



Interreg Italia-Malta

Fondo Europeo di Sviluppo Regionale
European Regional Development Fund



UNIONE EUROPEA
EUROPEAN UNION

Minutes

8th Executive Committee meeting

29 May 2020 – video conference

4 June 2020 - video conference

Approved on 22 June 2020

On May 29, 2020 at 09:30, the eighth meeting of the Executive Committee of the INTERREG V-A Programme took place, Present members are: Luca Palazzo (ACT), Patrizia Barberi (Pari Opportunity-Sicilia), Vincenzo Petruso (Dipartimento Regionale della Programmazione), Pasquale Li Puma (Ambiente -Sicilia), Perit Frans Mallia (Malta Planning Authority), Andre Callus (National Commission for the Promotion of Equality), Carmel Vella (Ministry for Foreign and European Affairs). The meeting was attended by Marco Sambataro (JS), Ilva Parlato (JS), Chiara Di Bella (JS), Maria Elena Muscat (Territorial Cooperation Unit-Malta). Giovanni Sarri (Managing Authority) chairs the meeting.

The meeting was held in video conference due to mobility limitations caused by the Covid-19 emergency.

Giovanni Sarri, as delegated President, opens the work of the 8th Executive Committee of the INTERREG V-A Italy Malta Programme, greets the participants and gives reading of the agenda.

1. Approval of the agenda;
2. Review and approval of the revised AF submitted by potential lead partners whose project has been assessed with the following status: "project eligible for funding under pending condition" to apply to specific objectives and 2.2, 3.1 and 3.2 of The Notice 02/2019;
3. Examination and approval of the response to the counter-deductions transmitted by potential lead partners whose project has been assessed with the following status: "Project rejected" to apply to the specific objectives 3.1 of The Notice 02/2019;
4. Miscellaneous.

Giovanni Sarri checked the legal number and the necessary quorum of the participants, declares the meeting valid, also giving reading of the agenda that is approved.

It moves on to the review of **point 2 Review and approval of the revised AF submitted by potential lead partners whose project has been assessed with the following status: "project eligible for funding under pending condition" to apply to specific objectives and 2.2, 3.1 and 3.2 of The Notice 02/2019.**

Following the review of the revised application forms of the MEN, MOVE ON, CROSSWORK, SENHAR, AMPPA, SEA MARVEL, FAST, CORALLO, BIOBLU, I-WAVENET, GIFLUID projects transmitted by potential lead partners and instructed by the JS, the Executive Committee has verified whether they have followed up the contents of the QUALITY verification grids approved by the ExC. Below is the detail of the verification carried out on the projects listed above

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
2.2	C2-2.2-102 MEN	Submission of a new Application Form no later than the 18 th of May 2020	New Application Form submitted on the 18 th of May 2020
		Submission of a new Application Form both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version	New Application Form submitted both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version. It is highlighted that the Annex 1.b (excel part of the AF) the LP signed only its budget and not the whole sheets.
		Submission of the Annex 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner	Annexes 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner: PP2 - Istituto Tecnico Superiore Archimede Siracusa, PP 3 - Istituto Tecnico Superiore Steve Jobs Caltagirone PP 4 - Itaca soc. Cooperativa, PP 5 - Malta College of Arts, Science & Technology, PP 6 - Gruppo di Azione Locale Terre di Aci scarl, PP 7 - Istituto Tecnico Superiore Mobilità Sostenibile Trasporti Catania
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reshaping WP1 in line with the management requirements disciplined by the Manual of the programme 2. Revising FLC budget for all PPs up to the ceiling of the 4%. 3. Erasing all the activities and the corresponding budget related to meetings, events and travel (within WP 1 and WP 2) in connection with the year 2020 4. VAT: reduction of the Line items "external expertise and services" for the corresponding amount of VAT for PP 3 - Istituto Tecnico Superiore Steve Jobs Caltagirone, PP 4 - Itaca soc. Cooperativa and PP 5 - Gruppo di Azione Locale Terre di Aci scarl due to the fact that they declared to recover VAT. 5. Timeplan: updated working plan with project activities starting 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>(Criterion 5.1 - Management structures (e.g. project steering committee) are proportionate to the project size and needs and allow partners' involvement in decision-making)</i> It is noted that the section reported in WP 1 have been revised and are present in addition some actions relating the claiming activities from partners and also the submission of 3 Request for reimbursement (advancement, interim and final). 2. <i>(criterion 8.1 - Project budget is proportionate to the proposed work plan and the main outputs and results aimed for)</i> The First level control for the LP has been fixed at euro € 53.297,55. On the basis of the total budget the 4% for the FLC should be equivalent to Euro 53.273,04. As a consequence, Euro 24,51 have to be erased. The new total budget for the LP is Euro €

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
		between the 13th of July and the 1st of September 2020	<p>1.331.825,93.</p> <p>The first control for the PP2 has been fixed at euro 8.434,6 and it is correct.</p> <p>The first control for the PP3 has been fixed at euro 4.000 and it is correct.</p> <p>The first control for the PP4 has been fixed at euro 2.666,67. On the basis of the total budget including additional financing (5% of the VAT) the FLC should be equivalent to Euro 2.807,21. The amount of Euro 140,20 have to be increased from the same line item in favor of FLC.</p> <p>The first control for the PP5 has been fixed at euro 30.308,64 and it is correct.</p> <p>The first control for the PP6 has been fixed at euro € 5.871,00 and it is correct.</p> <p>The first control for the PP7 has been fixed at euro € 5.871,00 and it is correct.</p> <p>3. <i>(criterion 8.1 - Project budget is proportionate to the proposed work plan and the main outputs and results aimed for)</i> The activities and the corresponding budget related to meetings, events and travel have be postponed to 2021.</p> <p>4. <i>(general comments)</i> Regarding the VAT for PP 3 - Istituto Tecnico Superiore Steve Jobs Caltagirone and PP 5 - Gruppo di Azione Locale Terre di Aci scarl, the LP clarified within the cover letter that these partners cannot recover the VAT and as a consequence this represent a real costs. Having regard, PP 4 - Itaca soc. Cooperativa the partner declares to recover only the 5% of the VAT within the project. Consequently, the amount of</p>

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS		FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
				<p>Euro 2.790,48 has been deducted from the ERDF contribution and has been included as additional contribution up to the PP 4.</p> <p>5. The time plan has been updated with a starting date fixed on the 1st of September 2020.</p>
			Budget previous AF	Budget revised AF
		Budget	<p>€ 2.830.251,00 of which</p> <p>ERDF: € 2.302.863,35</p> <p>NC: € 406.387,65</p> <p>Add. Co-financing: € 121.000,00</p>	<p>€ 2.829.517,77 of which</p> <p>ERDF: € 2.299.892,47</p> <p>NC: € 405.863,38</p> <p>Add. Co-financing: € 123.790,48</p>
		JS comments	<p>Regarding the comments listed under point 2, it is highlighted what follows:</p> <p>For the LP the amount of Euro 24,51 regarding FLC has to be erased. The new total budget for the LP is Euro € 1.331.825,93.</p> <p>For PP 4 the amount of Euro 140,20 regarding FLC has to be increased from the line item External expert and services and in favour of FLC.</p> <p>The LP have to submit a new revised AF with the Annex 1.b properly signed.</p>	

