Task Force Meeting Preparatory Document: Overview of MC inputs on the third call(s)

1. Which climate-related topics could be addressed in Priorities 2 and/or 3 of the Programme to meet the targets set for the Programme in terms of contributing to the climate objectives of the EU?

DE	The following topics could be addressed to meet the targets set out in the Programme in terms of contributing to the climate objectives of the EU: -**Mobility** (sharing systems, city logistics,…) -**Harbours** as logistics hubs for **green energy** -**Innovative technologies** -**Energy-management** (energy poverty, green heating systems, heating plans at the municipal level, participative energy plans) Please note that these are our initial thoughts that will be further discussed and specified in our upcoming National committee meeting on September 26th.
DK	- **Renewable energy** planning is a huge issue in DK, so a project focusing on how and where to build renewable energy installations could have a positive impact, - Further issues: **civil engagement, green mobility, connection between urban and rural, adaption to climate changes**
EE	The topics **mapped by the PACs** under Priorities 2 and 3 are **quite wide** and it is difficult to bring out one or another topic forward as mostly all topics under those priorities contribute to climate objectives. Following PACs proposal we would like to highlight the topic of **coastal development** in view of new demands for space and climate neutrality (wind parks vs other interests and environmental protection). The topic mentioned under Priority 3 „**Innovative climate solutions and adaptation to climate change in urban and rural areas**" is relevant also for Priority 2. Probably it is reasonable to stress the horizontal importance of development of **innovative solutions under climate change and adaptation** to climate change throughout Priorities 2 and 3. **Connections between peripheral areas and regional centres** are creating a lot of challenges and we know that the solutions applied in different regions and countries are due to resources availability very different. This topic would be of interest for Estonia especially if projects would be able to concentrate on some new solutions which would put into collaboration regions with different level of development and would have not only local but also transnational influence.
FI	

LT	
LV	1. **Circular** approaches in **businesses** – product development, reuse of materials and resources. (3.1.)
	2. **Digitalisation** of **climate**-related **solutions**/processes. (3.1.)
	3. Increased **renewable energy production and use** (in businesses, public buildings, transport). (3.2.)
	4. Developed **environmentally friendly** and **digital maritime transport** and **port** operations. (3.3.)
	• The growing importance of information technology is one of the possible measures in reaching the EU decarbonisation objectives in transport, that promotes usage of electronic documents digitalization of processes in transport and logistics system. Use of benefits provided by digitalization is one of current global and European challenges.
	5. **Urban mobility planning** from different perspectives (3.3.) e.g.:
	• Sustainable, accessible and affordable public transportation systems for cities and their surrounding areas;
	• Prioritizing least protected road users (pedestrians, cyclists and micro mobility users) in urban mobility planning;
	• Solutions for incorporation of Low Emission Zones in mobility planning for large cities with a focus on SUMPs.
	6. Improved **regional planning processes** for better integrated approaches in different sectors – transport, water, waste, energy. (3.1., 3.2., 3.3.)
NO	
PL	We propose a **broad approach** to all climate change-related topics in both Priorities.
	However we could encourage applicants to address some areas (without excluding others). From the point of view of Polish regions, these could be: more **effective water management** to counteract the effects of natural disasters, including drought and floods (incl. flash floods). Urban areas may need to focus on **rainwater management** and **flood prevention**, while rural areas may emphasize **sustainable agricultural** practices and water conservation.
	In Priority 3, **circular economy** still needs significant support in awareness-rising measures, experience and knowledge sharing. Focus should be also given to improving **energy efficiency**, **renewable energy**, **green mobility** - low-emission transport and citizens' involvement in actions for **climate neutrality**.
SE	SE, no other comments then that we should look into the previous made Portfolio analysis and in AP 1 and what has been addressed there.

2. Considering that there may be limited or no funding remaining in Priority 2 after the call for core projects tackling the challenge of hazardous submerged objects and dumped munition in the Baltic Sea, would you support the reallocation of funds from Priority 3 to Priority 2 to allow addressing the climate targets through projects in both priorities?

