

# UPDATES ON PROGRAMME PRIORITIES FOR 2ND CALL

8 May 2024

Ilze Ziverte, Project Manager of the Joint Secretariat

**Interreg**



Co-funded by  
the European Union

**Latvia – Lithuania**

# Financing available for projects for 2nd Call for Proposals

Priority	Specific objective	ERDF co-financing (EUR)	Max ERDF per project (EUR)	Max total project budget (EUR)
<b>1. Capacity building and people-to-people cooperation</b>	1.1 Other actions to support better cooperation governance (ISO6.6)	<b>5 327 780</b>	250 000	312 500
<b>2. Green, resilient and sustainable development</b>	2.1 Promoting climate change adaptation and risk prevention and resilience taking into account ecosystem- based approaches (RSO2.4)	<b>7 391 490</b>	600 000	750 000
	2.2 Enhancing protection and preservation of nature, biodiversity and green infrastructure, including in urban areas, and reducing all forms of pollution (RSO2.7)	<b>7 658 980</b>	600 000	750 000
<b>3. Fair and inclusive society</b>	3.1 Promoting the socioeconomic inclusion of marginalized communities, low income households and disadvantaged groups, including people with special needs, through integrated actions, including housing and social services (RSO4.3)	<b>3 680 440</b>	500 000	625 000
<b>4. Economic potential of tourism and heritage</b>	4.1 Enhancing the role of culture and sustainable tourism in economic development, social inclusion and social innovation (RSO4.6)	<b>3 601 290</b>	600 000	750 000




# Updates on Specific Objective 1.1

Changes in Specific rules for SO 1.1:

- ✓ Projects must contribute to at least two **mandatory** Programme output indicators **with respective result indicators**:

 "Organisations cooperating across borders".

 "Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects".

- ✓ It is recommended that **equipment** purchases under CC5 (equipment) **do not exceed 20%** of the total project budget.



# Updated Programme Manual Annex I



Specific objective 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1							
Output indicator name	Measurement unit	Definition	Time measurement achieved	Result indicator name	Measurement unit	Definition	Time measurement achieved
Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects (RCO04)	Pilot actions	The indicator counts the pilot actions developed jointly and implemented by supported projects. The scope of a jointly developed pilot action could be: to test procedures, new instruments, tools, experimentation or the transfer of practices.  In order to be counted by this indicator: - the pilot action needs not only to be developed, but also implemented within the project. and - the implementation of the pilot action should be finalised by the end of the project.  Jointly developed pilot action implies the involvement of organizations from Latvia and Lithuania in its implementation.	Upon project finalisation.	Solutions taken up or upscaled by organisations (RCR104)	Solutions	The indicator counts the number of solutions, other than legal or administrative solutions, that are developed by supported projects and are taken up or upscaled during the implementation of the project or within one year after project completion.  The organisation adopting the solutions developed by the project may or may not be a participant in the project.  The uptake / up-scaling should be documented by the adopting organisations in, for instance, strategies, action plans etc.	During project implementation / up to one year after project completion
<b>Comments</b> In the Application Form PPs should describe the need for the pilot action (implementation-related activity designed to test the feasibility of jointly developed new approach (e.g. procedures, new instruments, tools, experimentation or the transfer of practices), who will participate in its development, how it will be used during project implementation and by whom, as well as who will participate in the testing of the pilot action.				<b>Comments</b> Project should report at least '1' as target value for the result indicator "Solutions taken up or upscaled by organisations (RCR104)" if the project has chosen the output indicator "Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects (RCO04)".  "Solution taken up or upscaled by organisations" refers to a pilot action, which after its testing was recognised as appropriate for further use without any major improvements.			



# Conclusions from 1st Call



Common mistakes/shortages for SO 1.1:

- ✓ The project has a strong emphasis on the purchase of equipment, but the planned equipment is not intended for joint cooperation activities.
- ✓ Planned activities are not related to any indicated cross-border challenge.
- ✓ Durability of project activities is not justified.
- ✓ IT solutions are planned without analyzing already available solutions in the market.
- ✓ Training activities include development of basic skills.