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
2.2	C2-2.2-112 MOVE ON	Submission of a new Application Form no later than the 18 th of May 2020	New Application Form submitted on the 18 th of May 2020
		Submission of a new Application Form both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version	New Application Form submitted both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version
		Submission of the Annex 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner	Annexes 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner: PP 2 - HERMES Corporation Limited
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revising and better detailing results indicators 2 and 3 have in column "Descrizione – description (B)" also clarifying the difference between "Aziende che manifestano interesse rispetto alle finalità progettuali" and "Stakeholders che manifestano interesse rispetto alle finalità progettuali as well as their respective role. 2. Output: the table in WP 3 has to mirror the list of outputs indicators included in section C.2.1. 3. Output: in table "project output indicators" it has to be registered the coherence with the programme indicator 2.2.2 only from project indicator n. 3. 4. Output: verifying the possibility to adopt the programme output indicators 2.2.1 and 2.2.3 for those project output indicators listed under the project specific objective n. 2 5. Demonstrating that the high level of associated partners (such as the regional departments of the Sicily region) included within the project will assure concrete actions to guarantee the sustainability of the project outputs (such as the use of the project findings in the mainstreaming programmes for the period post 2020). 6. Revising section C.6 for Maltese partner, in line with the 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. (criterion 3.1.2 - The project result indicators are clearly linked to the indicators of the specific objective (SO) of the Axis) It is noted that the project results indicators n. 2 and 3 have been better detailed in column "description (B)". they have been also reworded and quantified (RI n. 1. Aziende coinvolte ai fini dell'attivazione degli stage and RI n. 2 Stakeholders coinvolti ai fini dell'attivazione degli stage e per attività di disseminazione e capitalizzazione) in order to better mirror the direct contribution of the project. 2. (Criterion 3.1.4 The project main outputs indicators are clearly linked to the project's specific objectives) it is noted that the section C.2.1 include a list of all outputs as foreseen within WP3. In addition is also important to highlight that the new three main project outputs show a full coherence with the programme and call requirements. In fact they reworded project output n. 01 (n. 50 imprese che attivano stage) and added also the following new project main outputs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - n. 1 Network transfrontaliero tra aziende e stakeholders partecipanti al progetto per la promozione della mobilità nell'ambito della programmazione 2021-2027; - n. 02 Protocolli d'intesa nazionali tra aziende e stakeholders partecipanti al progetto per la promozione della mobilità nell'ambito della programmazione 2021-2027.

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
		<p>administrative Maltese procedures</p> <p>7. Communication: revising communication specific objectives and made them coherent with activities</p> <p>8. Communication: revising approach/tactics in order to assure that the involvement of the main stakeholders as listed in activity A.C.6 will be included also in the starting phase of the communication activities.</p> <p>9. Communication: improving coherence of the activity A.C.2</p> <p>10. Revising FLC budget for all PPs up to the ceiling of the 4%.</p> <p>11. Clarifying the line item: "Consulente legale specializzato in questioni di mobilità transnazionale".</p> <p>12. Including within the budget of WP 2 a new item regarding: "company tutoring, services that cover travel expenses (prepaid round-trip ticket for each participant to the work placement where the internship will be held) as well as accident insurance for workers</p> <p>13. Erasing all the activities and the corresponding budget related to meetings, events and travel (within WP 1 and WP 2) in connection with the year 2020</p> <p>14. Reporting the ID number of deliverables within the AF (excel version)</p> <p>15. Localisation: make coherent the localization of travel and accommodation</p> <p>16. VAT: proving that the VAT isn't recoverable. In case this confirmation won't be guarantee a reduction of the Line items "external expertise and services" for the corresponding amount of VAT for LP - ASS.FOR.SEO.</p>	<p>3. (criterion 3.2 - The project output indicators clearly link to programme output indicators) it is noted that the coherence among project outputs indicators and been fixed. In addition, as previously reported, two new project output indicators have been added taking into consideration the Activities A.C.4 A.C.6 aimed to encourage the adoption of protocols among stakeholders to support cross-border mobility.</p> <p>4. (criterion 3.2 - The project output indicators clearly link to programme output indicators). It is noted that the adoption of the programme output indicators 2.2.1 and 2.2.3 has been guaranteed.</p> <p>5. (criterion 3.3 - Project main outputs are durable in relation to the problems that afflict the two islands (The proposal describes the concrete measures able to guarantee the sustainability of the outputs and results achieved by the project) it is noted that within the AF it has been clarified that the associated Partners will make a significant contribution both to promoting the project and to promoting the sustainability and capitalization of its outputs (e.g. by making its network of relationships available, participating in project meetings, promoting the project outputs in the respective areas of competence, participating in the definition of national memoranda of understanding and the establishment of a cross-border network for the promotion of mobility). Nevertheless, any specific new actions within the AF has been fixed in order to demonstrate such involvement of the associated partners.</p> <p>6. (Criterion 5.2 - The procedures to generate the expenditures (n. of the procedures, public procedures typology, n. of contracts to sign, and so on) are clear and detailed in order to ensure efficient and effective transparent processes.) It is noted that within the section C.6 part of the administrative procedure of the Maltese</p>

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
		<p>Società Consortile ar.l. and PP 2 - HERMES Corporation Limited is expected.</p> <p>17. Timeplan: updated working plan with project activities starting between the 13th of July and the 1st of September 2020</p>	<p>partner will be conducted with "affidamento diretto".</p> <p>7. (criterion 6.1 - The communication objectives clearly link to the project specific objectives) it is noted that 4 communication specific objectives are fixed and are also coherent with the corresponding project specific objectives. The 4 communication specific objectives are hereunder listed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - raggiungere e sensibilizzare i giovani e neo-diplomati e le aziende sul tema della mobilità transfrontaliera e internazionale; - Informare l'utenza target sull'avviso per voucher di mobilità e sulle diverse attività progettuali; - Diffondere e capitalizzare i risultati progettuali; - Fornire ai giovani e alle aziende strumenti conoscitivi specifici per un'efficace realizzazione e gestione degli stage. <p>8. (criterion 6.2 - The approach/tactics chosen are appropriate to reach communication objectives) it is noted that the involvement of the main stakeholders as listed in activity A.C.6 could be reached with the revised approach/tactics in relation to the 4 communication specific objectives fixed.</p> <p>9. (criterion 6.3 - Communication activities and deliverables are appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders). It is noted that the starting date of the activities A.C. 2 and A.C. 4 has been fixed in the same date.</p> <p>10. (criterion 8.1 - Project budget is proportionate to the proposed work plan and the main outputs and results aimed for). The budget for FLC has been revised accordingly for the LP and PP 2.</p> <p>11. (criterion 8.1 - Project budget is proportionate to the proposed work plan and the main outputs and results aimed for). Within the cover letter, the LP clarified the role and the corresponding tasks for the line item relating to "Consulente legale specializzato in</p>

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
			<p>questioni di mobilità transnazionale".</p> <p>12. (criterion 8.1 - Project budget is proportionate to the proposed work plan and the main outputs and results aimed for). Within the cover letter, the LP clarified the foreseen expenditure concerning the prepaid round-trip ticket for each participant to the work placement where the internship will be held, is already included within the budget line item of PP 2. It is also noted that within section C.6 "External expertise and services, Equipment" of the AF a new budget line (company tutoring, services that cover travel expenses - prepaid round-trip ticket for each participant to the work placement where the internship will be held) has been added</p> <p>13. (criterion 8.1 - Project budget is proportionate to the proposed work plan and the main outputs and results aimed for). The activities related to meetings and events (within WP 1 and WP 2) in connection with the year 2020 have been revised with "on line modality".</p> <p>14. (criterion 8.1 - Project budget is proportionate to the proposed work plan and the main outputs and results aimed for). The ID number of deliverables have been added to each expenditures of the budget for the LP and PP 2.</p> <p>15. (criterion 8.1 - Project budget is proportionate to the proposed work plan and the main outputs and results aimed for). It is noted that the location of travel and accommodation for the LP reports data not coherent.</p> <p>16. (general comments) Regarding the VAT for the LP and PP2, it is noted that within the cover letter has been clarified that these partners cannot recover the VAT and as a consequence this represent a real costs.</p>

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS		FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
				17. (general comments) The time plan has been updated with a starting date fixed on the 1 st of September 2020.
		Budget	Budget previous AF	Budget revised AF
			€ 2.840.000,00 of which ERDF: € 2.414.000,00 NC: € 426.000,00	€ 2.840.000,00 of which ERDF: € 2.414.000,00 NC: € 426.000,00
		JS comment	<p>Regarding the comments listed under point 6, it is highlighted what follows:</p> <p>For PP 2 is noted that within the section C.6 part of the administrative procedure of the Maltese partner will be conducted with "affidamento diretto". The LP and PP 2 have to be informed that the procedure for selecting services and for purchase goods have to be in line with chapter 9 of the Implementation Manual Interreg "V-A ITALIA MALTA" that fixed the following principle for all (public and private as well) beneficiaries of the programme:</p> <p><i>"In accordance with the economical principle, the resources used by the beneficiary in the implementation of their activities should be aimed at a acquiring the best quality at the best price. Allocations for the implementation of works, services and goods shall also <u>respect the principles of free competition, equality of treatment, non-discrimination, transparency, proportionality and publicity envisaged by community, national and regional law.</u> According to the principle of efficiency, the best relationship between utilised resources and the respective results achieved must be found. The principle of effectiveness deals with the attainment of the respective objective and achievement of the envisaged results".</i></p>	