DE	**In principle, yes**, but it could be misunderstood as a signal if funds were to come exclusively from the 3rd priority. Although most of the funds are still available here, we could also choose as an approach to **shift 1/3 of the funds** still available both from **Priority 1 and 3** respectively. This would also correspond to the 10% rule, up to which funds can be shifted without changing the programme.
DK	- The Danish delegation is open for a reallocation of max **10 mio. € from priority 3 to priority 2** and is aware of Danish interest in priority 2 (just to have some reassurance that there still is a demand) - If we open for further projects in priority 2 possible focus could be blue economy, innovation and business development within water technology.
EE	Yes, we **support the reallocation** of funds from Priority 3 to Priority 2.
FI	
LT	
LV	We are **in favor of keeping the allocation** of funds per priorities as it was initially planned, allocating the funding to the projects which will be submitted in Priority 3. Climate targets may be achieved also by the projects in Priority 3. We may consider reallocation of Programme funding between priorities only if there is a risk of achieving the Programme targets.
NO	
PL	We would **support the reallocation** of funds from Priority 3 to Priority 2 to allow addressing the climate targets through projects in both priorities.
SE	SE is a little hesitant to rush into this. It is ok if absolutely necessary, but why not deal with climate challenges in the climate priority? Why is it so hard to find good projects in prio 3? SE would prefer to step up the work to actively get projects into priority 3. Don't move funds unless there is an external event outside of the programme that affects the program. SE don´t see that a high search pressure in priority 2 is enough to justify a transfer of funds between priorities.

3. What should the thematic focus of the third call(s) in Priority 1 be?

DE	**Digitalisation** yes, but without a focus on standardisation. Projects should preferably focus on comprehensive approaches to **planning processes** like "Urban test beds"
DK	**Digitalization of public services, fx digital monitoring of biodiversity** and **climate change** to identify challenges as early as possible and thereby quicker responses to these threats
EE	Considering economic and social challenges which are faced currently by our regions including due to the war in Ukraine, the 3rd call projects should focus on the following topics: • **societal security** and disaster reduction, involving civil society, • **social and economic responses in peripheral areas** to recent geo-political challenges, • providing **support to businesses undergoing transition** (not as separate topic but including creative entrepreneurship and creative and cultural sector).
FI	
LT	
LV	1. Enhancing the development, improvement, and exchange of experiences within **psychological support services** and support groups dedicated to **children with disabilities and their families**. (1.1.) 2. Formulating a comprehensive strategy for inter-institutional and inter-regional collaboration to address **social support and services** issues. This strategy aims to establish a unified approach to implementing social case management processes, particularly in the context of supporting families with children who have disabilities. (1.1.) 3. Developing and testing mechanisms that manage economic and societal challenges in the BSR macro-region in a coordinated fashion, developing services based on mutual learning experiences, e.g. piloting **smart health solutions**. (1.1.) 4. Strengthen **European identity** based on common values, culture and heritage (1.1.) 5. Untap **digitalization** (1.1.) 6. Strengthening the role of **cultural operators** as centers of local communities (1.1.) 7. Ensuring the delivery of **social services** on an interregional level, guided by the principle of providing services in proximity to an individual's place of residence. (1.2.) 8. Pioneering and evaluating the adoption or broader utilization of **cutting-edge technologies and tools** in the **administration of social services**. This endeavor seeks to enhance service convenience, attain superior outcomes for clients, and optimize the process of organizing and documenting services. Wherever feasible, this also includes reducing reliance on human resources. (1.2.) 9. Implementing localized solutions for delivering **support to individuals with complex social care requirements** within their place of residence. This involves a flexible, person-centric approach to organizing social services, harnessing local community resources, and advocating for the interests of service users. (1.2.)

