ETC Regulation and Programmes in 2021-2027: an overview

In a nutshell

European Territorial Cooperation is one of the two objectives of Cohesion policy and the essence of the EU frameworks for cooperation in Europe’s territories. CPMR members have strongly pointed out the added value of European Territorial Cooperation and the need for the EU to show real ambition by increasing its funding.

The legislative framework for European Territorial Cooperation 2021-2027 is close to be finalized as trilogues between the European Parliament, the Council of the EU and the Commission have entered the last stages. However, the impasse on the post-2020 MFF and the Covid-19 outbreak have both caused the negotiations to be delayed.

At the same time, the Commission started at the end of 2019/early 2020 the dialogue with Member States on the definition of the new ETC Programmes for 2021-2027 based on a set of orientation papers.

This note provides an overview of the main regulatory elements related to the European Territorial Cooperation in 2021-2027. It also takes a look at the main changes, both on a geographical and thematic point of view, proposed for the transnational and cross-border maritime programmes that are most relevant for CPMR members.

Context and state of play of negotiations | The regulation on future ETC | Orientation Papers

Annex I: Key elements and positioning on ETC
1. Context and state of play of negotiations

The European Commission presented its proposal for the ETC 2021-2027 in May 2018. As mentioned in previous CPMR analysis, the text features significant changes compared to the previous periods:

- The three traditional strands (cross-border, transnational and interregional) are reshaped into 5 components, with two new ones dedicated to outermost regions (component 3) and cooperation on innovation (component 5) respectively.
- A major difference with the past is the restriction of the cross-border cooperation component to land borders and the consequent integration of the maritime cooperation into the transnational cooperation component. This is part of a broader push for a rationalization of programmes, officially to tackle existing overlaps, in practice to cope with a smaller budget.
- The allocations for the ETC are impacted by the proposed reduction of the Cohesion policy envelope post-2020.

Different aspects in the Commission proposal raised concerns from the perspective of the CPMR. The CPMR presented its messages on the Regulation to the relevant co-legislators on various occasions.

Inter-institutional negotiations on the proposed regulation began in October 2019 after the European Parliament and the Council of the EU adopted their positions in March and June 2019 respectively. By December 2019, a compromise agreement was reached between co-legislators on a significant number of provisions of the regulation. A series of more contentious elements are still being negotiated and the principle “nothing is agreed until everything is agreed” applies. At the same time, provisions with budgetary implications are separately dealt with under the negotiations on the 2021-2027 MFF.

Further advancements on the ETC Regulation have been affected by the fact that the political trilogues on the sectorial regulations were frozen in January 2020 by the European Parliament to protest at the lack of progress in negotiations among Member States over the MFF. Negotiations at technical level, which were still ongoing, were halted from end of February due to the Covid-19 crisis.

What is next?

The adoption of the ETC regulation is conditional to the approval of the post-2020 MFF, on which Member States had been negotiating unsuccessfully until February 2020. The Covid-19 crisis has prompted the Commission to revise the MFF proposal (the new framework will be presented on 27 May). However, it is not granted that Member States will reach a quick agreement on the new MFF proposal, nor that the European Parliament will thereafter give a swift consent to the deal found in the Council.

As a result, the adoption of the ETC regulation is likely to be delayed. Adding to this, the abrupt slowdown of administrative activity in most Member States owing to the Covid-19 crisis may well cause the adoption of ETC programmes to take place at the earliest in the second half of 2021.

However, it is expected that the European Commission will present an extension of the cohesion policy programmes 2014-2020 by two years, which would apply also to the current ETC programmes in place. In line with the CPMR demands, the extension would support a smooth transition between the two programming periods until an agreement on the MFF is achieved, but also frontload resources to face the Covid-19 challenges. At the time of writing, the role that ETC programmes will have as part of the Recovery Instrument and how they would benefit from the expected cohesion budget top-up is unclear.
2. The regulation on future ETC: what is in it⁴?

