

**Interreg
Europe**



Co-funded by
the European Union

CHERRY

CHERRY project's impact on Regional Policies INTRODUCTION TO THE PARTNERS' ANALYSIS

TRANSNATIONAL PEERING ACTIVITY N3

Brasov 25 June 2025

Interreg Europe's objective

As defined in Article 3 of the Regulation (EU) 2021/1059 on ETC, Interreg Europe is part of the 'strand C' of Interreg and is dedicated to reinforcing 'the effectiveness of cohesion policy'.

More specifically, the same article defines Interreg Europe's purpose as being to promote 'exchange of experiences, innovative approaches and capacity building ... in relation to the identification, dissemination and transfer of good practices into regional development policies including Investment for jobs and growth goal programmes'.

Based on this provision, as well as on the needs and challenges identified in the cooperation programme, the Interreg Europe programme will pursue the following overall objective:

To improve the implementation of regional development policies, including Investment for jobs and growth goal programmes, by promoting the exchange of experiences, innovative approaches, and capacity building in relation to the identification, dissemination and transfer of good practices among regional policy actors.

Interreg Europe is therefore dedicated to cooperation among regional policy organisations from across Europe. By supporting learning and increasing the capacities of these organisations, the programme will strive to improve the design and delivery of regional development policies.

Interreg
Europe



Co-funded by
the European Union

CHERRY

General project and financial management

The objective of an interregional cooperation project (of its core phase) is to improve - through the exchange of experience - the performance of the regional development **policy instruments** of the participating regions, including Investment for jobs and growth goal programmes, in line with the programme mission set out in Article (3) (3) (a) of the ETC Regulation (EU) 2021/1059.

Policy instrument

A policy instrument is a means of public intervention. It refers to any strategy, programme, or law developed by public authorities and implemented to improve a specific territorial situation. In most cases, financial resources are allocated to a policy instrument. However, an instrument can also refer to a strategy or legislative framework with no specific funding (e.g., a Smart Specialisation Strategy) as long as this strategy or legislative framework comply with the above definition (i.e., 'developed by public authorities and implemented to improve a specific territorial situation'). In principle, internal documents of organisations (e.g., mission statements, in-house strategic orientations) does not qualify as policy instruments. In the context of Interreg Europe, operational programmes under the Investment for jobs and growth goal are 'policy instruments'. Beyond the EU's cohesion policy programmes, local, regional, or national public authorities implement their own policy instruments, which can also be addressed by Interreg Europe projects.

THE CORE PHASE

Core phase – ‘interregional learning’

The core phase is dedicated to the **exchange of experience** among project partners and to the integration of the lessons learnt from the cooperation activities into the regional development policy instruments addressed by the project.

The core phase lasts **three years**.

Semester 1-6

The project's overall objective of improving the policies of the participating regions should ideally be achieved by the end of the core phase. Partner regions that do not achieve policy improvements during the core phase must produce, by the end of this core phase, **an action plan for policy improvement**

REPORTING THE IMPACT ON THE POLICY - 1

2. Policy improvements

Has the project succeeded in improving this policy instrument?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Please indicate the nature of this improvement (see also section 4.3.1 of the programme manual):

New projects financed

☐ Yes ☒ No

Change in the management

☐ Yes ☒ No

Revision of the instrument

☐ Yes ☒ No

Please describe in detail the policy improvement achieved thanks to the project.

0/2500

REPORTING THE IMPACT ON THE POLICY - 2

Please describe how the project has led to this improvement i.e., what is the link between the improvement and the activities organised within the project (including pilot action if relevant)? Which lessons learned from the project were at the origin of this improvement? Please name the practices, activities or other content source which provided the inspiration for achieving this result.

0/2500

This field is required to save the current page.

Can you provide any evidence about this policy improvement? If possible, please upload the relevant document(s). (PDF only, max 10MB).

(No documents uploaded)

Total size: 0 B Selected: 0 file(s)

 Download ZIP

 Upload

**Interreg
Europe**



Co-funded by
the European Union

CHERRY

REPORTING THE IMPACT ON THE POLICY - 3

If applicable, please estimate the amount of funding influenced by the project.

