

Questions	Commission answers
<p>Why does the list of thematic objectives not include integrated urban and spatial development as a separate objective?</p>	<p>Cohesion policy should be aligned with Europe 2020 and funding concentrated on the respective thematic objectives. At the same time, the integrated approach to territorial development is facilitated throughout the regulatory framework for all thematic objectives, especially through integrated programming and through the possibility to bundle resources from various priority axes for Integrated Territorial Investments.</p>
<p>What is the difference between an ITI and LD? Could LD strategy be basis for ITI?</p>	<p>ITI is a delivery mode – it is a way of managing support from different priority axes of one or more operational programmes to achieve integrated investment in a particular territory. It does not prejudice how decisions are taken on the investments themselves – this process may be top down, or bottom up, or a combination of the two.</p> <p>Integrated community-led local development strategies are used to implement community-led local development (CLLD) which is strictly bottom-up. An example of this is LEADER, financed under the rural development policy. In the case of CLLD it is the local action group, which determines the content of the local development strategy and the operations financed under it. Even though such strategies may frequently be co-financed by several Funds, several OPs and priorities, there may be CLLD strategies which are financed from one Fund or one priority axis only.</p> <p>Within an ITI, CLLD strategies can be used as one element or building block and can serve as a specific method for implementing certain groups of projects. CLLD could for example be one component of an integrated urban strategy implemented through an ITI.</p>
<p>Is the use of territorial development actions obligatory?</p>	<p>The use of the mechanism for CLLD and ITIs are optional, except as set out below.</p>

	<p>As regards the ERDF, there is a minimum 5% ear-marking for integrated sustainable urban development.</p> <p>As regards the EAFRD, community-led local development (Leader) is obligatory with a minimum spending rate of 5% of the EAFRD envelope in each rural development programme.</p> <p>The Partnership Contracts and operational programmes need to set out the arrangements to ensure an integrated approach to the use of the CSF Funds to the territorial development of urban, rural, coastal and fisheries areas and areas with particular territorial features. The territorial development instruments provided in the regulations facilitate such an integrated approach.</p>
<p>Will the suggested approach to territorial development not lead to a fragmentation of the funding?</p>	<p>No. The Commission proposals provide the flexibility for Member States to decide how best to combine the different instruments at its disposal in order to ensure that they best contribute to its overall development strategy.</p>
<p>What co-financing levels would be used in terms of ITI's and CLLD that unite resources from the EAFRD and the SA? There are 3 categories of regions in Cohesion Policy but only 2 in EAFRD (no transition regions)</p>	<p>It should first be noted that ITI does not cover the EAFRD.</p> <p>As regards CLLD, maximum co-financing rates are established for the different funds in the fund-specific rules. For the structural funds, the co-financing rate of the relevant priority axis or axes would apply.</p>
<p>What is the definition of "local"?</p>	<p>There is no definition of local in the legislative proposals, this will depend on the institutional set-up of the Member State. The important thing about the local development approach proposed is that it be community-led. Therefore the local area should have sufficient critical mass to implement a viable local development strategy and, at the same time, be sufficiently small to allow for local interaction. A delegated act will set out criteria for the definition of the area and the population covered by the strategy (Art. 29 (6) CPR).</p>