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
2.2	C2-2.2-128 CrossWork	Submission of a new Application Form no later than the 18 th of May 2020	New Application Form submitted on the 18 th of May 2020
		Submission of a new Application Form both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version	New Application Form submitted both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version
		Submission of the Annex 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner	Annexes 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner: PP 2- Istituto professionale di Stato "Principi Grimaldi", PP 3 - Creolabs Ltd, PP 4 - Malta Chamber of SMEs
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PP 3: submitting the Annual Report and Financial Statements referred to 2018 and 2019 in order to verify the financial capacity 2. Demonstrating within the AF the high level of associated partners (such as the regional departments of the Sicily region as well as the association of categories) which will assure concrete actions to guarantee the sustainability of the project outputs (such as the use of the project findings in their institutional programming activities). 3. Clarifying concretely the meaning of the information reported within box "How will the project main outputs related to the work package be further used once the project has ended?" of WP3 4. Communication: assuring within WP 2 a tailored activity able to concretely involve the 7 associated partners 5. Revising FLC budget for all PPs up to the ceiling of 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PP 3 CREOLAB submit only a management account regarding 2018 and not the Annual Report and Financial Statements referred both 2018 and 2019. The partner affirms that on the basis of the Maltese legislation he will submit the Annual Report and Financial Statements referred to 2019 when it will be approved. <p>Regarding management account for 2018 it is highlighted that the document isn't audited as required by the law. The evaluation carried out highlights that the beneficiary does not have the necessary financial capacity to implement the project.</p> <p>In fact, it is highlighted that the total equity value of the beneficiary for the year 2018 is equivalent to € 3.063,00. Following the formula $PN / (CP-C) > 0,2$ applied for all private partners involved within the call 02/2019 the result is 0,1244 where:</p> <p>PC: Total equity= € 3.063,00</p> <p>CP: TOTAL BUDGET= € 164.055,30</p> <p>C: ERDF= € 139.447,01</p>

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
		<p>the 4%.</p> <p>6. Localisation: make coherent the localization of travel and accommodation</p> <p>7. Erasing all the activities and the corresponding budget related to meetings, events and travel (within WP 1 and WP 2) in connection with the year 2020</p> <p>8. VAT: reducing the line items "external expertise and services" for the corresponding amount of VAT for LP, PP 3 and PP 4.</p> <p>9. Timeplan: updated working plan with project activities starting between the 13th of July and the 1st of September 2020</p>	<p>2. (Criterion 3.3 - Project main outputs are durable in relation to the problems that afflict the two islands (The proposal describes the concrete measures able to guarantee the sustainability of the outputs and results achieved by the project)). It is noted that the 7 Associated Partners will be actively involved during the project in a Task-force which will have the aim to promote the project opportunities through awareness activities among their associates: CNA Sicilia, Legacoop Sud Italia, Sicindustria addressing their SME members, CGIL Sicilia, CISL Sicilia, UIL Sicilia addressing the workers who lost their jobs or are looking for an employment and Dipartimento Famiglia della Regione Siciliana will address through its regional coverage the disadvantaged groups. All Associated Partners will include in their respective websites a direct link with CrossWork Platform which is the main wheel of continuously evolving the cross-border mobility. In addition to this it is highlighted that within WP 2 a new action, namely activity A.C.7, has been added. This activity, namely "Active concerning the Involvement of the Associated Partners (AP)" will deliver a minutes of the meetings that will be held as well as a Protocol of collaboration signed by APs with CrossWork Network which will assure a continuous synergy between the signatories and will assure the dissemination of project outputs and deliverables.</p> <p>3. (Criterion 3.3). within the section "How will the project main outputs related to the work package be further used once the project has ended?" has been clarified that the Creation of income generators, such as: add banners of companies/institutions hosted on the CrossWork platform: when interested to have more visibility on the platform by placing web banners, companies/institutions could contribute on voluntary basis with donations or free services (e.g. yearly free technical maintenance of the platform).</p> <p>4. (Criterion 6.3 - Communication activities and deliverables are appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders) it is</p>

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
			<p>highlighted that within WP 2 a new action, namely activity A.C.7, has been added. This activity, namely "Active concerning the Involvement of the Associated Partners (AP)" will deliver a minutes of the meetings that will be held as well as a Protocol of collaboration signed by APs with CrossWork Network which will assure a continuous synergy between the signatories and will assure the dissemination of project outputs and deliverables.</p> <p>5. Criterion 8.1 - FLC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - regarding the expenditures for FLC for the LP it is fixed at Euro 4.500 while the 4% correspond to Euro 4.797,70. - Regarding the expenditures for FLC for the PP 2 it is fixed at Euro 23.700 while the 4% correspond to Euro 24.616,92. - Regarding the expenditures for FLC for the PP 3 it is fixed at Euro 6.300 while the 4% correspond to Euro 6.562,21. - Regarding the expenditures for FLC for the PP 4 it is fixed at Euro 4.800,00 while the 4% correspond to Euro 4.758,79 . <p>It is also noted that within the line item of the external services and expert for PP 2 there are a total amount of Euro 5.200 in addition. More specifically outputs D.C.3.1 has been increased of Euro 4.000 while output D.C.6.3 has been increased of Euro 1.200.</p> <p>6. Criterion 8.1 - localisation. Partners provided to make coherent the localization of travel and accommodation.</p> <p>7. Criterion 8.1 – Events 2020. Partners provided to change the project presentation conference in video conference event with a total amount of zero Euro.</p> <p>8. (general comments) Regarding the VAT for the LP and PP3 and PP 4 declared that the expenditures listed within the "external expertise and services" are already calculated without VAT.</p> <p>9. (general comments) The time plan has been updated with a starting</p>

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS		FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
				date fixed on the 1 st of September 2020.
		Budget	Budget previous AF	Budget revised AF
			€ 1.018.553,68 of which ERDF: 865.770,63 NC: € 152.783,05	€ 1.013.190,58 of which ERDF: 861.211,99 NC: 151.978,59
JS comment		<p>Regarding point 1 it is confirmed that the beneficiary creolab does not have the necessary financial capacity to implement the project. The issue will be discussed within the ExC in order to understand if in line with the Maltese legislation a solution can be reached (i.e. ask to the beneficiary a capital increase in order to enhance the total equity value.</p> <p>Regarding the comment listed in point 3 (<i>"How will the project main outputs related to the work package be further used once the project has ended?"</i>) it is important to share with the ExC if a state aid has to be registered for the LP.</p> <p>Regarding the comment listed in point 5 (FLC) it is required that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the LP, PP 2, PP 3 and PP4 will reshape the AF fixing the FLC at the percentage of 4%. - the PP 2 has to erase from its budget the required additional amount of Euro 5.200 regarding the output D.C.3.1 (that it has been increased of Euro 4.000) as well as the output D.C.6.3 1 (that it has been increased of Euro 1.200). <p>The LP, PP 3 and PP 4 have to be informed that the procedure for selecting services and for purchase goods have to be in line with chapter 9 of the Implementation Manual Interreg "V-A ITALIA MALTA" that fixed the following principle for all (public and private as well) beneficiaries of the programme:</p> <p><i>"In accordance with the economical principle, the resources used by the beneficiary in the implementation of their activities should be aimed at a acquiring the best quality at the best price. Allocations for the implementation of works, services and goods shall also <u>respect the principles of free competition, equality of treatment, non-discrimination, transparency, proportionality and publicity envisaged by community, national and regional law.</u> According to the principle of efficiency, the best relationship between utilised resources and the respective results achieved must be found. The principle of effectiveness deals with the attainment of the respective objective and achievement of the envisaged results".</i></p>		