Current period (EUR)

Semester 4

0.00

Cumulative (EUR)

0.00

Please explain how the above amount was estimated.

0/2500

What if the impact on the policy is not achieved by the Core Phase?

Partner regions that do not achieve policy improvements during the core phase must produce, by the end of **this** core phase, **an action plan** for policy improvement.

Action plan

The action plan for policy improvement is a document specifying how the lessons learnt from the cooperation work in the core phase will be implemented in a region in order to improve the policy instrument addressed by this region. It provides information on the nature, costs, and timeframe of the action(s) to be implemented, the stakeholders involved, and the way the action(s) derive from the project. Only regions that do not achieve a policy improvement by the end of the core phase need to produce an action plan.

Appendix 1 – Action plan for policy improvement - template

This template is automatically integrated in the last progress report of the core phase. It appears in the 'Results' for regions which haven't yet demonstrated any policy improvement.

Policy context

<p>1/ Policy instrument addressed</p> <p>Does the action plan address the initial policy instrument addressed in the application form?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If no, please provide the features of the new policy instrument(s) addressed: (see description of a policy instrument in the application form)</p>
<p>2/ What kind of improvements do you envisage for this instrument?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * New projects financed through the instrument <input type="checkbox"/> * Change in the management of the instrument <input type="checkbox"/> * Revision of the instrument itself <input type="checkbox"/> <p>Please further explain the expected improvement deriving from the action(s)?</p>

Details of the action(s) envisaged

<p>ACTION X:</p> <p>Name of the action: _____</p>
<p>1. Relevance to the project (please describe how this action derives from the project and in particular from the Interregional exchange of experience. Where does the inspiration for this action come from?)</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
<p>2. Nature of the action (please describe the content of action 1 precisely. What are the specific activities to be implemented?)</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
<p>3. Stakeholders involved (please indicate the organisations in the region which are involved in the implementation of the action and explain their role)</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
<p>4. Timeframe (please specify the timing envisaged for the action)</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
<p>5. Indicative costs and source of funding (if applicable, please estimate the costs related to the implementation of action 1)</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>

Example of Action Plan

Follow-up Phase

Follow-up phase – monitoring the effects of the policy improvements

the follow-up phase will primarily be dedicated to monitoring the first effects of the policy improvements and monitoring whether additional policy improvements are being or have been achieved.

More specifically, partner regions having achieved policy improvements under the core phase must monitor the effect of these improvements in their territories.

The partner regions that produce an action plan for policy improvement are required to monitor whether the envisaged improvements are being or have been achieved.

Each partner is responsible for implementing and monitoring the progress of their action plan and for reporting to the lead partner. It should be noted that Interreg Europe will support only the costs incurred for the monitoring; **the costs related to the implementation itself of the actions cannot be covered by the project's budget but must be funded from relevant local, regional, or national sources.**

During the follow-up phase, and if relevant, partners can also continue learning and exchanging experience on the activities of this phase (i.e., activities dedicated to monitoring the effects of policy improvements and/ or the implementation of action plans).

How did we plan the impact of CHERRY into our policy?

D - Main policy instruments addressed ▲

Overview

- 1 Regional Law 23/2015
- 2 RP Veneto ERDF 2021-2027
- 3 Regional Development Progra...
- 4 Regional programme 2021-202...
- 5 Balaton Priority Area Develop...
- 6 Regional programme 2021-202...
- 7 Zemgale Planning Region's De...
- 8 Cultural Policy Délibération n° ...
- 9 Beleidsnota Leiedal 2020-2025