Maritime cooperation

An agreement was reached in the trilogue to reinstate the maritime cooperation within the cross-border cooperation strand in line with the CPMR demands. The Commission original proposal to place maritime cooperation under the transnational cooperation component would have led to a much sharper decline in allocations for maritime cooperation than the other strands compared to current levels (by at least 39% according to CPMR estimates). Moreover, the current 14 maritime programmes would have been more at risk of facing mergers to cover larger areas at the expense of their specific geographical focus. The reintroduction of maritime cooperation under cross-border cooperation helps avoid this scenario, at least partially considering that the Commission seems determined to press ahead with reducing the number of maritime programmes.

The 150 KM provision

A related issue is the geographical scope of maritime programmes, i.e. what is the maximum distance to define maritime borders under the ETC. The agreement in the trilogue has confirmed the current limit of 150 KM with a certain flexibility, i.e. allowing for “potential adjustments needed to ensure the coherence and continuity of cooperation programme areas and where cross-border interaction may effectively take place”. This latter criterion is not in the current regulation and could in effect lead to widening the scope of maritime programmes - e.g. extending Italy-France to Lazio as it is only 153km far away from Corsica - or create new ones involving territories that were not able to establish programmes with its closer neighbors due to the limitation (such as the Balearic Islands).

Interregional cooperation

The trilogue decided to maintain the 4 existing programmes under the interregional cooperation strand (Interreg Europe, URBACT, ESPON and INTERACT). The Commission had proposed a narrower scope, and consequently a smaller budget, for this component which would have likely led to the disappearance of URBACT, INTERACT and INTERREG EUROPE. The latest MFF negotiating-box had proposed to increase the budget for interregional cooperation from 100 million to 500 million to adapt the strand to the “restored” programmes.

Macroregional strategies

The Commission proposal sought a reinforced link between macroregional/sea basin strategies and the transnational strand. Originally the regulation set out that priorities in the programmes concerned should be fully aligned with priorities of corresponding strategies. The European Parliament and the Council have both proposed more flexibility, i.e. 80% and 75% respectively. The final level of alignment is still being discussed between co-legislators.

Allocation methodology

The Commission proposed a substantial revision of the methodology to determine the allocation of resources by Member State covering the cross-border and transnational cooperation. The main change is the introduction of a new criterion based on the share of the population living within 25 kilometers of borders.

The current two criteria – total population in border regions and total population in Member States – would remain, but the scope of the first one would now cover all land border NUTS3 regions and other NUTS3 regions where half of the population leaves within 25km from a border. The weighting of the 25 km criterion is set by the latest version of the MFF compromise at 30.5% while border population is at

---

⁴ This section takes a closer look at the items within the ETC Regulation of relevance to the CPMR. The note refers to the compromise agreement reached between legislators in December 2019 and to the latest proposal of the MFF Negotiating-Box (February 2020)
45.8%. Member States’ total population is set at 20% and at the 3.7% for the total population of outermost regions. The 25 kilometer criterion appears to be too limited and does not reflect the demographic situation of many border regions where many urban agglomerations at greater distance are deeply involved in cooperation.

The Transnational component is only calculated based on Member states population and the Outermost regions component based on the share of the total population of outermost regions.

**Component 5**

The Component 5 “Interregional innovation investments” could be at risk as the changes proposed during the negotiations may lead to an overall reduction of resources. The European Parliament has appeared tepid on the new component downgrading it from the status of component to that of “initiative” with a slightly reduced envelope. The latest version of the MFF compromise in the Council sets out to move component 5 under the ERDF regulation halving the envisaged budget from 900 to 500 million.

Both the Parliament and Council have clarified that the governance of the innovation innovations under direct or indirect management shall be entrusted to an expert group comprising a representation of regions (Council). No decision on where the Component will be finally placed (ERDF or ETC) has been done.

**Co-financing and pre-financing**

The Commission proposed to reduce the co-financing rate to 70% compared to the current 80-85%. Lower co-financing put forward for all cohesion policy programmes are justified with the need to reinforce the local ownership and mobilize more funding. The latest version of the MFF discussed at the level of the Council has confirmed the Commission proposal whilst Parliament proposed to maintain it at 80%. Pre-financing rates were also significantly lowered in the Commission proposal but restored in line with current levels by both the EP report and the Council proposal. Lower co-financing and pre-financing could have a negative impact on the implementation of programmes. The risk is that less pre-financing will lead to liquidity challenges in several programmes.

