



Stakeholder consultation

Comprehensive insights from focus groups



Table of contents

Table of contents	2
Introduction	3
Consultation and analysis methods	3
Focus groups insights	4
The added value of Interreg North Sea	4
High-priority topics requiring cooperation	5
Obstacles to transnational cooperation	9
Pathways forward (BuildUP focus groups)	11
Long-term impact for Interreg projects	11
Communication and capitalisation	13
New partnerships	14
Reporting	15
Project administration	16
Novelties	16

Introduction

This document complements the “Stakeholder consultation – Shaping the future Interreg together” report. It provides comprehensive insights from the focus groups conducted in parallel with the survey of stakeholders. Due to space constraints imposed by DG REGIO for the official report, we could not include all of the material we gathered during the consultation. However, the invaluable insights and remarkable level of engagement by stakeholders during the focus group sessions we held in conjunction with three separate events in 2024 inspired us to compile this secondary report to sit alongside the main report. It captures the full spectrum of perspectives, ideas, and recommendations shared by stakeholders during the focus group discussions.

Consultation and analysis methods

We conducted 10 focus groups in which 107 stakeholders participated. The first two focus group meetings took place in Copenhagen on 14-15 May 2024, involving our Monitoring Committee and national contact points. On June 27 in Bergen, we conducted another four focus group meetings with members of the North Sea Commission. On 23 October 2024 in Billund, we held the last four focus group sessions directly after the BuildUP event on project implementation. The main participants were project representatives, including a sub-group of consultants who manage projects.

The first six focus group meetings were centred on questions aiming to identify the high-priority topics requiring cooperation, obstacles to cooperation, the value added of Interreg for stakeholders, and desired novelties for the upcoming programme period.

The feedback from the first six focus groups as well as the survey responses clearly revealed the shared challenges and desired changes in transnational cooperation. Therefore, we decided to ask participants in the last four focus groups to think about solutions to the identified challenges, recognising that project members were uniquely positioned to address these issues given their direct experience in project work. The specific questions are outlined at the start of each section below.

The analysis of the meeting minutes was carried out manually without the use of AI tools.

Focus groups insights

THE ADDED VALUE OF INTERREG NORTH SEA

In your opinion, what is the added value of Interreg transnational cooperation programmes?

North Sea Commission Energy and Climate Change Working Group

Participants highlighted that a significant advantage of Interreg projects is their ability to foster integrated thinking and unite individuals who might not typically collaborate.

“Integrated thinking is a benefit of Interreg projects. They bring together people who are not normally working together.

North Sea Commission Transport Working Group

The transport group participants appreciated the opportunities provided by Interreg, including the chance to learn from other countries, explore and develop innovative solutions to address specific challenges, build networks, and draw inspiration from shared experiences. They valued the contribution of Interreg in fostering new ideas locally and in changing mindsets.

They also mentioned that Interreg contributed to aligning public transport solutions in different countries. An example was the project Stronger Combined, which facilitated the promotion of the carpooling app Nabogo.

North Sea Commission Marine Resources and Smart Regions Working Groups

The focus group participants applauded Interreg for promoting cooperation and networking among actors from different regions and fostering knowledge transfer. They emphasised that transnational cooperation gave project partners that worked together a louder voice than they could have had individually. They also think that Interreg serves a crucial role in bringing key issues to the political forefront, with project outputs having the potential to influence policy decisions. Nonetheless, they maintained that more cooperation is needed, especially to promote safety, security, and social innovation.

Private consultants group at BuildUP event in Billund

How has North Sea funding allowed you to go above and beyond the “normal” tasks/activities/aims your organization carries out and do MORE? Please provide concrete examples.

Private consultants shared with facilitators that Interreg North Sea funding has enabled them to establish themselves as key resources for projects seeking assistance with application processes. As one consultant put it: “it allows us to be a vessel of information.”

Project community members group at BuildUP event in Billund

How has North Sea funding allowed you to go above and beyond the “normal” tasks/activities/aims your organization carries out and do MORE? Please provide concrete examples.

Participants maintained that North Sea funding has been particularly valuable in fostering cross-border collaboration and community building and creating networks that would not have existed otherwise. North Sea Programme support has also accelerated the implementation of innovative infrastructure projects, such as those in the port of Hamburg, and supported local initiatives like Samsø's goal to become fossil-free by 2030. Many expressed that these collaborative frameworks have been essential to their achievements, suggesting that similar outcomes would have been impossible without the North Sea Programme.

