, communication channels, including social media outreach, where appropriate, planned budget and relevant indicators for monitoring and evaluation)**

*Reference: Article 17(4)(i)*

*Text field [4 500]*

6. **Indication of support to small-scale projects, including small projects within small project funds**

***Reference: Article 17(4)(new j), Article 24***

*Text field [7 000]*

## 7. Implementing provisions

### 7.1 Programme authorities

*Reference: Article 17(7)(a)*

***Table 10***

| **Programme authorities** | **Name of the institution** [255] | **Contact name** [200] | **E-mail** [200] |
|---|---|---|---|
| Managing authority | | | |
| National authority (for programmes with participating third countries, if appropriate) | | | |
| Audit authority | | | |
| Group of auditors representatives | | | |
| Body to which the payments are to be made by the Commission | | | |

### 7.2 Procedure for setting up the joint secretariat

*Reference: Article 17(7)(b)*

*Text field [3 500]*

### 7.3 Apportionment of liabilities among participating Member States and where applicable, the third countries and OCTs, in the event of financial corrections imposed by the managing authority or the Commission

*Reference: Article 17(7)(c)*

*Text field [10 500]*

## 8. Use of unit costs, lump sums, flat rates and financing not linked to costs

*Reference: Articles 88 and 89 CPR*

***Table 11: Use of unit costs, lump sums, flat rates and financing not linked to costs***

| Intended use of Articles 88 and 89 | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| From the adoption programme will make use of reimbursement of eligible expenditure based on unit costs, lump sums and flat rates under priority according to Article 88 CPR (if yes, fill in Appendix 1) | ☐ | ☐ |
| From the adoption programme will make use of financing not linked to costs according to Article 89 CPR (if yes, fill in Appendix 2) | ☐ | ☐ |

## APPENDICES

- **Appendix 1: Map of the programme area**
- **Appendix 2: Union contribution based on unit costs, lump sums and flat rates**
- **Appendix 3: Union contribution based on financing not linked to costs**
- **Appendix 3a: List of planned operations of strategic importance with a timetable**

## Appendix 2: Union contribution based on unit costs, lump sums and flat rates[17]

**Template for submitting data for the consideration of the Commission**

**(Article 88 CPR)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Date of submitting the proposal | |
| Current version | |

[17] *The Council's partial mandate changed the title of the appendix, linked to CPR Block 6. Without prejudice to further alignment on the outcome of the interinsitutional agreement on CPR Block 6.*

## A. Summary of the main elements

| Priority | Fund | Estimated proportion of the total financial allocation within the priority to which the SCO will be applied in % (estimate) | Type(s) of operation | | Corresponding indicator name(s) | | Unit of measurement for the indicator | Type of SCO (standard scale of unit costs, lump sums or flat rates) | Corresponding standard scales of unit costs, lump sums or flat rates |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Code | Description | Code | Description | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

1.1.1.1.

## B. Details by type of operation (to be completed for every type of operation)

Did the Managing Authority receive support from an external company to set out the simplified costs below?

If so, please specify which external company: Yes/No – Name of external company

Types of operation:

| | |
|---|---|
| **1.1. Description of the operation type** | |
| **1.2 Specific objective(s) concerned** | |
| **1.3 Indicator name**[18] | |
| **1.4 Unit of measurement for indicator** | |
| **1.5 Standard scale of unit cost, lump sum or flat rate** | |
| **1.6 Amount** | |
| **1.7 Categories of costs covered by unit cost, lump sum or flat rate** | |
| **1.8 Do these categories of costs cover all eligible expenditure for the operation? (Y/N)** | |
| **1.9 Adjustment(s) method** | |
| **1.10 Verification of the achievement of the unit of measurement**<br>**- describe what document(s) will be used to verify the achievement of the unit of measurement**<br>**- describe what will be checked during management verifications (including on-the-spot), and by whom**<br>**- describe what the arrangements are to collect and store the data/documents** | |
| **1.11 Possible perverse incentives or problems caused by this indicator, how they could be mitigated, and the estimated level of risk** | |
| **1.12 Total amount (national and EU) expected to be reimbursed** | |

[18] Several complementary indicators (for instance one output indicator and one result indicator) are possible for one type of operation. In these cases, fields 1.3 to 1.11 should be filled in for each indicator.

## C: Calculation of the standard scale of unit costs, lump sums or flat rates

*1.* Source of data used to calculate the standard scale of unit costs, lump sums or flat rates (who produced, collected and recorded the data; where the data are stored; cut-off dates; validation, etc.):

| |
|---|
| |

*2.* Please specify why the proposed method and calculation is relevant to the type of operation:

| |
|---|
| |

*3.* Please specify how the calculations were made, in particular including any assumptions made in terms of quality or quantities. Where relevant, statistical evidence and benchmarks should be used and attached to this annex in a format that is usable by the Commission.

| |
|---|
| |

*4.* Please explain how you have ensured that only eligible expenditure was included in the calculation of the standard scale of unit cost, lump sum or flat rate;

| |
|---|
| |

*5.* Assessment of the audit authority(ies) of the calculation methodology and amounts and the arrangements to ensure the verification, quality, collection and storage of data:

| |
|---|
| |

** Justifications on the underlying data, the calculation methodology and resulting rate or amount and related assessment by the audit authority [(in points 1, 3 and 5)] are not required when the simplified cost options submitted in this Appendix are established at Union level [(other policies or through the DA referred to in Article 88(4)].*

## Appendix 3: Union contribution based on financing not linked to costs

**Template for submitting data for the consideration of the Commission**

**(Article 89 CPR)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Date of submitting the proposal | |
| Current version | |

## A. Summary of the main elements

| Priority | Fund | The amount covered by the financing not linked to costs | Type(s) of operation | Conditions to be fulfilled/results to be achieved | Corresponding indicator name(s) | | Unit of measurement for the indicator | Envisaged reimbursement to the beneficiaries[19] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Code | Description | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| The overall amount covered | | | | | | | | |

[19] *The Council partial mandate added this column in line with CPR Block 6. Without prejudice to further alignment on the outcome of the interinsitutional agreement on CPR Block 6.*

## B. Details by type of operation (to be completed for every type of operation)

Types of operation:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1. Description of the operation type | | | |
| 1.2 Specific objective(s) concerned | | | |
| 1.3 Conditions to be fulfilled or results to be achieved | | | |
| 1.4 Deadline for fulfilment of conditions or results to be achieved | | | |
| 1.5 Indicator definition for deliverables | | | |
| 1.6 Unit of measurement for indicator for deliverables | | | |
| 1.7 Intermediate deliverables (if applicable) triggering reimbursement by the Commission with schedule for reimbursements | Intermediate deliverables | Date | Amounts |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 1.8 Total amount (including EU and national funding) | | | |
| 1.9 Adjustment(s) method | | | |
| 1.10 Verification of the achievement of the result or condition (and where relevant, the intermediate deliverables)<br>- describe what document(s) will be used to verify the achievement of the result or condition<br>- describe what will be checked during management verifications (including on-the-spot), and by whom<br>- describe what arrangements there are to collect and store the data/documents | | | |
| 1.10a Does the grant provided by Member State to beneficiaries take the form of financing not linked to costs? [Y/N][20] | | | |
| 1.11 Arrangements to ensure the audit | | | |

[20] *The Council's partial mandate added point 1.10a, which was amended to improve clarity.*

| | |
|---|---|
| trail<br><br>Please list the body(ies) responsible for these arrangements. | |

## Appendix 3a: List of planned operations of strategic importance with a timetable - Article 17(4)

| |
|---|
| *Text field [2 000]* |