<p>What is the difference between local development and Community-led local development?</p>	<p>Local development is a generic concept, CLLD refers to a bottom-up process with the involvement of both public and private local interests. It has to be differentiated from local development driven by Local Public Authorities.</p>
<p>What is the relationship between development programmes of local municipalities and local development strategies?</p>	<p>Local development strategies for community led local development have to respond to certain requirements set out in the regulation (community-led, private and public partners, multi-sectoral, etc.) and are distinct from territorial strategies that municipalities may implement. However, as municipalities are usually integral actors in local actions groups, consistency and coordination between these strategies is to be expected.</p>
<p>How should approval of local development strategies be organised if several funds are involved? At what stage should resources by different funds be allocated for the implementation of the strategy?</p>	<p>The Managing Authorities of all programmes involved have to approve the local development strategy. This will be done by a (joint) special committee set up by the Managing Authorities for this purpose (Art. 28 (3) CPR).</p> <p>Resource allocation will be done at the joint selection of the strategy. The local strategy as proposed by the local action group will identify the needs of support from the different Funds and programmes in order to implement all aspects of the strategy, including indicative budget allocations. The decision to approve a local development strategy shall then set out the allocations of each CSF fund by programme and priority.</p>
<p>Can CLLD cover several programmes? Can it be set up at sub-regional level?</p>	<p>Yes. CLLD has to be implemented at sub-regional level.</p>
<p>How should local development be incorporated in programme (separate priority axis, operation)? How will participation of different Funds be</p>	<p>For the ERDF, it will be included under the thematic objective of promoting social inclusion and combating poverty under the</p>

<p>reflected? Who designates lead fund?</p>	<p>investment priority on the economic and physical regeneration of deprived communities, but can include activities related to all thematic objectives. For the ESF, it is foreseen as an investment priority under the same thematic objective (promoting social inclusion and combating poverty) but can also include activities related to all thematic objectives listed in the scope of the ESF. Community-led local development can either constitute the whole of one priority axis or be implemented as part of a priority axis including several investment priorities related to social inclusion with the co-financing rate of the priority axis concerned. Where CLLD is supported under a single priority axis under ERDF or ESF, it can benefit from a top-up of 10% on the - co-financing rate (Art. 110 (5) CPR).</p> <p>Under the EAFRD it will continue to be included in the rural development programme, as a rural development instrument which addresses one or more EU priorities for rural development.</p> <p>Under the EMFF CLLD will be included under a specific Union priority.</p> <p>The participation of different Funds in the implementation of a local development strategy will have to be reflected by the LAG when drawing up the strategy. It will also depend on the availability of funding from each individual Fund in the respective MS/region to contribute to the implementation of the strategy.</p> <p>The lead Fund in a given area is designated by the Member State, i.e. by the Managing Authorities concerned in consultation with the LAG for each strategy (Art. 28.3). The choice of the lead Fund depends on the activities foreseen in the strategy by the LAG and the type of area in question.</p>
---	---

<p>Could CLLD LAG-s use the resources of any CSF fund irrespectively of which the Lead Fund is? Could a LAG use resources from more Funds (including EAFRD) and more priorities on its own right, or could it only be done via an ITI?</p> <p>Would there be any internal required ratios for the use of different CSF funds in the implementation of a local strategy, or this would be free to determine by the LAG/MS itself?</p>	<p>Yes. There is no need for an ITI.</p> <p>It is up to the LAGs to set out the planned allocation for each of the Funds, which will be contained in the financial plan of the strategy. The allocation will depend on the needs and projects identified in the local development strategy. The selection committee when approving the strategy will also set out the allocations of each CSF Fund and programme for each CLLD strategy.</p>
<p>Would a given LAG always need to remain within a NUTS2 region or would there be a possibility to cover areas from more NUTS2 regions? Is it conceivable that an area of cooperation defined under Articles 28 and 28 stretches across the area of two different Operational programmes (in Germany: Länder)?</p> <p>How would the fact that EAFRD differentiates between 2 regional categories and Cohesion Policy takes account of 3 be handled? (There are no “transition” regions under EAFRD.)</p>	<p>The LAG area has to be sub-regional. In principle a LAG area does not have to correspond to, and can cut across, administrative boundaries but how this will be organised is up to the Member States. Cooperation of territories implementing individual local development strategies under a "strategic roof" could also be a way to deal with it.</p> <p>The impact of a CLLD being in a transition region for cohesion policy, which is not applicable for EAFRD, would be on the co-financing rate (see above).</p>
<p>Art 28.1b states that “<i>at the decision making level neither the public sector nor any single interest group shall represent more than 49 % of the voting rights</i>”. What does “public sector” exactly mean here?</p> <p>Why is it needed to mention "single interest group", taking into account that in a multi-sectoral strategy an interest group should never be able to get close to 49%?</p>	<p>"Public sector" means: Local authorities or any other public bodies which are run by the local authorities. This could also include public services, such as for example public employment services. Practical examples on the composition of the decision boards of LAGs can be found in the implementation of Leader. (Further guidance to MS will be given on these provisions.)</p> <p>"Single interest group" relates to specific interest or sectoral representation (e.g. in relation to the fisheries sector as regards CLLD under the EMFF or farmers as regards the EAFRD).</p>