“North Sea funding has given us the “privilege” of looking through the “wisdom” of other partners’ approaches and stepping through the “door” together to resolve new common challenges instead of remaining in our own bubble.

HIGH-PRIORITY TOPICS REQUIRING COOPERATION

In which topic areas do you see the biggest need and potential for transnational cooperation in the North Sea Region?

North Sea Commission Energy and Climate Change Working Group

The North Sea Commission Energy and Climate Change Group drew attention to the problem of indirect emissions caused by an inefficient use of resources. A concrete example mentioned was food waste. Yet another example included buildings and museums that are unused as well as cars that sit idle for most of the time. They highlighted the need to optimise

the use of resources and foster circular economy. A second topic they raised was the need to ensure a just transition and social justice.

The transition to a low-carbon and environmentally sustainable economy and society should not leave or push anyone behind, according to participants. At the same time, there were calls for an inclusive dialogue that gives citizens the space to share their needs and priorities, which must be considered when developing approaches to a just transition. Participants also emphasised the need to establish spaces for a multilevel dialogue at regional, national and local levels. Finally, stakeholders underscored the need to streamline good practices into governance structures to amplify projects' impacts. They recognised that the programme has many good examples and practices of these and that they should be communicated at the political level.

“Social justice is important– we must remember that the North Sea Region is also part of the bigger world. If we can be good at just transitions and communicate this to the outside world, then we can have a bigger impact.

North Sea Commission Transport Working Group

Stakeholders stressed the critical importance of enhancing cross-border connections, both within EU countries and with neighbouring non-EU countries. They also mentioned the need to bolster military mobility infrastructure – a relatively new but critical topic. Furthermore, they emphasised the need for climate adaptation solutions. Above all, they called for coastal management and planning and transition towards renewable energy sources.

North Sea Commission Marine Resources and Smart Regions Working Groups

Water management emerged as a high-priority topic among the participants of this focus group. They stressed the urgency of managing the sea level rise, draughts, and groundwater at the transnational level. Food and energy security also require joint efforts to effectively ensure self-supply and reduce vulnerability to external threats. In addition, there were calls for strengthening the circular economy and fostering the development of skills related to circularity. Biodiversity protection was yet another critical topic that they stated requires coordinated efforts over a large area rather than being addressed locally. Emphasis was placed on the issues of unsustainable fishing practices, fish health, the impact of mass agriculture on biodiversity, and soil depletion. Finally, stakeholders pointed out the importance of intensifying the adoption of innovations such as drones.

“ More multi-level governance and inter-sectoral cooperation are especially crucial on these topics. There are currently too many isolated initiatives and activities at local, regional and national levels. We need to join and work as one and create more synergies.

North Sea Commission Youth Committee

The question given to this group was worded slightly differently: *In the place where you live, what are main challenges that you think could be addressed through cooperation, e.g. reducing river pollution, attracting tourists, etc.?*

Youth group participants identified high housing prices as the most significant challenge they face. The young people stressed that it is nearly impossible to secure a place to live without the support of one's parents. Therefore, they called for housing projects and/or subsidies for people with lower income. At the same time, they highlight the need of avoiding 'ghettoing' and promote diversity by mixing private and social housing. A second pressing issue is the lack of adequate public transportation in the rural areas. The young people argued that centralisation in urban areas has resulted in fewer public transportation options, which in turn has increased the necessity of car ownership. In addition, they claimed that rural areas fail to attract young people, highlighting the need for more engaging events and appealing opportunities to capture the interest of youths. Furthermore, they criticised the presence of familial relations in rural politics, arguing that it fosters inefficiencies and discourages young people from engaging in political activities. Water management was also perceived as a critical topic by young people. They noted that extreme weather conditions like high levels of rainfall, flooding and drought have had a heavy impact on the economy and should be prioritised in the next Interreg period.

“ Sustainable water management is of great importance to us and other regions in Europe. We hope to see this in the next Interreg period.

Monitoring Committee

Participants in this focus group highlighted climate change adaptation as a key priority for transnational cooperation efforts. Notably, they emphasised the need for enhanced cooperation in coastal management as well as risk and disaster management. They also drew attention to the need to protect biodiversity, boost circular economy, and accelerate the

green transition. Another prominent theme that emerged was mobility. They stressed the importance of strengthening rural-urban connectivity and improving accessibility to islands.