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
3.1	C2-3.1-115 SENHAR	Submission of a new Application Form no later than the 18 th of May 2020	New Application Form submitted on 18 May 2020
		Submission of a new Application Form both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version	New Application Form submitted both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version
		Submission of the Annex 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner	Annexes 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner: PP2 - Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (CNR-IAS); PP3 - University of Malta
		1. PP2: including within the AF the missing box "Esperienza e capacità gestionali del partner nella partecipazione e/o la gestione di progetti di cooperazione territoriale cofinanziati dall'UE o altri progetti internazionali" (criterio 2.2)	1. PP2: the box "Esperienza e capacità gestionali del partner nella partecipazione e/o la gestione di progetti di cooperazione territoriale cofinanziati dall'UE o altri progetti internazionali" has been included in the AF
		2. PP2: including within the AF the missing box "Ruolo e compiti del partner al progetto" (criterion 2.3)	2. PP2: the box "Ruolo e compiti del partner al progetto" has been included in the AF
		3. Reporting in Table A (first part) the result indicator of the specific objective and in Table A (second part) at least one of the programme's result indicators (criteria 3.1.2 and 3.1.5)	3. The LP has reported in Table A (first and second part) the programme output indicator
		4. Completing the column "Project main output" in section C.3 - Work plan per work package also reporting correctly the unit of measure and target value within the corresponding boxes (criterion 3.1.4)	4. Section C.3 - Work plan per work package has been correctly completed
		5. WP3 : detailing activities, output and deliverables in order to clarify how many information/observation points will be carried out and where considering that the O.T1.1 "Creazione di punti di osservazione/informazione ecc."	5. WP3: LP correctly aligned the target value of O.T1.1 and related deliverable indicating the number 6 thus presuming that each of the three sites will be equipped with more than one information/observation point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SIC: Fondali dell'Isola di Capo Passero</u> (ITA090028) which includes: Habitat H1110 - (Banchi o fondali di sabbia var. maërl); Habitat H1170 (Scogliere biogeniche var. vermetidae reef); Habitat H1120 (P. oceanica)

	<p>reports n. 1 as measure unit/target value but the related deliverables refer about n. 6 sites (criterion 7.1)</p> <p>6. WP4: detailing activities, output and deliverables in order to clarify where and how n. 8 workshop/focus group will be carried out and in particular the deliverable related to n. 1 camper equipped as laboratory that should move among ports associations, schools etc. (criterion 7.1)</p> <p>7. WP4: detailing activities, output and deliverables in order to clarify where n. 1 awareness campaign will be carried out and how it will assure a crossborder impact</p> <p>8. WP4: detailing activities, output and deliverables in order to clarify how n. 1 gaming will be carried out and how it will assure a crossborder impact (criterion 7.1)</p> <p>9. Detailing tasks among partners in Sicily to be fully in line with partners' role (criterion 7.3)</p> <p>10. Revising FLC budget for all PPs up to the ceiling of the 4%. (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>11. Erasing € 16.000 for presentation and dissemination activities of the LP and PP 3 outside the programme area, namely USA and UK (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>12. Application of depreciation to LP and PP3 with particular regards to "equipment" such as Software (GIS, MENTIMETER, altro) as well as Materiale consumo laboratorio per dimostrazioni in lab ed esposizioni (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>13. Erasing the amount corresponding to "equipment" which includes goods such as Hardware (tablet), Hardware (pc desktop + stampante e tablet) that aren't justified since they are already included within the flat rate expenditures of administrative costs (criterion 8.1)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>MPA: Capo Gallo – Isola delle Femmine</u> (EUAP0555) which includes: Habitat H1110 - (Banchi o fondali di sabbia var. maërl); Habitat H1170 (Scogliere biogeniche var. vermetidae reef) • <u>SIC: fil-Bahar fil-Grigal ta'</u> (MT0000105) which includes: Habitat H1110 - (Banchi o fondali di sabbia var. maërl); Habitat H1170 (Scogliere biogeniche var. vermetidae reef); Habitat H1120 (P. oceanica) <p>6. WP4: The LP enhanced the number of focus groups up to 9, namely n. 6 focused on plastic threat to biodiversity in 6 sites and n. 3 focused on temperature threat to biodiversity in 3 sites. The LP enhanced the number of campers equipped as laboratory up to 2 that will reach 3 beaches and 3 ports areas.</p> <p>7. WP4: The LP enhanced the number of campaigns "P come Pesce, non Plastica!" up to 2: a campaign in 3 ports and a campaign in 3 beaches covering the Sicilian and Maltese territories</p> <p>8. WP4: The LP clarifies that n. 1 gaming will be carried out at the same time in three different beaches (Capo Passero, Capo Gallo, fil-Bahar fil-Grigal) thanks to a specific IT tool that will be developed</p> <p>9. Tasks have been detailed within the box "Ruolo e compiti del partner al progetto" of the AF</p> <p>10. The LP and PP3 revised the budget allocated for FLC up to the 4% threshold</p> <p>11. Presentation and dissemination activities of the LP and PP3 outside the programme area, namely USA and UK have been erased</p> <p>12. The LP points out that depreciation rules have not to be applied to equipment of LP and PP3 considering that "materials and software will be of exclusive use for the project and they are essential to carry out demonstration and outreach activities in SenHAR. Those materials are not thought for scientific research but will be</p>
--	--	---

		14. Erasing all the activities and the corresponding budget related to meetings, events and travel (within WP 1 and WP 2) in connection with the year 2020 (criterion 8.1) 15. Timeplan: updated working plan with project activities starting between the 13th of July and the 1st of September 2020		necessary to demonstration of results and to engage and bring science to people". In particular, what above is referred to: "Materiale inventariabile vario (es. telecamere, macchine fotografiche, registratori etc.)"; "Software (MENTIMETER, altro"; "Materiale inventariabile vario acquisizione dati da campo (es. drone)"; "Materiale consumo per dimostrazioni in lab ed esposizioni (e.g. vaschette tattili, barattoli, retini, plasticherie ecc"; "Schede termiche per ThermoBlitz (i.e. temperature loggers" 13. The amount corresponding to "equipment" which includes goods such as Hardware (tablet), Hardware (pc desktop + stampante e tablet) have been erased 14. The activity and budget have been erased and/or postponed 15. Project activities will start the 1 st of September 2020
		Budget	Budget previous AF	Budget revised AF
			€ 830.000,00 of which ERDF: € 705.500,00 NC: € 124.500,00	€ 799.841,80 of which ERDF: € 679.865,53 NC: € 119.976,27
JS comment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>Points 3 (criteria 3.1.2 and 3.1.5):</u> in order to align the project's indicators to the Ulysses system requirement, the JS will provide to insert the programme's result indicators "Protected marine sites and areas that develop joint actions for the biodiversity protection" corresponding to the Kms of n. 3 protected areas envisaged by the project (SIC: Fondali dell'Isola di Capo Passero; MPA: Capo Gallo – Isola delle Femmine and SIC: fil-Bahar fil-Grigal ta')<u>Budget:</u> during the implementation phase the amount of € 18.950 allocated by the LP for carrying out the deliverables D.T.2.1.2 "Allestimento camper itinerante"; D.T.2.1.3 "Preparazione materiale audio, video cartaceo, animazioni ed infografiche"; D.T.2.2.1 "Strategia per la raccolta plastiche presso le marinerie" should report the same description in the word and excel sections of the AF.		