<p>Unclear wording of Art. 28.(5) CPR: In order to make it clear that a CLLD strategy can be funded by several Funds, the wording should be changed.</p>	<p>The Commission takes note of the comment and will reflect on possible rewording.</p>
<p>It must be sure, that “action plan” in Art 29.1 (e) CPR does not have the meaning of an ex-ante determination of projects the local action group has to perform on a timetable. The interpretation should be that “action plan” refers to action which could be directly influenced by the local actions groups like animation actions etc.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Art 29 (2) CPR states that “Member States shall define criteria for the selection of local development strategies. The Fund-specific rules may set out selection criteria.” What sections of the fund-specific rules does the text refer here?</p>	<p>It refers to the regulations applicable to the different Funds. While the Fund specific regulations for the EAFRD, ERDF and ESF do not foresee to provide any criteria, the one for the EMFF will.</p>
<p>In order to make the approval of multi-funded local development strategies more operational, shouldn't the wording of Art. 29 (5) CPR say "by the relevant managing authorities" instead "by the managing authority"?</p>	<p>The Commission takes note of the comment and will reflect on possible rewording</p>
<p>Art 30 (2) CPR states that “<i>The managing authority shall ensure that the local action groups either select one partner within the group as a <u>lead partner in administrative and financial matters</u>, or come together in a <u>legally constituted common structure</u>.</i>” What authorities would the lead partner/legal person here have? What will be the role of the LAG and the MA in the project selection?</p>	<p>The lead partner is only a proposed practical solution to organise the different tasks carried out by a LAG in respect of financial implementation. It might be useful to delegate the administrative and financial matters to a sub-regional authority for instance or to create a new legally constituted common structure. Practical examples for both types of solutions proposed in Art. 30 (2) CPR can be found in the implementation of Leader in any Member State.</p> <p>This provision is not linked to the division of tasks between the Managing Authority/Certifying Authority/Paying Agency and the LAG as regards decision-making and approval of operations (Art. 30 (3 f))</p>

	CPR). Additional tasks beyond the minimum tasks set out in Art. 30 (3) CPR may be delegated to the LAGs .
In case of multi-funded strategy is the task of the managing authority spelled out in Art. 30 (2) the task of the managing authority of the lead Fund)?	This could be a practical solution, but should be determined at Member State level.
How would a written selection procedure work (Art. 30 (3 b) CPR)?	The selection procedure normally consists of voting on projects in the presence of the members of the selection board. Experience with Leader has shown that also other types of selection procedures can be implemented. To use a written procedure is an option in this context. Other possibilities are currently also being used in Leader, such as "online voting" via a specific IT application developed by LAGs. What is important is to document properly the results of the selection to ensure full transparency of the process.
Is the possibility of appeal against LAG selection decisions not an issue which falls under corresponding national law?	Yes. The appeal procedure depends on the administrative delivery of the decisions and the possibility should be provided following national rules in this respect.
How can a Managing Authority ensure that Funds are correctly spent by the local action group (Art. 30 (3f)?	The operations financed under local development strategies are for the most parts managed like any other operations financed by the CSF Funds and are under the ultimate responsibility of the Managing Authority. They are subject to management verifications and audit, and where there is a more extensive delegation they may be subject to audit of management and control systems. The main question of control arises in regard to the correctness project selection, which is one of the main tasks of local action groups and therefore cannot be fulfilled by the managing authority itself. However the Commission proposal has foreseen that local action groups should present the project proposals they have selected for financing to the responsible body (in the case of cohesion policy, this is the managing authority or an intermediate