**ETC budget**

The allocation for ETC are impacted by the proposed reduction of the cohesion policy envelope post-2020. While negotiations on the MFF are underway, the allocation for “European Territorial Cooperation” goal under ERDF would suffer a cut by 24% compared to the current programming period (2014-2020: EUR 10.390,7 in million) if we consider the MFF Negotiation-Box from February 2020. This rather bleak picture could change with the revised MFF proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territorial Cooperation</th>
<th>EC proposal</th>
<th>EUCO PRES Negotiation-Box (Feb’20)</th>
<th>Change (EUCO Pres vs EC proposal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-border</td>
<td>8 430</td>
<td>7 930</td>
<td>-500 (-5.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnational</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 693</td>
<td>[-23.68% compared to 2014-2020]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>(7 089)</td>
<td>(7 159)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>+ 70 (+1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outermost regions</td>
<td></td>
<td>270</td>
<td>+ 400 (+400%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td>970</td>
<td>+ 1 (+0.37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under ERDF</td>
<td></td>
<td>970</td>
<td>-970 (-100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under ETC</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>(under ERDF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>470</td>
<td>(mainstreamed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Financial allocation for Territorial Cooperation components (in 2018 prices)*
Third country participation on ETC

The participation of third countries in specific cooperation programmes (cross-border as well as transnational programmes) will be in line with the agreement laying down the conditions applicable to the participation of the third country concerned in any EU programme. The leaving of the UK from the European Union generates concerns and doubts on the continuity of the ETC programmes where UK regions participated (see Brexit section below).

Please see Annex 1 for a detailed overview of the positions of the European Parliament and the Council on the various aspects of ETC compared to the CPMR position.

3. Orientation papers: How will programmes look like post-2020

The Commission kicked off the negotiating process on the ETC programmes 2021-2027 by circulating to Member States a series of orientation papers. These documents outline options and recommendations on the thematic and geographical focus of future programmes.

Although orientation papers do not reflect the official position of the Commission they serve as a basis for talks with Member States and are expected to frame the negotiations. The Commission has prepared separate orientation papers for each EU land border under the cross-border strands and each geographical/functional area deemed to be covered by a programme under the transnational strand.

Maritime orientation papers have been also drafted to account for EU maritime borders around sea basins in line with the Commission proposal. Additional orientation papers were prepared for programmes under the component outermost region and for the external borders of the EU.

The following paragraphs provide a partial overview of changes proposed by orientation papers with particular regard to the transnational or maritime cross-border programmes of particular relevance for CPMR members. The orientation papers signal an overall intention by the Commission to slightly reduce the number of maritime cross-border and transnational programmes compared to the previous periods. As a result, a very limited number of programmes would disappear and/or be merged whereas some will extend their scope to other areas.

The Commission justifies this approach on the need to avert overlaps between programmes or optimize cooperation in larger functional areas. Another major reason is also the decreased envelope for ETC. A relatively common feature across the orientation papers is the stronger thematic concentration, which translates in a smaller number priorities compared to the 2014-2020 period. It is worth noting that several transnational programmes are proposed to include an enhanced territorial focus under the new Policy Objective 5.
**Mediterranean – Black Sea area**

The geographical scope of Interreg MED (Euro-Mediterranean Area Programme 2021-2027 or EuroMed) is proposed to be expanded. It would absorb large parts of the South West Europe programme and nearly the whole area of Balkan Med programme⁵ whereas these two programmes are suggested to be discontinued. The extended Interreg MED will thus include a number of inland regions. The alignment with the Mediterranean Sea Basin programme (ENI CBC) will also be reinforced. The programme will maintain its focus on innovation and low carbon economy (PO1 and PO2), and additionally cover PO5 to promote capacities and empowerment on local level and address specific issues in territories (with a particular focus on remote/hinterland areas and islands).