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
3.1	C2-3.1-119 AMPPA	Submission of a new Application Form no later than the 18 th of May 2020	New Application Form submitted on 18 May 2020
		Submission of a new Application Form both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version	New Application Form submitted both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version
		Submission of the Annex 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner	Annexes 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner: PP2 - Regione Siciliana - Dipartimento Regionale della Pesca Mediterranea; PP3 - Comune di Ustica; PP4 - Gharb Local Council; PP5 - Ghajnsielem Local Council
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PP4-Gharb Local Council: box related to partner's competences has to be completed with details on the organization's thematic competences relevant for the project (criterion 2.2) 2. PP4-Gharb Local Council: box related to partner's role has to be completed with details on the role/added value of PP4-Gharb Local Council within the partnership considering that the activities related to the MPA in Malta are up to Ghajnsielem Local Council where the North-East Marine Protected Area is located (criterion 2.3) 3. PP2-Regione Siciliana - Dipartimento Regionale della Pesca Mediterranea: box related to the partner's role has to be completed considering that the partner should have a driving role not only in the drawing up of the AMP Implementation and Organization Regulations but also in its endorsement in order to assure the future application within the MPA (criterion 2.3) 4. Detailing the project's overall objective and the project specific objectives (criterion 3.1.3) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PP4-Gharb Local Council: organisation's thematic competences relevant for the project have been clarified within the specific section of the AF and also through a reference letter by the Ministry for Gozo 2. PP4-Gharb Local Council: the corresponding section has been completed with details on the role/added value of PP4-Gharb Local Council which will coordinate all activities aimed at drafting the Regulation and its subsequent adoption and application within the MPAs 3. PP2-Regione Siciliana - Dipartimento Regionale della Pesca Mediterranea: box related to the partner's role has been completed specifying that it will define the Memorandum of Understanding with the Entities in charge of undertaking the approval of the Regulations and contextual adoption and implementation by the managing bodies of the MPAs in the territory. It will coordinate all activities aimed at drafting the Regulation and subsequent approval ensuring future application within the MPAs 4. The project's overall objective and the project specific

		<p>5. Including the following outputs and output indicators in Table B: a) O.T1.2-laboratori e percorsi didattici, b) O.T1.3-campagna di comunicazione sui social network, c) O.T2.1- centri di educazione ambientale, d) O.T2.2-piattaforma web based di informazione ambientale, e) O.T3.1-campagna di pesca sperimentale, f) O.T3.2-corsi di informazione/formazione per la diversificazione della pesca (criterion 3.1.4)</p> <p>6. Including a specific and tailored action up to the Maltese and Italian institutional partners which assures in Sicily and Malta the full operation of the "AMP Implementation and Organization Regulation" (criterion 3.3)</p> <p>7. Communication: correctly complete the activities considering that the reference to the visual identity is partially unnecessary due to the fact that the project adhere to the brand manual requirement of INTERREG (criterion 6.3)</p> <p>8. WP3: activities, output and deliverables have to be detailed considering that: a) n. 3 awareness campaign are not detailed among activities in WP3 but they are listed among outputs; b) n. 30 information/training days are detailed among activities in WP3 but they are not listed among outputs (criterion 7.1)</p> <p>9. Better detailing tasks among partners (criterion 7.2)</p> <p>10. Revising section C.6 in order to better understand what partners are purchasing. (criterion 7.5)</p> <p>11. Reporting the reference to the output within excel version of the AF (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>12. Reducing of at least 50% the budget allocated to "travel and accommodation" by all PPs to take part at Steering</p>	<p>objectives have been detailed</p> <p>5. The outputs have been reported in Table B</p> <p>6. The WP5 specifies that the "AMP Implementation and Organization Regulations" will be drawn up by the two institutional partners in Malta and Sicily, namely PP2 and PP4. The institutional partners will sign a memorandum of understanding with which they undertake, once the drafting of the regulation is completed, to approve it and contextually the managing bodies of the MPAs to adopt and implement it on their territories</p> <p>7. Communication activities have been completed accordingly</p> <p>8. In WP3, activities, output and deliverables have been aligned</p> <p>9. Tasks have been better detailed</p> <p>10. Section C.6 has been revised</p> <p>11. The reference to the output within excel version of the AF has been reported</p> <p>12. The budget allocated to "travel and accommodation" by all PPs has been reduced and now corresponds to: LP - € 11.260; PP2: € 5.500; PP3: € 6.620; PP4: € 5.600; PP5: € 5.600</p> <p>13. The budget allocated to "Realizzazione piano di comunicazione interna ed esterna al progetto" has been reduced to € 40.000</p> <p>14. The LP clarifies that "Sperimentazione ai fini della Riduzione dell'impatto degli attrezzi della piccola pesca sulla biodiversità" refers to deliverable D.T3.1.1-Campagne di pesca sperimentale and that "Diversificazione delle attività degli operatori della pesca artigianale al fine di diminuire l'impatto sulle risorse pescabili refers to deliverable D.T3.2.1-</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Committees meetings which is currently corresponding to LP - Euro 17.265, PP2 - Euro 13.190, PP3 - Euro 13.030, PP4 - Euro 10.940 and PP5 - Euro 11.960 (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>13. Reducing of 80% the budget allocated to “Realizzazione piano di comunicazione interna ed esterna al progetto” which is currently corresponding to € 180.000 (Euro 60.000 allocated per LP, PP2 and PP4 respectively) (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>14. Better detailing and explaining other expenses (such as Diversificazione delle attività degli operatori della pesca artigianale al fine di diminuire l’impatto sulle risorse pescabili, Sperimentazione ai fini della Riduzione dell’impatto degli attrezzi della piccola pesca sulla biodiversità). Eventual duplication have to be erased and “who does what” has to be clarified in relation to the services to be provided in the Sicilian and Maltese territories (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>15. Detailing the nature of "equipment" line item also clarifying what will be purchased in correspondence of “Fornitura ed installazione arredi ed attrezzature per allestimento centro di informazione ambientale (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>16. Erasing all the activities and the corresponding budget related to meetings, events and travel (within WP 1 and WP 2) in connection with the year 2020 (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>17. Timeplan: updated working plan with project activities starting between the 13th of July and the 1st of September 2020</p>	<p>Corsi di formazione/informazione per la diversificazione dell’attività di pesca. On this regards, the LP provides additional documentation explaining how the activities/deliverables are expected to be carried out</p> <p>15. The LP provides additional details on the type of equipment that will be purchased for each CEA</p> <p>16. The activity and budget have been erased and/or postponed</p> <p>17. Project activities will start the 1st of July 2020</p>	
		Budget	Budget previous AF	Budget revised AF

			€ 2.000.000 of which ERDF: € 1.700.000 NC: € 300.000	€ 1.840.000 of which ERDF: € 1.564.000 NC: € 276.000
JS comment				

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
3.1	C2-3.1-114 SEAMARVEL	Submission of a new Application Form no later than the 18 th of May 2020	New Application Form submitted on 18 May 2020
		Submission of a new Application Form both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version	New Application Form submitted both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version
		Submission of the Annex 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner	Annexes 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner: PP2 - University of Malta
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Detailing the involvement of partners and associated partners in WP4 and partially WP5 (criterion 2.1) 2. Clarifying the role of PPs in relation to the awareness campaigns and their link with PPs' institutional mission (criterion 2.3) 3. Correctly reporting the result indicator n.1 that should be the one corresponding to the selected indicator of the specific objective of the Axis (criterion 3.1.2) 4. Correctly reporting the project result indicator n.2 clarifying if the indicator is the local population made aware of the biodiversity or the awareness campaign also including the measure unit (criteria 3.1.2 and 3.1.5) 5. Detailing the procedures to generate the expenditures also revising section C.6 (criteria 5.2, 7.3, 7.5) 6. Revising approach/tactics chosen in relation to the communication objective n. 1 (criterion 6.2) 7. Clearly explaining how the subjects entitled to carry out the campaigns will be involved (criterion 7.2) 8. Aligning the workplan and the GANNTT (criterion 7.3) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The LP detailed the involvement of the partners in the related section of the AF specifying that the two universities proposing the SeaMarvel project, in addition to dealing with research and training, are also engaged in activities of the so called "Third mission". In particular, they collaborate profitably with all institutional and civil society subjects interested in the issue of environmental sustainability aiming at the transfer of knowledge to local communities and entrepreneurship in terms of the capability of those actors daily involved with their work in the protection of marine natural resources. Furthermore, it is explained that SEA MARVEL represents a unique opportunity to strengthen some of these collaborations with a view to the "third mission". This is the reason why 3 specific groups of stakeholders have been involved as associated partners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>6 Natura 2000 sites and Marine Protected Areas</u> that have married SEA MARVEL to structure a new relationship with the territory, intensifying the relationship with the closest schools in geographical terms, benefiting from the monitoring activities envisaged by the project and acquiring new knowledge from disseminate through a toolkit (Toolkit) of scientific and informative materials useful to visitors and guides. The sites will also be subject to awareness campaigns and extraordinary cleaning for the collection of plastics, also through competitions between the schools involved, and the use of innovative technologies, the