Demographic change presents another critical challenge, according to Monitoring Committee members. The decline in population, particularly in rural areas, coupled with the overpopulation of urban centers, causes pressing social issues that demand collaborative approaches to be addressed effectively. To boost competitiveness in the North Sea Region, participants called for common planning and development of schemes to support businesses and SMEs, including those in rural areas. In addition, they stressed the critical need of innovation development and adoption as well as advancing digitalisation, particularly in the delivery of public services. Engaging citizens in developing approaches for a fair and equitable green transition emerged as another important topic. Finally, participants underlined the importance of transnational cooperation in maritime spatial planning.

National contact points (NCPs)

National contact points stressed the importance of climate change adaptation and mitigation. First, they underlined the importance of joint efforts in water management, as well as in addressing extreme conditions such as draughts and flooding. They hoped that more projects focusing on mitigating the risks of flooding would be implemented in the upcoming programme period. Furthermore, they said that they would like nature-based solutions to flooding to be prioritised. A second topic that emerged during the focus group session was energy security. NCPs called for more planning and standardisation of energy infrastructure among the seven programme countries. They also emphasised the need to scale up existing solutions in the energy sector rather than reinventing the wheel. Third, they stressed the importance of addressing population change, including the movement of people driven by climate change. They also highlight the critical need to promote social inclusion and equality, especially in the face of growing social differences and immigration. To this end, they suggested implementing practical pilots for the inclusion of minorities and bringing people together. At the same time, NCPs considered it important to strengthen democratic processes and citizen engagement.

Rural-urban divide is yet another pressing issue, according to the NCPs. Greater efforts are needed to integrate rural areas into Interreg initiatives and provide them with the necessary support to ensure that they do not fall behind. Digitalisation and innovation also emerged as central topics, with particular emphasis on digital security and the demand for high technology readiness level innovations. Participants also emphasized the importance of promoting circularity and providing support to SMEs in advancing the green transition.

NCPs emphasized the need to improve governance among programme countries and to learn how to work together on common challenges. Finally, they recommended a more flexible approach for the next programme period, whereby applicants have the freedom to propose new ideas based on changing circumstances (i.e. immigration, economic difficulties, war etc.).

OBSTACLES TO TRANSNATIONAL COOPERATION

In your specific region, what are the major obstacles to transnational cooperation? How could these be removed?

North Sea Commission Energy and Climate Change Working Group

Stakeholders highlighted administrative burdens and the complexity of the application process as significant barriers to applying for funding from Interreg. They also described the current Interreg approach as predominantly top-down and suggest that it should transition to a more bottom-up model. This shift would empower individuals and communities to take a more active role in shaping their society and addressing regional challenges. Finally, a key challenge they identified was the unsatisfactory communication outside the Interreg bubble of the invaluable intangible benefits of Interreg cooperation (e.g. lasting transnational relationships cultivated through projects).

North Sea Commission Transport Working Group

The transport group participants identified administrative burden as the main obstacle to cooperation. They argued that it requires a high level of expertise and an excessive amount of time, which prevents them from focusing on the effective management of a well-functioning project. Moreover, they noted that administrative complexities disproportionately affect smaller partners with limited resources, effectively excluding them from participating in Interreg projects.

Calls for cooperation with the UK in the next programme period were also emphasized. Norwegian participants highlighted that their current funding challenges, stemming from their government's decisions to cut funding to the North Sea Programme, are creating uncertainty among stakeholders and acting as a significant obstacle to collaboration.

North Sea Commission Marine Resources and Smart Regions Working Groups

Securing financing was highlighted as a significant barrier to participating in Interreg projects. Significant emphasis was also placed on enhancing the involvement of smaller organisations and rural communities in Interreg to maximise its impact, bridging the rural-urban divide, and fostering regional cohesion. Participants highlighted that successful cooperation depends on

projects that bring together a diverse range of relevant stakeholders. They stressed that broad engagement across different groups, combined with a multi-sectoral approach, is essential for achieving a more substantial and far-reaching impact. They also stated the need for developing clusters across different value chains. Finally, participants in this focus group also expressed their desire to cooperate with UK partners.

“ It is a good idea to embrace **a multi-sectoral approach** because pressure on NSR is getting bigger and bigger. For example, with nature conservation, pollutions etc. and we have to open the floor to all sectors. They need to come out of their corners and work more together. We can learn from previous good examples and projects which have tried this and seen good results from this type of approach.