	body) for final verification of eligibility before approval. Practical examples can be found in the implementation of Leader in any MS.
Article 30.1 states that “ <i>Member States shall define the <u>respective roles of the local action group and the authorities responsible for the implementation of the relevant programmes, for all implementation tasks relating to the strategy</u></i> ”. What do “respective roles” mean? What possibilities does the Member State have here?	MS can opt for an implementation system which gives more autonomy to LAGs, including tasks related to the formal approval of operations, payment and control, or for a more "conservative" models where the LAGs only has the minimum tasks as set out in Art.30 (3). Practical examples can be found in the implementation of Leader.
What is the rationale for the deadline in Art. 29 (4) CPR?	The deadline is set based on experience with the aim to ensure that there is enough time for implementation of the strategy. In addition, it has been set to avoid a funding gap for existing LAGs which can be supported under the current programmes (EAFRD, EFF) until the end of 2015.
According to Art. 29 CPR local development strategies are to be approved by the end of 2015. According to 87.2 (c) CPR on the other hand CLLD territories need to be identified in the programme. How can this be done if LAGs are approved later? What needs to be identified here?	Art. 87 (2 c iv) CPR only asks for the identification of the types of areas in which community-led local development can potentially take place and thus only sets the frame. Local development strategies will then be developed on this basis. The EMFF will also require Member States to broadly define the types of fisheries areas eligible for CLLD. The (F)LAG will then define the exact boundaries of their territory when drawing up their local development strategy.
Why does the LD strategy have to include a financial plan? It is hard to see distribution of funds before selection of investments.	A plan is needed in order to give an idea of the planned investments and for the financial management of each programme. It can be adapted in the course of the implementation, if necessary.
What is the scope of the delegated act foreseen in Art. 29 (6) CPR? Why is it needed at all?	The delegated act will not define areas and the respective population covered by individual strategies, but set out the criteria to be applied in order to ensure that local development takes place in a homogeneous area. It is needed as CLLD is only efficient with a certain critical mass

	in terms of area and population which should not be exceeded or not fall below.
What is the difference between a cross-sectoral and an integrated strategy?	An integrated approach allows the combination of policy areas, whereas a cross-sectoral approach brings together different economic actors from different sectors.
Further clarification on committee needed (Art. 29 (3) CPR)	The purpose of the Committee is to select the local development strategy. It will be set up by the Managing Authorities concerned. The selection committees for the selection of the local development strategies under Leader in the current period can be taken as an example.
When a local development strategy involves contribution from several funds, a lead fund is designated, which finances the running costs, animation and networking activities. Is it possible for a project to receive financing from several CSF funds, for example the <i>EAFRD</i> and the EMFF?	This can happen, but in this case the project or operation must be able to identify in its accounts the expenditure supported by the different Funds.
Is there a limit to the running costs for the local development strategy?	The overall ceiling established for running costs and animation in Art. 31 (d) CPR, i.e. 25%, has to be respected. There is no distinct ceiling for running costs.
Article 110 on “Determination of co-financing rates” says in paragraph 5 that “The <i>maximum co-financing rate</i> under paragraph 3 at the level of a priority axis <i>shall be increased by ten percentage points, where the whole of a priority axis is delivered through</i> financial instruments, or through <i>community-led local development.</i> ” Can a whole OP be devoted to CLLD, or can it only be represented within a priority axis?	It is foreseen under both the ERDF and ESF that CLLD is delivered through a single priority axis. This priority axis can be exclusively composed of CLLD, in which case it can benefit from an additional 10% cofinancing. Alternatively, it can be part of a priority axis and combined with other social inclusion investment priorities.
What is meant by "specific evaluation arrangements/activities" in Art. 29 (1f) and 30 (3g) CPR?	Self-monitoring and self-evaluation are necessary elements to ensure the effectiveness of the local development strategy. That is why