	10. Offering educational and support programs aimed at identifying and **preventing domestic violence**. These programs are specifically tailored for individuals with mental disorders, those with dementia, or others with limited resources or self-care capabilities within the framework of social services. (1.2.) 11. Developing integrated **public services tailored to the needs of functional regions**, specific territories or population groups. (1.2.) 12. Developing common standards and establishing **sustainable, inclusive and trustworthy digital public services** in the Baltic Sea region including by piloting interoperable public services. (1.2.) 13. Development of **cultural services** for different target groups and audiences in society. (1.2.)
NO	
PL	In our opinion, we should **not limit Priority 1** to specific challenges but rather keep all topics open. Yet, we might encourage applicants to take into account especially such topics as **digital innovation** and **transformation**, development models that **reduce the dependency** of the Baltic Sea region on **global supply chains** and strengthen **resilience** of the Baltic Sea as a macro-region. It is also important to create **safe society models**, taking into account vulnerable groups (such as seniors). From the point of view of climate issues, the call could focus on increasing the **resilience** of communities and the economy to **emergencies** related to **extreme weather events** (droughts, floods, other natural disasters) and **epidemics**.
SE	Comments from the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency as a part of SE subcommittee. There is a wish that the current narrow interpretation of Objective 1 "Resilient economies and communities" under Priority 1 is to be broadened and also include issues of "societal security and disaster reduction, including civil society". It is very difficult to build a resilient economy and society without including basic security issues. It is about a resilient society where actors are prepared to face consequential natural disasters, where all actors at all levels, including civil society, are proactive. A resilient economy is directly linked to and dependent on good cyber security. A resilient and safe region where residents can live in security is more competitive and attractive. The description today is more about resilient management, but SE would like to see the announcement open opportunities for projects that contribute more directly to PA Secure.

4. *Should the third call(s) be open for both core and small projects? Or only for one type? Do you see a specific role for both or one of these project types?*

DE	**Open for both**
DK	The Danish delegation prefers to **allocate as much as the funding as possible to core projects**, but recognizes **the strategic role in small projects** when it comes to engaging newcomers and development of core projects. But bearing in mind where we are in programme implementation the Danish delegations considers core projects as giving more value for money since they have to pilot their solutions. If the third call is open for both small and core projects, it **should be clear how much of the remaining funding is allocated for small and core projects in each priority**. Fx 3 of the remaining 15 Mio. in priority 1 for small projects (corresponding to approximately 6 projects) and 12 Mio € for core projects (corresponding to approximately 6 projects)
EE	Estonian delegation **supports both core and small projects** for the 3rd call. Although under **Priority 2** we propose to consider supporting of **only core projects** since the projects under this priority are by average have bigger budgets then under other priorities. The activities under this priority imply higher budgets especially in case of piloting.
FI	
LT	
LV	We see that the third call **should be open both to core and small projects**, as the applicants have shown great interest in both types of projects. The only exception could be to open the call for core transport/mobility projects operation of which is more complex and requires more expensive pilot solutions. So far there are no small projects approved by the Programme with LV partner involvement in Programme objective 3.3. Smart green mobility.
NO	
PL	In our opinion, the third call(s) **should be open for both core and small projects**. Both of these project types have different roles. Small project is an instrument important for initiating contacts by partners who have not participated in the Programme before and for regions that are less active or incapable to participate in high-budget cooperation schemes. Core projects allow testing new solutions in the Baltic Sea region.
SE	SE would like that JS evaluate the progress and implementation of call 1 and call 2 of small project before deciding of future small projects in call 3. Are the results and implementation in line with what we expected? SE more in favor of core projects.

5. Do you have any further suggestions or recommendations for the upcoming call(s)?

DE	It should be discussed how the programme can be stretched in a meaningful way. Besides the platforms and extension stage projects, it could be possible to work with **thematic calls**, over allocation and **not using all the remaining funds in the 3rd call**.
DK	-
EE	Within next call we see viable to encourage partners to include in their projects the following topics which are to be still explored within support of the programme: • the promotion of **digital technologies**, particularly in terms of establishing **common standards** across different policy areas and BSR regions; • comprehensive approaches **to planning processes**, • working with **administrative and legal** barriers, • **citizen engagement** in actions through different policy areas. We consider those topics as cross-cutting, horizontal and relevant in all priorities.
FI	
LT	
LV	Not at this moment.
NO	
PL	The programme could **strengthen advice to applicants**, especially to **rejected projects**, as many of them deal with topics that are key to the BSR, (e.g. clear communication on what went wrong between consultations of the concept and submission of the full application, what was misunderstood/neglected etc., offer of special consultations upon receiving the assessment sheets, tutorial on the most common mistakes). The **involvement of PACs** can be important, it is unclear whether applicants and beneficiaries can count on their active support. Do PACs plan using funds reserved for project generation tools? Before the call is announced, the issue of the programme approach to projects relating **to small (local) nuclear power plants should be discussed**. It is not renewable energy, but it is green and as such it is covered by specific objective 3.2.
SE	-