An extended INTERREG MED has the merit of helping achieve a higher level of integration in the Mediterranean area at large. But it has downsides. For start, it will result in higher competition and a less balanced distribution of resources. While the budget is going to be increased, it won’t make up for the suppression of South West Europe and Balkan MED. The smaller budget for ETC is explicitly cited by the orientation paper as one of the main reasons for the new geography (and for discontinuing the SUDOE and Balkan MED programmes). This might also result in a diluted geographical focus for certain areas. For instance, the Balkan MED area has peculiar challenges that are unlikely to be addressed by an extended Interreg MED. The inclusion of inland regions acknowledges that the Mediterranean area stretches beyond the sea-basin. On the other hand, it will also imply that the programme needs to tackle additional challenges. This is clearly pointed out by the paper as it refers to the need of holding dedicated calls for inland areas.

Regarding the maritime programmes, it is recommended to maintain the current architecture of the three maritime cross-border programmes in the Mediterranean Sea (Italy-Malta; Italy-France; Greece-Cyprus) as the areas they cover are far apart.

---

⁵ Bulgaria is not included in the proposed new area of the EUROMED programme except for its Black Sea NUTS 2
Adriatic-Ionian area

According the orientation paper, the Adriatic-Ionian Programme 2021-2027 will be extended to North Macedonia to reflect the country’s recently acquired membership in the EUSAIR strategy, with which the geography of the programme is already fully aligned. The thematic coverage of the programme will see a stronger concentration on PO1 and PO2 whilst transport and mobility (PO3) will not be any longer a priority. The focus of the programme on tourism and cultural heritage in line with one of the pillars of the EUSAIR strategy is expected to be addressed, albeit to a lesser extent than in the past, through the inclusion of a priority linked to POS.

Regarding the maritime programmes in the areas, the orientation paper for the area proposes to extend the scope of the maritime programme Italy-Croatia to Slovenia (land cross-border Italy-Slovenia and Slovenia-Croatia will be maintained). Greece-Italy would be maintained and it is suggested to extent its scope to include Basilicata and Calabria.

Atlantic Arc

Significant changes are suggested for the new Atlantic Area programme, which would be broadened to include land-locked regions and/or regions previously covered under the SUDOE programme (such as Estremadura, Madrid, Castilla y Leon, La Rioja, Navarra). The new geography of the programme has the merit to acknowledge the existence of interlinks – and common challenges – between numerous coastal and inland regions in the area.

On the other hand, the choice of (new) participating regions seems in some instances not following a clear logic – Madrid and not Paris, Picardie and not Hauts-de-France for example. Moreover, in France, it seems that the latest decentralisation reform has not been taken into account since the former regions Midi Pyrenees or Picardie has been included in the programme, and not the new regions Sud and Hauts-de-France.

The extended geographical scope may also lead to more competition on projects while the budget will likely decrease. The identified thematic objectives do not consider the area of accessibility, despite this being identified as key to achieve full integration in the area (mobility/accessibility was not among the priorities in 2014-2020).

The alignment with the Atlantic Sea-Basin strategy needs also more clarity.
**North Sea region**

The major geographical change affecting the post-2020 North Sea Region programme would be the loss of the North Sea coastal parts of the UK. The only other change proposed in the orientation paper is to extend the program to the whole territory of the Netherlands, whereas it currently covers only the coastal provinces. There is currently no sea-basin or macro-regional strategy in the North Sea Region, but the North Sea Region orientation paper refers to the CPMR North Sea Commission as a cooperation element in the region.

Moreover, the paper seems to have drawn some inspiration from the draft North Sea Region 2030 strategy, developed by the North Sea Commission. This strategy and the new programme are developed simultaneously and there is hope that the new programme will support the priorities of the NSC strategy. Thematically, the major difference between the North Sea Region Orientation paper and the 2014-2020 programme is the exclusion of PO3 (mobility/connectivity).
The orientation paper recommends that the geographical scope of the Alpine Space transnational programme be fully aligned with that of the European Strategy for the Alpine Region (EUSALP). This was not the case in the previous period as the strategy was adopted in 2015. Therefore, the new geography of the programme will include in addition the German NUTS 2 regions of Karlsruhe and Stuttgart (parts of NUTS 1 region of Baden-Württemberg) and Niederbayern, Oberpfalz, Oberfranken, Mittelfranken, Unterfranken (parts of NUTS 1 region of Bavaria). On the other hand, the French NUTS 2 region Grand-Est/Bas-Rhin and Haut-Rhin are suggested to be excluded since are not covered by EUSALP.