	specific arrangements need to be set out in the strategy itself. The evaluation activities will then be carried out by the local action group.
Does the preparatory support under Art. 31 (a) CPR also include the support for LAGs, whose strategy might not be selected for funding later on?	Yes.
Can the drafting of local development strategies be covered by the costs of preparatory support in Article 31 (a) CPR?	Yes.
How can the continuation of existing action groups be ensured? Will the local action groups which function at present have to register again after the regulation is adopted?	Existing action groups from the EAFRD and the EFF have to submit new strategies (in a way as a continuation of their current ones), there is no automatic "carry-over" from this funding period to the next. "Registration" is not part of the EU regulations. As regards existing overlaps between current EAFRD and EFF strategies, flexible models have to be designed at the level of the Member State so that the continuity of the work can be ensured. Multi-funded strategies can of course imply changes in the current set-up of the LAG.
How would the alignment of LAGs (in Cohesion Policy and the EAFRD) be coordinated between EAFRD and Cohesion Policy? Would this coordination need to be managed by the national level? Does the Commission foresee any arrangements for this?	MS will set out the arrangements to ensure an integrated approach to the use of the CSF Funds for territorial development in the Partnership Contract. It is thus up to the MS to make their strategic choices as regards CLLD and decide on which level coordination can best take place. The Commission will seek to communicate existing good practices in this respect.
Regulation of the LEADER in EAFRD so far has excluded the support of cities from the LEADER programmes. Will this be changed with regard to EAFRD? If not, how will this be aligned with the possibility to finance (rural) LAG-s from both SFs and the EAFRD?	Operations financed by the EAFRD in urban areas are not per se excluded, but are much more limited than the impact of ERDF in rural areas. A concrete example of a multi-fund strategy for a given area could be cooperation between the EAFRD and the ERDF in urban/metropolitan

	areas and for urban-rural linkages.
How can LD work in ETC context? How would voting right be distributed among members from different countries?	<p>The approach is essentially the same. However, the cooperation context still needs to be respected which is why the ETC regulation stipulates that the local action group has to include representatives from both sides of the border.</p> <p>The cross-border local development strategy would then be selected by the Monitoring Committee and implemented by a cross-border local action group.</p> <p>There are no specific provisions concerning the voting rights.</p>
Is it possible to use CLLD in parallel under an ETC-programme and an OP (or rural development programme)?	Yes, the approach can be used in both contexts in parallel. The focus of the activities would be likely to differ, given that in the ETC context the cooperation aspect and the involvement of regions from different Member States would be the determining factor.
To what extent does Community-led local development apply to the Cohesion Fund?	Given the nature of cohesion fund investments, bottom-up integrated strategies promoted by community-led local development are difficult to envisage. The necessary actions can better be carried out in the framework of the ERDF.
In the ESF regulation “community-led local development” has been introduced as an investment priority contributing to the <i>Promoting social inclusion and combating poverty</i> thematic objective. We view CLLD more as a mechanism for promoting territorial development, rather than a priority in itself – could you provide additional information? Also, should CLLD co-financed by the ESF be limited to the priorities of the <i>Promoting social inclusion and combating poverty</i> objective?	Promoting social inclusion and combating poverty is one of the main objectives of the ESF, but the ESF may support other priorities (related to employment, education and institutional capacity as detailed in its scope) for which a local strategy could be developed to respond to the needs of the territory. The creation of a specific investment priority for "community led local development" has been made to facilitate the programming phase for Member States and to give a greater flexibility to local groups in the design of their local strategy when choosing their priorities in terms of employment, education, social inclusion and the projects which relate to these priorities.