	<p>9. Revising FLC budget for LP up to the ceiling of the 4% (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>10. LP - Erasing the line item "travel and accomodation costs" which includes € 22.500 for "Mission schools for challenge prize and visit Natura 2000 in Sicily and Malta" and including it within the line item "external expertise and services costs" (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>11. LP - Better detailing the awareness campaigns as well as their costs considering that the budget includes € 400.000 for carrying out 4/10 awareness campaigns. It is not clear who organizes the remaining 6 ones and the budget seems to be overestimated. (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>12. LP - Providing clarification and details on the 3 school challenges and related budget (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>13. LP - Better detail and explain "Operators for surveys on board of Ferrys" as well as "Operators for surveys with fishermans" whose cost of Euro 144.000 seems to be overestimated (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>14. LP - Erasing the amount corresponding to "equipment" which includes goods such as Hardware (tablet, laptop) that aren't justified since they are already included within the flat rate expenditures of administrative costs (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>15. LP - Application of depreciation to "equipment" such as Reflex Camera, Binoculars, GPS (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>16. LP - Clearly detailing the purchase and use of equipment such as: Seabin, Equipment for fishemmmans Sentinels (cameras, etc,), Useful and Eco Gadgets, Toolkit for Natura 2000 Sites, Toolkit for Plastic Free Schools (bottles, posters, plate), Toolkit for passengers</p>	<p>"Seabins", which will be provided on loan for use and installed in the areas to monitor and eliminate plastic waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>National research institutes and international organizations</u> that have joined SEAMARVEL to actively support partners in the activities envisaged by WP5 "Sea Sentinels" designed to involve local population groups in Citizen Science activities • <u>National or local institutions</u> responsible for school policies, which will support the project with the involvement of the 15 Institutes that will be selected and involved in the activities of Wp 3 and Wp 4, in particular in monitoring activities, with Plastic free campaigns, the organization of 3 Challenge and all awareness campaigns related to 10 international days on the environment <p>2. The LP detailed the role of the Universities within the "Role and tasks of the project's partner" section as well as within the WP4.</p> <p>3. The LP correctly reported the programme result indicator n. 1 corresponding to "Protected marine sites and areas that develop joint actions for biodiversity protection"</p> <p>4. The LP correctly reported the project result indicator n.2 clarifying that the indicator is the local population and visitors of Natura 2000 sites made aware of the richness and fragility of the biodiversity needing to be preserved also correctly reporting the measure unit</p> <p>5. All the procedures for generating expenses have been described in more detail and table C.6 has been integrated, inserting the description of both the expenses to be carried out and the ways in which they will be carried out, as well as the procedures of public evidence for their acquisition, taking into account the national laws and internal regulations of the two universities</p> <p>6. Approach/tactics chosen in relation to the communication objective n. 1 has been revised with tailored activities for institutional entities such as universities, research institutes etc.</p>
--	---	---

		<p>and crew, Toolkit for reggatta (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>17. PP2 – Providing clarification and details on the awareness campaigns and related budget considering that no budget is currently allocated for them (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>18. PP2 - Providing clarification and details on the school challenges and related budget considering that n. 2 school challenges are expected and budget currently includes only € 6.000 for only one (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>19. PP2 - Application of depreciation to “equipment” (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>20. Erasing all the activities and the corresponding budget related to meetings, events and travel (within WP 1 and WP 2) in connection with the year 2020 (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>21. Timeplan: updated working plan with project activities starting between the 13th of July and the 1st of September 2020</p>	<p>7. The LP clarifies that SEA MARVEL plans to allocate about 25% of the resources to select those subjects who, in Sicily and Malta, will propose the most innovative ideas to increase awareness of the population on the need to protect Natura 2000 sites and implement lifestyle changes able of amplifying the social and environmental impact that SEA MARVEL aims to achieve. The subjects to whom the calls will be addressed (NGOs and environmental associations recognized at national or regional level) will collaborate with the two scientific partners to carry out all the "Awareness" activities foreseen by WP4 and part of WP5, and benefiting from the scientific activities and instrumentation provided in WP3 by Universities.</p> <p>8. Workplan and the GANTT have been aligned</p> <p>9. LP: FLC budget is not perfectly aligned to 4%</p> <p>10. LP: The line item "travel and accommodation costs" which includes € 22.500 for "Mission schools for challenge prize and visit Natura 2000 in Sicily and Malta" has been erased and included in the line item "external expertise and services costs"</p> <p>11. LP: reference within the AF has been provided clarifying that the campaigns are linked to major campaigns to established dates at national and international level (for women and girls in science (11.02), whales (16.02), tuna (2.5), biodiversity (22.05), sea turtles (23.05), sea (11.04), environment and the fight against illegal fishing (5.06), oceans (8.06), maritime workers (25.06), without plastic bags (12.09)</p> <p>12. LP: details on the 3 school challenges and related budget have been provided in the AF</p> <p>13. LP: it is clarified that stakeholders linked to the sea as small-scale fishermen, sailors and crew of ferries and hydrofoils will be the key players for the activities for increasing sustainable management of coastal and marine resources always accompanied by the researchers</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>of the universities</p> <p>14. LP: the amount corresponding to "equipment" which includes goods such as Hardware (tablet, laptop) has been erased</p> <p>15. LP: it is clarified that technology and related equipment are for the project purpose excepted the reflex camera whose amount has been totally erased</p> <p>16. LP: it is clarified that the technologies envisaged by the project (Drones, ROVs, Seabins, etc.) represent not only useful innovations to monitor the health of the environment (in the case of Rov and drones) or to reduce waste at sea (such as the case of the Seabin which collects plastics at sea), but in SEA MARVEL they become cutting-edge devices to increase knowledge and raise awareness of the damage that plastic waste creates to the marine environment and therefore the need for everyone (operators and ordinary citizens) to change some habits. During the monitoring activities with the operators foreseen both in WP3 and in WP4, the beneficiary actors involved (schools, fishermen, cruise passengers, etc.), with the help of the selected environmental organizations, will be encouraged to properly use the laboratory equipment in Malta, the boat equipment in Sicily and the Seabins settled in Natura 2000 sites to understand the fragility of the marine ecosystem and the need to preserve it.</p> <p>17. PP2: reference within the AF has been provided clarifying that the campaigns are linked to major campaigns to established dates at national and international level (for women and girls in science (11.02), whales (16.02), tuna (2.5), biodiversity (22.05), sea turtles (23.05), sea (11.04), environment and the fight against illegal fishing (5.06), oceans (8.06), maritime workers (25.06), without plastic bags (12.09)</p> <p>18. PP2: clarifications on the 3 school challenges (1 in Malta and 2 in Sicily) have been provided clarifying that the efficacy of involving schools in plastic free management operations and education will be</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>tested</p> <p>19. PP2: it is clarified that technology and related equipment are for the project purpose</p> <p>20. The activity and budget have been erased and/or postponed</p> <p>21. Project activities will start the 1st of September 2020</p>
		Budget	Budget previous AF	Budget revised AF
			<p>€ 2.251.741,83 of which</p> <p>ERDF: € 1.913.980,55</p> <p>NC: € 337.761,27</p>	<p>€ 2.198.424,21 of which</p> <p>ERDF: € 1.868.660,58</p> <p>NC: € 329.763,63</p>
JS comment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point 9: during the implementation phase the amount of € 62.976,47 for LP will be allocated to first level control needs 		