The programme will continue focusing on innovation and environment (PO1 and PO2), while the area mobility/connectivity (PO3) is no longer contemplated. The programme will include a specific axis under the Policy Objective 5. Under the latter, the programme is intended to support bottom-up territorial strategies to consider the specificities of inner-peripheries and smaller areas threatened by out-migration and fragmentation.
**Baltic sea region**

The geography of Interreg Baltic Sea Region Programme will not change compared to 2014-2020 and thus remains fully aligned with the area of the European Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region. The orientation paper suggests reducing the number of priorities compared to previous periods. The focus on R&I and environment will be kept, under the policy objectives 1 and 2, while the programme will no longer feature mobility/accessibility among its priorities. A stronger thematic concentration is justified with the goal of maximizing the impact of the investment. **On the other hand, it is at odds with the wide spectrum of priorities covered by the EUSBR.** In this regard, the orientation paper recommends stronger complementarity with cross-border programmes in the area.

The maritime cross-border programmes in the Baltic area are suggested to undergo a considerable reorganization. The orientation paper on maritime cooperation in the area suggests **merging the maritime programme Botnia-Atlantica with land cross-border programme Sweden - Finland - Norway (Nord) into one new programme.** It is also proposed to **merge the programmes Central Baltic and South Baltic into one maritime programme.** The ÖKS programme (Öresund-Kattegat-Skagerrak) is proposed to integrate the maritime part of DE-DK programme (and possibly DE part of maritime South Baltic).

This new architecture is partially problematic. It is justified by the paper on the ground that **the areas of the merged programmes have many commonalities. However, differences also abound.** One could wonder if a higher integration could be best achieved by having more synergies in place among the programmes instead of merging them. Another major drawback is that the overall resources flowing through the new programmes will be most certainly less than in 2014-2020 with a diminished projects’ intensity. There is also the risk that the relatively high know-how cumulated in the programmes would be reduced which would have an impact on the quality and effectiveness of their actions.

**Islands**

Several orientation papers place emphasis on the specific challenges facing the islands and the need to address them, including via ad hoc actions. This strengthened focus is partly due to the introduction of the Policy objective 5. Under this objective, both Adrion and Interreg MED envisage measures to promote capacities and empowerment on of the local communities vis-à-vis the risk of marginalization. At the same time, innovative approaches are proposed to ensure cooperation among islands aiming at improving connections, sustainable tourism and at fostering circular economy. The orientation paper on Interreg MED hints at supporting cooperation on specific “island issues” via dedicated actions. The cross-border maritime papers provide a strong focus on islands in relation to challenges such as accessibility, environmental impact, reduced services, energy.

**Macroregional strategies**

Orientation papers duly reflect the provision to reinforce the alignment between Macroregional and Sea Basin strategies and the corresponding transnational programmes (although the paper on the Atlantic Programme is a little unclear in some respects). One common feature for transnational programmes related to Macroregional strategies is that they are proposed to cover a narrower range of objectives compared to the 2014-2020 period, which would exclude some Macroregional strategies’ priorities from their scope.

More specifically, it is proposed that these programmes do not cover the new PO3 on transport and mobility on the ground that the scale of investment required in this area exceeds by far and large the financial capacity of these programme. One could argue that transnational programmes have so far financed plenty of projects on mobility and transport with limited budget, for instance to support planning or exchange activities.
Implications of Brexit

At the time of writing, the participation of the UK in the ETC programmes 2021-2027 seems very unlikely. Orientation papers for programmes currently involving the UK have taken a prudent approach on the issue. The documents do not contemplate the participation of British regions in the programmes concerned but clarify that the UK could still opt in depending on outcome of negotiations.