<p>How is an ITI presented in a programme (as a priority axis, an operation?)</p>	<p>An ITI is neither an operation nor a priority axis. It allows the implementation of operational programmes in a cross-cutting way and to draw on funding from several priorities possibly from different programmes to ensure the implementation of an integrated strategy. ITIs will therefore be set out separately in the programming document and indicate the financial allocations from each priority axis set aside for their implementation. The contribution of each operation to the implementation of the ITI will be part of the monitoring arrangements.</p>
<p>How is an ITI managed? How will the delegation of tasks work in <i>monofund</i> and <i>multifund</i> programmes?</p>	<p>An ITI is managed either directly by the Managing Authority or through the delegation of certain tasks of the Managing Authority to an intermediate body (Art. 113 (6)). The form and degree of the delegation may vary in accordance with the institutional set-up of each Member State. Whether a programme is mono-fund or multi-fund does not make a difference to the delegation.</p>
<p>What exactly are the "other territorial strategies" mentioned?</p>	<p>This wording gives MS the possibility to use ITI not only for sustainable urban development strategies but for other types of territorial strategies. Territorial employment pacts (such as developed by Austria in the current ESF programme) are a concrete example although currently only supported from the ESF. However, the use of ITI for such approaches is only an option for MS.</p>
<p>Can an ITI include major projects?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>How can ITI be implemented in ETC context?</p>	<p>The approach is essentially the same. ITIs allow combining funding from different priorities of a programme in order to facilitate an integrated approach. However, the cooperation context still needs to be respected which is why the ETC regulation provides that any intermediate body designated for the implementation of an ITI shall be a "joint" body. ITIs in a cross-border context could be useful for example to implement an integrated strategy for urban development in</p>

	twin-cities that are divided by a national border. They could theoretically also cover different ETC programmes.
Why can ITIs not be used in context of EAFRD and EMFF?	Given the different programming mechanisms, the implementation of an ITI in the EAFRD and EMFF is not foreseen in the proposals.
What is the relationship between ITIs and the list of cities?	<p>The Partnership Contracts and the relevant operational programmes will contain a list of cities where integrated actions for sustainable urban development will be implemented through ITIs and to which the ITI management is delegated (Art 7 par. 2 of ERDF regulation; the references to this list of cities will be corrected in a corrigendum). Cities managing ITIs for sustainable urban development should thus be included in the list (and contribute to the 5% earmarking). Other ITIs not linked to integrated actions for sustainable urban development should not be included in the list.</p> <p>In the MS where the ESF is used to support sustainable urban development through ITI, the partnership contract and the relevant operational programme will also include the indicative annual allocation of the ESF support.</p>
Should the cities where an Integrated Territorial Investment will take place coincide with those on the list of cities that will participate in the urban development platform set out in Article 8?	The cities proposed by Member States in the Partnership Contract to participate in the Urban Development Platform should correspond to those cities where integrated actions for sustainable urban development are to be implemented, in accordance with Art. 7(2) of the ERDF-regulation.
Why isn't the physical dimension of urban development (such as built environment) represented within the scope of ERDF?	Most of the elements of the physical dimension of urban development are covered by the investment priorities (Art. 5 of ERDF regulation). For example, specific urban investment priorities are foreseen to promote low-carbon strategies for urban areas, to improve the urban