North Sea Commission Youth Committee

In your daily life, what are the biggest difficulties for cross-border or transnational cooperation, e.g. different languages, mountain ranges that separate communities from one another, demographic decline, negative stereotypes?

Geography emerged as a key obstacle to cooperation. For example, the presence of mountains was highlighted as a factor that complicates in-person meetings for Norwegian Youth Committee members and their counterparts. While air travel offers a faster alternative, it is both costly and environmentally unsustainable. Second, the young people highlighted that cooperation should be facilitated by gathering all relevant information centrally, to ensure easy access when needed. Third, they called for more resources be allocated for youth engagement in cooperation. They also emphasized the significance of expanding the youth council model currently practiced in Norway, where coordinators facilitate collaboration across councils. Another obstacle to cooperation was the prevalence of nationalistic perspectives and weak European identity. They suggested that we should strive to view Europe as a country, rather than a group of separate nations. Finally, the young participants highlighted echoed the other groups' support for cooperation with UK partners.

“ Think of Europe as a country, rather than many different countries.

Monitoring Committee

According to Monitoring Committee members, a major obstacle to cooperation lies in the misalignment between local, regional, and national policies, accompanied by differences of legislation across countries. A second issue is the use of jargon and technical concepts that alienate citizens. Third, the existing territorial differences when it comes to the speed of innovation and economic development might represent a barrier to cooperation. Finally, the inadequate capacities of local authorities and SMEs, resulting from a lack of skills and match funding, pose yet another barrier to cooperation.

National contact points (NCPs)

The administrative burden and the level of funding were viewed by the NCPs as key obstacles to cooperation. In line with this, the lack of Norwegian funding and Norwegian Interreg policy were also perceived as problematic. Second, they highlighted a limited understanding of Interreg, even among project partners. They noted that there are too many rules and that the terminology and language used in the Interreg world might be alienating. Third, they pointed out that consortia are not always fully aligned on project goals, and, in some cases, the appropriate partners may be missing in the partnership. This creates a less-than-ideal situation for achieving project success. They identified the difficulty of finding project partners as part of the problem. In addition, they raised concerns about consultant-driven projects, questioning the extent to which they promote cooperation. They also called for greater inclusion of SMEs in Interreg and harmonisation of rules across Interreg programmes. Finally, they argued that a significant barrier to cooperation lies in the fact that cooperation is not a priority for elected people.

PATHWAYS FORWARD (BuildUP focus groups)

Long-term impact for Interreg projects

How can (we as a programme/you as project community members) ensure the long-term impact of project solutions/strategies? What could we do to promote the uptake and upscaling of solutions/strategies after project end? Could you give examples of past/current success in this respect?

Project community members group at BuildUP event in Billund

To maximise the impact of previous projects and their outcomes, project members called for enhanced knowledge sharing among stakeholders and potential participants. They proposed several strategic approaches to achieve this goal. They suggested the establishment of a comprehensive knowledge bank that would serve as a centralized repository of all projects,

their outcomes, collected data, and success stories. This resource would not only document best practices but also provide actionable policy recommendations for decision-makers. To complement the knowledge bank, the organisation of targeted thematic events would create dynamic platforms for stakeholder engagement. These events would facilitate direct connections between participants while showcasing successful projects and their potential for adoption and scaling. Furthermore, participants stressed the importance of fostering collaboration between Interreg Baltic Sea Region and Interreg North Sea stakeholders. This, in their opinion, would help to create valuable synergies and amplify the impact of solutions developed within each programme.

To ensure sustained project impact, members recommended the introduction of capitalisation calls. These funding opportunities would incentivize new projects to build upon previous successes, creating a continuous cycle of innovation and implementation. The current small-scale project duration of 18 months was viewed as a limitation to achieving lasting impact. To address this, members suggested extending project timeframes and encouraging project spin-offs that could develop sustainable revenue streams. An innovative suggestion made was to engage younger generations through initiatives such as summer schools. These programs could introduce young people to Interreg's mission while familiarising them with ongoing projects and their achievements, helping to ensure long-term community involvement and project sustainability.

Private consultants group at BuildUP event in Billund

According to the consultants in their own focus group, projects should incorporate legacy planning from the very beginning of their implementation - even during the application phase - with clear strategies for post-project sustainability. This includes creating tangible, useful results that can be utilized beyond the project's lifetime and securing commitment from partners to maintain the project's benefits. In addition, they believe that there should be a strong focus on embedding the project's outcomes at a political level (including EU level) to ensure institutional support and policy changes that can sustain the impact. Finally, projects should be designed as stepping stones for future initiatives, with careful evaluation of outcomes and translation of results into actionable policies that create lasting change.