In the event the UK joins at a later stage it would not be able to influence the drafting of the programmes to reflect any particular needs of its participating regions. A few programmes will also be discontinued as a result of Brexit (Interreg V-A - France-United Kingdom (Manche); Interreg Two Seas; the two cross-border programmes between UK and Ireland). The PEACE programme will be maintained.

Another issue is whether cooperation programmes covering areas heavily impacted by Brexit could contribute to tackle it, via a dedicated priority. Orientation papers do not contain any mention to this.
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**Bright Green** – in line with CPMR position  
**Light Green** - partially agrees with CPMR position  
**Orange** – does not explicitly agrees with CPMR position  
**Red** – disagrees with CPMR position  
**Grey** – Point excluded from the compromise agreement as it’s still being discussed between the European Parliament and the Council of the EU, or because it’s part of the MFF negotiations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY ELEMENTS</th>
<th>CPMR</th>
<th>EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT (first reading position approved March’19)</th>
<th>COUNCIL OF THE EU (partial agreement June’19 and MFF negotiation-box February’20)</th>
<th>COMPROMISE AGREEMENT (19/12/19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maritime cross-border cooperation</td>
<td>Should be maintained within cross-border cooperation</td>
<td>In line with CPMR amendment</td>
<td>In line with CPMR amendment</td>
<td>Under cross border cooperation (ETC Strand 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interreg budget line (in EUR million)</td>
<td>EUR 11.571,8 3.5% of ESI Funds</td>
<td>EUR 11.165,9 3% of ESI Funds</td>
<td>EUR 7.930 2.45%</td>
<td>Discussion under the MFF negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation with non-EU countries</td>
<td>Particular attention to regions that become new external borders</td>
<td>In line with CPMR amendment</td>
<td>The participation of third countries on Interreg programmes will be according to the agreement laying down the conditions applicable.</td>
<td>Provision under the horizontal negotiations on the MFF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interreg Europe, ESPON, and INTERACT programmes</td>
<td>Maintenance of the existing Interregional cooperation programmes</td>
<td>Support to the existing Interregional programmes</td>
<td>Re-introduction of Interreg Europe, URBACT, INTERACT and ESPON</td>
<td>Re-introduction of interregional programmes (ETC Strand 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of transnational cooperation programmes with macro-regional strategies and sea-basin strategies priorities</td>
<td>Encourage the alignment of the financial allocations of INTERREG programmes with macro-regional and sea basin strategies objectives with a sufficient degree of flexibility</td>
<td>When cross-border or transnational cooperation supports a macro-regional strategy or a sea-basin strategy, at least 80% the ERDF shall contribute to the objectives of that strategy</td>
<td>Where an INTERREG programme covers the same geographical area as a macroregional or sea basin strategy, at least 75% of the total ERDF shall be programmed on the objectives of that strategy</td>
<td>Ongoing discussions under trilogues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Interregional innovation investments (ETC Component 5)

- Support to Component 5
- Doubts about direct or indirect management
- Component 5 is not considered one of the components of Interreg. It is defined in a new article on the ETC Regulation.
- Direct or indirect management supported by an expert group
- Transferred to the ERDF Regulation
- Direct and indirect management

- Regions should be at the core of governance
- No specific reference to the role of regions in the governance model
- Regional participation in the group of experts supporting the Commission on the implementation of the programme.

- Ensure third countries’ partners are eligible for component 5.
- Non-EU countries would be able to participate, if they contribute financially
- Third countries can be covered by the instrument

### ETC Allocation methodology (CPR Annex XXII)

- Against the population criterion living within 25 km of land borders
- Cross-border and transnational cooperation: weighted sum of the shares of the population of border regions and the total MS population
- Outermost regions: shares of the total population of outermost region

> The European Parliament has not established its position on this provision.

- Cross-border cooperation: total population of which at least half of the regional population lives within 25 kilometers.
- Transnational component: Member states population
- Outermost regions: share of the total population of outermost regions

### Interreg co-financing

- The co-financing rate for Interreg programmes shall be no higher than 85%.

> In line with CPMR amendment

- The co-financing rate for Interreg programmes shall not be higher than 70%.

**Ongoing discussions under trilogues**

**Discussion under the MFF negotiations**

---
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