	<p>environment including the regeneration of brownfield sites and the reduction of air pollution, to promote sustainable urban mobility, and to promote social inclusion through supporting the physical and economic regeneration of deprived urban areas.</p>
<p>Are investments in urban areas going to be executed exclusively through integrated territorial investments?</p>	<p>No. The proposal foresees a minimum threshold of at least 5% of the ERDF to be allocated to integrated actions for sustainable urban development through ITIs with implementation delegated to cities. Apart from that, investments in urban areas can be supported through other instruments as well. Already now a large proportion of ERDF is used for sectoral investments in urban areas. Many of the investment priorities in the proposal are directly aimed at urban areas and there is no obligation to implement them through the instrument of integrated territorial investments. Concerning the ESF, many of its investment priorities can be used in urban areas.</p>
<p>Can urban policies only be pursued under the thematic objectives for which the investment priorities explicitly mention urban dimension?</p>	<p>No. The investment priorities set out in the ERDF regulation comprise specific urban investment priorities. These can be pursued separately (e.g. as parallel focused strands related to the relevant investment priorities, which could be contained in a single operational programme), or in an integrated fashion through an ITI, drawing on resources from several priorities (and possibly programmes). Apart from the specific urban investment priorities, a number of other investment priorities can be used for urban policies as well.</p> <p>Urban strategies can also use the different investment priorities listed in the ESF scope when they develop operations related to employment, education, social inclusion and institutional capacity.</p>
<p>How are functional urban areas addressed?</p>	<p>The proposed regulation leaves considerable flexibility for the design of operational programmes. This also allows for specific attention to be</p>

	<p>given to functional urban areas and for specific actions to be developed. This may also for example include the delegation of the implementation of part of the programme for a functional urban area to a dedicated body.</p>
<p>What is the definition of a city for the purposes of Art. 7 and 8 ERDF regulation? How should lists be established?</p>	<p>There is no definition of a city, this is up to the Member States and can also include small and medium sized towns as well as inter-municipal co-operations in city-regions or metropolitan areas.</p> <p>Member States are best placed to determine the process for establishing the list of cities.</p>
<p>Should the cities where an Integrated Territorial Investment will take place coincide with the list of cities that will participate in the urban development platform set out in Article 8?</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>Why is a ring-fencing of 5% proposed at all?</p>	<p>In view of their population and growth potential, cities can make a significant contribution to achieving the goals of Europe 2020. The conclusions of the 5th Cohesion report refer to the need for an ambitious urban agenda in cohesion policy post-2013 and to the need for clearer identification of financial resources to address urban issues. Stakeholders in general agree on the need to prioritise the urban dimension and the experience of the previous programming period has demonstrated that the absence of financial allocations up-front can lead to a situation where the necessary investments in urban areas are not provided for. The Commission's proposal for minimum ring-fencing of resources for integrated actions for sustainable urban development therefore stem from the need to prioritise investments in this field.</p> <p>While we are aware that the ring-fencing of 5% will be easily fulfilled in a number of Member States, it still sends an important political signal.</p>

Does 5% ring-fencing apply at national level or per category of region?	The 5% applies at national level.
Within this 5%, using the ESF and also the CF Funds is optional?	The 5 % only applies to ERDF. The use of ESF for sustainable urban development strategies is a choice left to MS.
Do we understand it correctly that the 5% ring fencing would be relevant for use in ITI's, but there could be other urban development actions outside these? Would the 5% be part of the general ERDF ring fencing?	The 5 % is a minimum amount only for integrated urban development actions carried out through ITIs delegated to cities, so there can be additional resources allocated to urban development through ITIs (without delegation to cities) and/or through investments under thematic investment priorities taking place in urban areas and contributing to urban development. The 5% ring-fencing is quite independent of the thematic concentration requirements set out for the ERDF in Art. 4 of the ERDF regulation.
Why do lists of cities have to be established already in Partnership Contract?	The Partnership Contract provides the list of cities proposed by Member States for the Urban Development Platform so that the Commission has the necessary information to draw up and adopt the list of participating cities under Art. 8 of the ERDF regulation.
What if a city has its own OP, would that count towards the 5% ring-fencing or would it have to use an ITI?	Yes, this could count towards the 5% ear-marking, and the city would not have to use an ITI.
Can financial engineering instruments (JESSICA) be included in 5%?	Yes.
Why is the participation in the urban development platform limited at all? Why 300?	A limitation is necessary for reasons of practicability. The figure is based on experience with the Urban initiative.
What happens if cities do not want or do not have sufficient capacity to implement an ITI?	The regulations do not generally require that the management of ITIs be delegated to cities. Only for the purposes of the 5% ring-fencing, the integrated urban development shall be carried out through an ITI, through the designation of an intermediate body (a city). However, this