Number ↑	Name of the policy instrument	Name of the policy responsible authority	Involvement of the policy responsible authority	Investment for Jobs and Growth programme	Country
1	Regional Law 23/2015	Friuli Venezia Giulia Autonomous Region	Partner	No	Italy (Italia)
2	RP Veneto ERDF 2021-2027	Veneto Region	Partner	Yes	Italy (Italia)
3	Regional Development Programme of Kainuu (Kainuu Programme)	Kainuu Regional Council	Partner	No	Finland (Suomi/Finland)
4	Regional programme 2021-2027 Central Region	Centru Regional Development Agency	Partner	Yes	Romania (România)
5	Balaton Priority Area Development Programme (2021-2027)	Lake Balaton Development Coordination Agency	Associated Policy Authority	No	Hungary (Magyarország)
6	Regional programme 2021-2027 Dytiki Ellada	Region of Western Greece	Partner	Yes	Greece (Ελλάδα)
7	Zemgale Planning Region's Development Programme (2021-2027)	Zemgale Planning Region	Partner	No	Latvia (Latvija)
8	Cultural Policy Délibération n° 16-1067 du 16/12/2016 (legal Framework Carte Blanche aux artistes)	REGION PROVENCE-ALPES-CÔTE D'AZUR	Partner	No	France (France)
9	Beleidsnota Leiedal 2020-2025	Intercommunal Leiedal	Partner	No	Belgium (Belgique/België)

The impact of CHERRY on the policies

D.1.1.1	Territorial context	What is the state of play of the issue addressed by the project in the territory covered by the policy instrument? Which challenge needs to be overcome in this territory? Please be as specific as possible and provide detailed information on the characteristics of the territory.
D.1.1.2	General description of the policy instrument	Please name the policy instrument addressed (for Investment for jobs and growth goal programmes, please provide the name of the operational programme concerned).
		Is this instrument an Investment for jobs and growth goal programme (i.e. national or regional operational programme)?
		Please indicate the geographical scope of this instrument
		Please select how the authority responsible for this policy instrument is involved in the project:
		Please select the authority responsible for this policy instrument. Please describe the main features of this policy instrument (e.g. objective, characteristics, priority or measure addressed).
D.1.1.3	D.1.1.3 Expected policy improvement	
	New projects financed by the instrument	
	Change in the management of the instrument	
	Revision of the instrument itself	

3 TYPES OF IMPACT ON THE POLICIES

Type 1: A new type of project

using the lessons learnt from interregional cooperation, a region implements, in its territory, **a new type of project financed through one of its existing policy instruments**. This type of result is the most common. It implies the availability of funding within the policy instrument addressed. In some case, it is not one but several new projects that are supported through, for instance, the launch of a dedicated call for proposals.

Type 2: change in the management of the policy instrument (improved governance)

Interregional cooperation can also influence **the way a policy instrument is managed and implemented**. These improvements may, for instance, be related to:

- a revised methodology for evaluating the performance of the policy instrument
- the introduction of new criteria for selecting the projects supported by the policy instrument
- a more efficient way to publicise/advertise the calls for proposals launched under the policy instrument
- a modification of the decision-making rules or of the composition of the managing committee in charge of implementing the policy instrument.

Type 3: A revision of the policy instrument addressed (structural change)

The third type is the most challenging since it requires **a change to the policy instrument addressed**. It occurs when, based on the lessons learnt from the cooperation project, a region modifies the main features of this instrument. This can, for instance, take the form of adding a **new priority or measure**. It can also involve modifying the budget allocation between the policy instrument's different priorities.

Policy Improvements: example of type 1

The good practice developed by region A on promoting innovative tourism (using international electronic marketing) served as a basis for the development of the new project dedicated to the promotion of lake tourism in region B. The idea was to generate additional revenues for the tourism industry by providing new sustainable tourism experiences and services for visiting tourists. The new project was approved in region B for a total budget of EUR 80,000 fully financed through this region's 'Sustainable Tourism Development Strategy' (policy instrument addressed).

Policy Improvements: example of type 2

Based on the methodology developed in region A, region B improved the evaluation of its funding schemes defined in its Energy Efficiency Development Plan (i.e., a policy instrument is addressed in region B). As a result of interregional cooperation, region B updated and harmonised an ex-post questionnaire for all its regional funding schemes on energy efficiency. This revised approach and indicator system allowed the authority responsible for energy policy to determine whether its initial objectives had been reached in a simpler and more efficient way.

Policy Improvements: example of type 3

Based on the experience gained from different regions involved in the project, Region A has integrated full paragraph dedicated to 'corporate social responsibility' in the part of its updated Smart Specialisation Strategy dedicated to social innovation.

Thank you!