A project finished should be the start of a new project.

National contact points at BuildUP

The focus group of National Contact Points in Billund emphasised the need for a comprehensive, searchable database of projects and their results, complete with appropriate

filtering options. This would enable NCPs to better understand and promote successful solutions through their networks, addressing the current challenge of gaining a clear overview of project outcomes. Second, NCPs proposed organising thematic capitalisation events, potentially in collaboration with other Interreg programmes, to facilitate knowledge sharing and result dissemination. They also stress the importance of increasing awareness about Interreg among potential beneficiary organizations and developing strategies to secure their participation.

To ensure long-term sustainability, NCPs recommended requiring projects to identify implementation partners at the outset. These partners, such as municipalities or regions, would serve as policy owners responsible for adopting and implementing the solutions developed during the project lifecycle. Finally, they suggested following the model of Interreg Europe's Policy Platform, which effectively compiles policy recommendations in a format readily accessible to policymakers.

Communication and capitalisation

How can we support communication and dissemination of channels through which to connect to people working on similar topics, e.g. wind energy, health innovations, shared mobility? How can we create networks of people and organisations working on the same topics?

Project community members group at BuildUP event in Billund

Participants called for the integration of a communication platform with the existing Interreg North Sea website. This platform should be organized by topic, enabling users to upload and share experiences, knowledge, and solutions - like the Pure portal at the University of Southern Denmark. They also recommended providing applicants with access to information on previous projects within the same topic which would facilitate connections with former project partners for knowledge exchange. Moreover, participants proposed creating new opportunities for content sharing across Interreg programmes, such as showcasing projects and their outcomes.

Private consultants group at BuildUP event in Billund

Consultants suggested creating a platform that allows users to search for content by topic, drawing from past and current projects. They also suggested promoting communication among programmes to build synergies and break down network silos.

National contact points at BuildUP

The Flemish NCP mentioned that they have an online database encompassing all Interreg and other ERDF projects. The database features filtering functionalities that enable projects to

identify and connect with projects addressing similar themes. This represents an exemplary model that other programme countries could consider adopting. Furthermore, the NCPs proposed asking projects to identify 10 keywords that best characterise them, potentially as part of the application form. These keywords could be used for the filtering functionality in the database. Second, to enhance communication, dissemination, and networking, NCPs suggested organising thematic events with well-defined objectives. Including policymakers as participants could further enrich the event's value and boost its visibility. They also pointed out that project partners should be encouraged to invite peers from similar projects to their events with support from the Joint Secretariat and NCPs to facilitate these connections. Networking and building new connections were viewed as essential, but maintaining those relationships after returning from events was acknowledged to be challenging. One suggested solution was to create LinkedIn groups centred around specific project themes. With facilitation and support from the JS, these groups would be likelier to remain active and effective than if left alone.

New partnerships

How can we foster better ways for organisations to find potential partners for project applications?

Project community members group at BuildUP event in Billund

First and foremost, according to the project representatives, was the importance of reducing administrative burdens, allowing flexible co-funding, and providing more support for smaller organizations, NGOs, and SMEs to participate, potentially by expanding the Joint Secretariat's role in assisting these partners. They stated that current funding limitations and administrative complexity were pushing potential partners toward other programs like Horizon or LIFE. A second suggestion was to create better networking opportunities through match-making events (both live and hybrid) and a peer platform similar to Interreg Europe's for partner searches. Third, they mentioned leveraging existing networks and "multipliers" like EU Member State offices in Brussels and National Contact Points (NCPs) more effectively. Furthermore, they recommended identifying and mapping all national offices in Brussels and gatekeepers that could foster partnerships. Finally, they recommended implementing AI tools to help overcome language barriers in partner searches, while ensuring GDPR compliance.

Private consultants group at BuildUP event in Billund

A private consultant emphasized the importance of identifying local gatekeepers who could assist with partnership formation, helping to uncover potential collaborators in unexpected places or previously unknown networks. It was also noted that Horizon Europe enables potential applicants to join projects as sub-partners by selecting a call and exploring the

needs of other partners. This approach could be adapted in Interreg as well to connect potential partners.