# Updates on Specific Objectives 2.1 and 2.2

Changes in Specific rules for SO 2.1:

- ✓ Projects must contribute to at least two **mandatory** Programme output indicators with respective result indicators:

-  "Organisations cooperating across borders".
-  "Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects".

Changes in Specific rules for SO 2.1 and SO 2.2:

- ✓ The Programme **highly recommends** to supplement projects with **awareness rising activities**.

Changes in Specific rules for SO 2.2:

- ✓ In case of investments (for activity 5), **at no case should aim at attracting visitors or tourists**. Clear and concise information on the **specific natural values** that will be preserved by project efforts, and **expected environmental effect** must be presented in the application. Programme highly recommends to provide letter of support from relevant institutions or experts to justify planned for investments.





# Conclusions from 1st Call

## Common mistakes/shortages for SO 2.1 and SO 2.2:

- ✓ Lack of justification to address problem to the Priority 2 (especially – to SO 2.1).
- ✓ Absence of supporting data showcasing problem importance in project territory.
- ✓ Missing cross-border cooperation activities aligned with SO 2.1 or SO 2.2.
- ✓ Unclear scope and implementation steps for applied research activities.
- ✓ Issues with durability and dissemination of developed project documents.



## Conclusions from 1st Call

In the cases where practical activities to improve environmental quality are planned:

- ✓ Specific plots and selection criteria are not explained.
- ✓ Unclear goals and measurable targets for nature management or environmental activities related to equipment purchase.
- ✓ Lack of clarity on activity scope and steps for implementation.

For management of recreational areas under SO 2.2:

- ✓ Measures lack assurance they preserve ecosystems rather than attract visitors.
- ✓ Specific information on protected species or ecosystems missing.



# Updates on Specific Objective 3.1

## Improved definition of Programme's terms:

- ✓ **Social services-** are services which are defined in the relevant national legislation, except long term care services (in institutions).
- ✓ **Social inclusion measures-** are social rehabilitation activities and activities of social character not qualified as social service activities (for full text check PM page 22).





# Conclusions from 1st Call

Common mistakes/shortages for SO 3.1:

- ✓ Unclear focus on whether the project will develop social services or social inclusion measures.
- ✓ Insufficient cooperation activities among stakeholders.
- ✓ Lack of clear explanations regarding the intended project outcomes.
- ✓ Absence of detailed plans for utilizing developed documents: during the project, integration into partner or stakeholder activities, and post-project usage.
- ✓ Vagueness in disseminating project results among stakeholders for replication or upscaling purposes.

# Updates on Specific Objective 4.1

## Updated indicative list of activities supported for SO 4.1:

- ✓ Developing modern, digital, interactive **joint** cross-border tourism products.

## Changes in Specific rules for SO 4.1:

- ✓ Project activities and planned results must demonstrate cross-border cooperation nature and **developed touristic products must be joint.**
- ✓ One-off touristic attraction activities, that are organized only during the project lifetime and **are not linked to the project specific and/or communication objectives**, are not supported.





# Conclusions from 1st Call

Things to consider and pay attention for SO 4.1:

- ✓ Think of **original** and **innovative** ideas to attract tourists.
- ✓ Focus on **joint** cross-border tourism product.
- ✓ Think of **unifying elements** and clear **strategy** for planned tourism activities.
- ✓ Support project idea with **facts** (statistical data and research) to justify that proposed solutions will have significant impact on indicated challenges.
- ✓ Ensure **durability** of the produced outputs and results.

# Updates on Specific rules for all Specific Objectives

For projects intending to **develop documentation**:

- ✓ The AF (Application Form) must **explicitly outline the purpose** of the documentation.
- ✓ The AF should **specify the intended audience** for the documentation.
- ✓ The AF must explain **how the documentation will be utilized**.



Additionally, the PPs must provide **letter of support** from relevant stakeholders or authorities.

# Updates on Specific rules for all Specific Objectives

If stakeholders who would directly benefit from the project results **are not involved**, provide explicit information in AF on use of **results during and after** project:



**Who?**



**How?**



**When?**



**Support letter!**




Interreg



Co-funded by  
the European Union

Latvia – Lithuania

 [www.latlit.eu](http://www.latlit.eu)

 @LatviaLithuaniaProgramme

# THANK YOU!