	<p>does not mean that <u>all</u> tasks have to be delegated. Art. 113 (6) CPR stipulates that <u>certain</u> tasks can be delegated, which leaves enough flexibility to find suitable arrangements. The regulation does not establish minimum requirements.</p>
<p>What about cross border urban territories? How could they cooperate, harmonize their programmes, actions in this framework?</p>	<p>They could use an ITI within their cross-border ETC programme.</p>
<p>What is the relationship between the urban development platform and URBACT?</p>	<p>The purpose of the component of inter-regional cooperation set out in Article 2(3)(c) of the ETC regulation is to continue to provide for direct exchange of experience between cities concerning the identification, transfer and dissemination of good practice on sustainable urban and rural development (along the lines of the current URBACT programme, shared management).</p> <p>The purpose of urban development platform is to stimulate a more policy-oriented dialogue on urban development between the 300 cities undertaking sustainable urban development at European level, to make the contribution of cities to the Europe 2020 strategy more visible, and to capitalise on the results of innovative actions that cities undertake at the initiative of the Commission, as laid down in Article 9 of the ERDF regulation.</p> <p>The urban development platform is innovative in the sense that the Commission will play a more active role than before: the Commission will establish and operate the platform, adopt the list of participating cities on the basis of the list established in the Partnership Contract where integrated urban development actions are to be implemented. It will build on the experiences of the URBAN initiative, where direct communication was established between the cities and the Commission, and on the Regions for Economic Change initiative.</p>

How will cities be selected to participate in the platform?	Art. 8 sets out a number of selection criteria.
How do innovative actions relate to the urban development platform (is it a pre-condition for participating in the innovative actions initiative, for example)?	Cities which undertake innovative actions may participate in the work of the urban development platform in order to capitalise on good solutions found in the innovative action frame.
Rationale for innovative actions pursuant to Art. 9 ERDF regulation?	<p>The purpose is to have a dedicated instrument to foster <u>innovative</u> approaches to tackle urban challenges (economic, social, environmental and climate challenges in urban areas) which are often less successful in regional programmes given their experimental character and inherent risk.</p> <p>It will act as laboratory and include the financing of pilot and demonstration projects as well as of studies with the aim of fostering the joint search for best solutions at EU level. These can then be spread and transferred for implementation to regional programmes.</p>
Are the 0,2% of ERDF funding meant to complement the 5 % for urban development or are they part of it. Should these innovative measures not better be part of the Operational programmes?	The 0.2 % funding is distinct from the 5% ring-fencing requirement (cf. Art. 84 (7) CPR).
Which cities will benefit from innovative actions?	This cannot be determined in advance. Innovative approaches can be developed by any city, no matter its size, function of location.
What will be procedure for project selection and who will be involved? Who can apply?	<p>The European Commission is in the process of exploring various possible modalities for the implementation of Urban Innovative actions, building on the experience gained through the implementation of Regional Innovative Actions for the 2000 -2006 period.</p> <p>The European Commission shall adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 13 of the ERDF Regulation with regards to the procedures for the selection and implementation of innovative actions.</p>

How are macro-regional strategies addressed in legislative proposals?	<p>Macro-regional strategies will be addressed in the Common Strategic Framework. Where a Member State is covered by a macro-regional strategy, this will also be reflected in the Partnership Contract. For the operational programmes concerned, the contribution of planned interventions to macro-regional strategies will also be set out.</p> <p>Finally, the ETC regulation stipulates that the transnational cooperation programmes may specifically give support for the development and implementation of macro-regional strategies.</p>