National contact points at BuildUP

NCPs stressed that applicants should be actively encouraged to engage with NCPs during the application process, as many submitted applications directly without NCP involvement, missing out on valuable support and partnership opportunities. NCPs can leverage their international network to connect potential partners across countries. Furthermore, NCPs could provide support to draft a flawless application. They suggested that the North Sea Programme should make it mandatory for applicants to indicate whether they have consulted with NCPs prior to application, encouraging more pre-application engagement with NCPs. Finally, they proposed developing a stakeholder mind map to better visualize and understand potential partnership connections.

Reporting

What aspects of reporting would you like to see dropped or changed in the future?

Project community members group at BuildUP event in Billund

Participants discussed the need for a clearer distinction between output indicators and result indicators in the context of project pilots, as the current overlap creates some confusion. Second, they expressed their preference for a flat-rate approach to covering travel costs, as opposed to providing proof of expenses, which they found to be challenging and time-consuming. Finally, they called for simplified staff cost options and expressed a preference for reporting staff costs per reporting period rather than adhering to the per-month rule.

Private consultants group at BuildUP event in Billund

Consultants maintained that obtaining funding to cover the travel costs incurred to physically attend meetings and events is problematic. This prevents partners from taking part in events. At the same time, they stressed that it is important to “keep the column for travel costs,” which is essential to incentivise in-person meetings. The facilitator also asked whether Interreg funding in the future should be performance based and received a ‘no’ response. The consultants stressed that performance-based funding would bring about a lot of administrative work and complexities, as well as tension among partners.

National contact points at BuildUP

In contrast to other groups, the NCPs recommended enhancing the indicator module and adopting a performance-based payment approach. They also proposed the further simplification of reporting for small-scale projects in order to make it even easier for them on the administrative side of implementation.

Project administration

What simplifications in project administration would you like to see in the future?

Project community members group at BuildUP event in Billund

Participants requested enhanced functionalities in the OMS, such as a wider range of formats for downloading and exporting information, along with improved options for uploading files to the Document Centre. In addition, they criticised the fact that only project managers have access to the OMS, excluding the support staff who assist them (e.g. assistants). They also recommended extending the finance manager role to include financial partners. Furthermore, they highlighted that is difficult when only the project manager is authorised to open a report, which they believe could be ameliorated by introducing a backup role.

Novelties

How could the programme do things differently in the future to help you apply for and implement the best projects possible?

Project community members group at BuildUP event in Billund

Stakeholders expressed the need for more networking opportunities and better connections between projects, including more events like BuildUP and informal platforms for collaboration. Second, they called for workshops to facilitate capitalisation and events at which results from previous projects could be showcased. They asked for higher funding rates (above 60%), simplified guidance encompassing the best practices on how to navigate the Interreg world ("Interreg for dummies") and dedicated legal support for State aid matters. In addition, they suggested incorporating part of the costs linked to the iteration of a project into the budget of its predecessor, ensuring the necessary resources were secured for the development of the subsequent project. Finally, participants expressed a desire for stronger feedback loops between the programme and its projects.

Private consultants group at BuildUP event in Billund

Consultants stressed the importance of ensuring that all controllers have a clear understanding of what demands their attention and what does not, as occasionally unclear or unexpected remarks from controllers arise. They also emphasized that self-employed individuals should be allowed to participate in Interreg projects. Finally, they called for harmonisation of the rules governing the participation of self-employed individuals across the countries participating in Interreg North Sea.

National contact points at BuildUP

First, they recommended making it a mandatory requirement for applicants to consult an NCP before submitting their project. Second, some advocated for the possibility of reducing the application process from two formal steps to a single-step procedure. This could be preceded by a written procedure with the Monitoring Committee, eliminating the requirement to discuss expressions of interest in meetings. Under this approach, only successful project ideas would advance to the full application stage.

Monitoring Committee

Monitoring Committee participants called for shifting the focus from addressing symptoms to targeting root causes of problems, enabling more effective long-term solutions. Second, they highlighted the need to develop new partnership models. This would accommodate organisations that prefer to participate as associated partners without co-funding requirements or reporting obligations, while still maintaining their valuable contributions to projects. Third, they stressed the importance of delivering concrete, measurable outcomes that demonstrate clear public value. The committee emphasised that all projects should produce tangible results that can be effectively communicated to and directly benefit the general public. Finally, they emphasised the need for administrative simplifications, such as the adoption of more simplified cost options to allow projects to focus more on the actual activities.