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
3.1	C2-3.1-121 FAST	Submission of a new Application Form no later than the 18 th of May 2020	New Application Form submitted on 18 May 2020
		Submission of a new Application Form both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version	New Application Form submitted both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version
		Submission of the Annex 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner	Annexes 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner: PP2 - Ministry for Sustainable Development, the Environment and Climate Change; PP3 - University of Malta; PP4 - Città Metropolitana di Catania; PP5 - Libero Consorzio Comunale di Ragusa.
		1. PP2, PP3, PP4, PP5: including within the AF the missing box "Ruolo e compiti del partner al progetto" (criterion 2.3)	1. PP2, PP3, PP4, PP5: the missing box "Ruolo e compiti del partner al progetto" has been correctly completed
		2. Clarifying which partner is responsible for the WP4 activities in Malta, namely the intervention of biodiversity restoration. Furthermore, it has to be clarified if such interventions will be carried out in Malta and where as well as if such activity is in line with the institutional mission of PP2 or PP3 (criterion 2.3)	2. The LP clarifies that PP2-Ministry for Agriculture, Fisheries and Animal Rights will be in charge of the activity concerning the interception and eradication activities of IAS in the Maltese territory envisaged in WP3 and WP4. PP3- University of Malta, in collaboration with PHD-MAFA and ERA, will take care of the natural restoring activities of WP4 foreseen at Natura 2000 sites in Malta. The identified Natura 2000 sites in Malta are n. 3 and more specifically
		3. Better detailing results indicators in Table A as well as their measure unit and target values (criterion 3.1.2)	1) MT0000018 L-Inħawi tal-Buskett u tal-Girgenti (244.71 ha)
		4. Better defining project specific objectives currently described as activities (criterion 3.1.3)	2) MT0000020 - L-Inħawi tax-Xlendi u tal-Wied tal-Kantra (296.29 ha) and
		5. Completing output indicators related to the specific objective n. 3 "Coinvolgere e formare la cittadinanza e gli operatori del settore delle due isole nelle azioni di monitoraggio e contenimento/ripristino" and specifying indicators' measure unit (criteria 3.1.4 and 3.1.5)	3) MT0000023 - Il-Maghluq tal-Baħar ta 'Marsaskala (4.42 ha)
		6. Correctly completing output indicators in Table B as	3. Results indicators in Table A have been detailed and correctly aligned to programmes' ones
			4. Project specific objectives have been better defined and described
			5. Output indicator related to the specific objective n. 3 has been completed by inserting "n. 10 Incontri di sensibilizzazione, formazione

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
		<p>well as within the WPs (criterion 3.2)</p> <p>7. Detailing management structures in line with programme's provisions (criterion 5.1)</p> <p>8. Detailing the procedures to generate the expenditures also revising section C.6 in order to better understand what partners are purchasing (criteria 5.2 and 7.5)</p> <p>9. Revising communication objectives and tactics (criteria 6.1 and 6.2)</p> <p>10. Revising FLC budget for LP, PP4, PP5 up to the threshold of the 4% (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>11. Application of depreciation to "equipment" (€ 191.000) of LP and PP3 such as spettrofotometro a goccia, microscope (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>12. PP3 – clarifying in relation to "Attrezzatura necessaria per la realizzazione delle attività progettuali" what is the core of the equipment otherwise the expenditures will be cut (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>13. Erasing the amount corresponding to "equipment" which includes goods such as PC, stampante, scanner, ecc. that aren't justified since they are already included within the flat rate expenditures of administrative costs</p> <p>14. Erasing all the activities and the corresponding budget related to meetings, events and travel (within WP 1 and WP 2) in connection with the year 2020 (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>15. Timeplan: updated working plan with project activities starting between the 13th of July and the 1st of September 2020</p>	<p>e work experiences".</p> <p>6. Output indicators in Table B as well as within the WPs have been correctly completed</p> <p>7. Management structures in line with programme's provisions have been detailed</p> <p>8. Procedures to generate the expenditures have been detailed and section C.6 has been revised</p> <p>9. Communication objectives and tactics have been revised</p> <p>10. FLC budget for LP, PP4, PP5 up to the threshold of the 4% has been revised</p> <p>11. The LP explains that it deals with equipment necessary to reach project's aim and exclusively used for the project's needs. Thus, no depreciation rules have been applied</p> <p>12. PP3 – No explanation has been provided in relation to "Attrezzatura necessaria per la realizzazione delle attività progettuali",</p> <p>13. The amount corresponding to "equipment" which includes goods such as PC, stampante, scanner has been erased</p> <p>14. The activity and budget have been erased</p> <p>15. Project activities will start the 1st of September 2020</p>

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS		FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
		Budget	Budget previous AF	Budget revised AF
			€ 1.576.500,00 of which ERDF: € 1.275.000,00 NC: € 225.000,00 Add. Co-financing: € 76.500,00	€ 1.539.120 of which ERDF: € 1.243.227 NC: € 219.393,00 Add. Co-financing: € 76.500
JS comment			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Point 12: the amount of € 20.000 described as "Attrezzatura necessaria per la realizzazione delle attività progettuali" within the line item "equipment" of PP3 has been erased 	

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
3.1	C2-3.1-103 CORALLO	Submission of a new Application Form no later than the 18 th of May 2020	New Application Form submitted on the 18 th of May 2020
		Submission of a new Application Form both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version	New Application Form submitted both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version
		Submission of the Annex 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner	Annexes 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner: PP2 - Environment and Resources Authority (ERA); PP3 - Heritage Malta; PP4 - Agenzia Regionale per la Protezione dell'Ambiente Sicilia (ARPA); PP5 - Università degli Studi di Palermo; PP6 - Consorzio Plemmirio; PP7 - Consorzio di Ricerca per lo Sviluppo di Sistemi Innovativi Agroambientali (CORISSIA)
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Explaining which are the main findings of PANACEA and BIODIVALE projects which will be capitalized/improved within CORALLO project (criterion 1.4) Providing the endorsement of the project activities by the Assessorato regionale del Territorio e dell'Ambiente (criterion 2.3) Reporting the specific objective of the selected priority in Table A (criterion 3.1.1) Reporting the indicators of the specific objective in Table A (criterion 3.1.2) Merging the first two specific objectives (criterion 3.1.3) Properly indicating project output indicators also clarifying which are and how many are the Natura 2000 sites dealt with the project and if all of them are interested by project activities (criterion 3.1.4) Indicating measure unit and target value of the 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The section 1.4 of the AF has been revised. In particular having regard the use of the BIODIVALE AIS shipping tracker it has been reported "<i>The latter is an interesting tool with considerable didactic and edutainment potential, as its outputs can be incorporated within ship movement simulations occurring in Natura 2000 sites within Malta and SICILY and to quantify and to project (through audio-visual means) the shipping pressure on the natural resources of the marine Natura 2000 sites of interest.</i>". In relation to PANACEA project it has been reported that "<i>it represents a rare example of sustainability of funded Interreg Italia-Malta project deliverables/outcomes, given that the Maltese interpretation/visitor centre opened within this project in March 2013 is still a highly appealing attraction in Malta, as evident through the recent award this centre received in recent months (https://www.um.edu.mt/newspoint/news/features/2020/01/dwejramarinecentre). The experience gained within this project in designing visitor centres and didactic tools (e.g. underwater documentaries) will be availed of within the CORALLO project by consolidating the acumen acquired during the implementation of this project</i>"; The endorsement of the project activities by the Assessorato regionale del Territorio e dell'Ambiente has been provided through an official letter;

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
		<p>project result indicators (criterion 3.1.5)</p> <p>8. Properly indicating the coherence between project output indicators and programme's output indicator with particular regards to WP3 (criterion 3.2)</p> <p>9. Detailing the procedures to generate the expenditures also amending information reported for ARPA (criterion 5.2)</p> <p>10. Revising communication objectives and tactics (criteria 6.1 and 6.2)</p> <p>11. Better specifying and measuring the main outputs within WP 4 and WP 5 (criterion 7.1)</p> <p>12. Better describing WP3 highlighting which is the gap of knowledge that the project will bridge (criterion 7.1)</p> <p>13. Defining per each procurement the procedures to be followed (criterion 7.3)</p> <p>14. Better fixing the logical coherence among activities, deliverables and outputs (criterion 7.4)</p> <p>15. Revising section C.6 in order to better understand what partners are purchasing (criterion 7.5)</p> <p>16. Revising FLC budget for all PPs up to the ceiling of the 4% (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>17. Erasing of at least 50% the WP3 which is currently corresponding to € 154.720</p> <p>18. Clarifying if PP5 recovers VAT or not</p> <p>19. Erasing all the activities and the corresponding budget related to meetings, events and travel (within WP 1 and WP 2) in connection with the year 2020</p> <p>20. Timeplan: updated working plan with project</p>	<p>3. The specific objective of the selected priority has been reported in Table A;</p> <p>4. The result indicator of the specific objective has been reported in Table A;</p> <p>5. The first two specific objectives have been merged;</p> <p>6. The output indicators have been revised specifying that n.6 Natura 2000 sites dealt with the project and interested by project activities. However in the section 2.1 - table B it has been specified that n. 4 are maltese Natura 2000 sites and n. 2 are Sicilian sites, while in the section C.3 "Work plan per work packages" it is indicated that the N2K sites are n. 3 maltese and n. 3 sicilian.</p> <p>7. The measure unit and target value of the project result indicators have not been revised, nevertheless the value of 6 protected marine sites is mirrored in the project output quantification</p> <p>8. The coherence between project output indicators and programme's output indicator with particular regards to WP3 has been partially indicated. The LP, in WP3, has only clarified for each indicator the measure unit reporting <i>"Number (3 Maltese N2K sites and 3 Sicilian N2K sites included in the project) for a total of 6"</i>;</p> <p>9. The procedures to generate the expenditures have been revised for each partner. The information reported for ARPA have been properly amended inserting the reference to Dlgs 18/04 2016, n. 50;</p> <p>10. The communication objectives and tactics have been revised and better described;</p> <p>11. The description of the activities to be implemented within WP4 and WP5 have not been revised. In the WP2 – section target group it has been clarified the estimation of population, staff of Sicilian and Maltese regulatory entities, scuba diving and snorkelling communities, schools etc that will be involved in the project activities. Some clarification about what kind of equipment regarding the non-mobile fixed awareness-generating tools has been provided in section C.6. As per point 6 the output indicators within WP 4 and WP 5</p>

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
		activities starting between the 13th of July and the 1st of September 2020	<p>have been revised specifying that n. 6 Natura 2000 sites will be to interest by project activities;</p> <p>12. The WP3 has not revised highlighting which is the gap of knowledge that the project will bridge;</p> <p>13. As per point 9 per each procurement the procedures to be followed have been revised;</p> <p>14. The coherence among activities, deliverables and outputs has not been better fixed. It seems that the activities have been only postponed in line with the new starting data fixed on the 1st of September 2020</p> <p>15. In the section C.6 the procurements above listed has been revised and better described:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - commissioning of mobile & non-mobile N2K awareness & sustainability enjoyment tools in Maltese sites (LP – UoM); - commissioning of mobile awareness-generating exhibition (PP3 - HM); - installation costs for non-mobile facilities commissioned for Maltese visitor centres (PP3 - HM); - commissioning of mobile awareness-generating exhibition (PP4 - Arpa) - installation costs for non-mobile facilities commissioned for Sicilian visitor centres. (PP4 - Arpa) - commissioning of mobile & non-mobile N2K awareness & sustainability enjoyment tools in Sicilian sites (PP5 - UNIPA); <p>16. All PPs revised the budget allocated for FLC up to the 4% threshold;</p> <p>17. WP3: the 50% of the allocated budget has been erased. The revised budget amounts to € 77.359,25;</p> <p>18. It has been clarified that the PP5 doesn't recover VAT;</p>

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS		FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
				19. The activities and budget have been erased from P1 and postponed; 20. The time plan has been updated. The project activities will start on the 1st of September 2020
			Budget previous AF	Budget revised AF
		Budget	€ 1.693.237,00 of which ERDF: € 1.439.251,45 NC: € 253.985,55	€ 1.591.572,70 of which ERDF: € 1.352.836,80 NC: € 238.735,91
		JS comment	- <u>Point 6:</u> during the phase of implementation the LP should clarify how many of the Natura 2000 sites interested by the project are Maltese and how many are Sicilian	

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
3.1	C2-3.1-129 BIOBLU	Submission of a new Application Form no later than the 18 th of May 2020	New Application Form submitted on the 18 th of May 2020
		Submission of a new Application Form both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version	New Application Form submitted both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version
		Submission of the Annex 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner	Annexes 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner: PP 2 - Ministero di Gozo, PP 3 - Università degli Studi di Catania, PP 4 - Comune di Milazzo, PP 5 - University of Malta
		1. Revising the strategy of WP 3 and WP 5 also drafting mechanism for coordination and assuring the full involvement of PP2 – Ministry of Gozo and PP4 – Comune di Milazzo.	1. (criterion 2.3 - Each partners plays a defined and active role in the partnership in line with its own institutional mission statement) it is noted that within the section "Role and tasks of the project's partner" the role of LP and PP 2 – Ministry of Gozo have been better clarified. In addition it has been clarified within WP 3 and WP 5 that PP2 – Ministry of Gozo and PP4 – Comune di Milazzo will take part at the activities using the 20% of the internal staff flat rate and as a consequence they won't claim expenditures. In addition to this within WP 4 it has been clarified that PP4 – Comune di Milazzo will be responsible for the activities regarding the installation of the "campane" for the for the selective collection of plastics that will be carried out in the protected marine area of Capo Milazzo.
		2. Revising the list of the activities in charge to PP2 – Ministry of Gozo also demonstrating the involvement of the institutional partner in the Maltese territory in order to assure a concreteness of the envisaged actions	2. (criterion 2.3) Regarding the PP2 – Ministry of Gozo is confirmed that the core activities is linked within WP 2 – communication activities. There aren't scheduled new activities up to PP2 – Ministry of Gozo but only an explanation regarding the fact that PP 2 within WP 3 will make existing data available.
		3. Revising project result indicators and their measure unit in order to fully adhere to AF requirements which indicates that "At least one of the three project result indicator has to be the same of the programme result as well as its quantification has to be with the same measure unit of the programme result indicator".	
		4. Revising the wording of the 3 specific objectives	3. (criterion 3.1.2 - The project result indicators are clearly linked to the indicators of the specific objective (SO) of the Axis). It is noted that the measure unit of the Specific objective 1 has been fixed in line with ones foreseen by the programme (7,75 Km ²).
		5. Revising project's output indicators as per "targeted call" requirements	

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
		<p>6. Revising the measure unit of the programme result indicators</p> <p>7. Clarifying per each WPs "How will the project main outputs related to the work package be further used once the project has ended?" by fixing specific measures and operative actions in order to assure a concrete suitability of the project findings after the closure of the project</p> <p>8. Completing WP1 including the requirements of programme manual</p> <p>9. Listing per each procurement the legal basis and the procedures that will be adopted.</p> <p>10. Drawing up a coherent structure of communication objectives, approach/tactics, activities and deliverables</p> <p>11. PP2 – Ministry of Gozo: defining better its role considering that it is currently involved in WP2 only and no tasks are thought in relation to the fact that MGOZ is competent authority in the daily management of the natural resources of the island of Gozo</p> <p>12. Defining per each procurement the procedures to be followed</p> <p>13. Re-scheduling the activities of WP3 and WP5 and merging them</p> <p>14. Revising FLC budget for all PPs up to the ceiling of the 4%.</p> <p>15. Correctly fulfil the excel version of the AF indicating</p>	<p>4. (criterion 3.1.3 - The project specific objectives are clearly linked to the project's overall objective) It is noted that the wording used to describe the 3 specific objectives has been fixed.</p> <p>5. (criterion 3.1.4 - The project main outputs indicators are clearly linked to the project's specific objectives) It is noted that the three project outputs indicators has been aligned to those programme indicators required by the call.</p> <p>6. (criterion 3.1.5 - The result indicators of the project are clearly identified (measure unit and target value)) as it was previously highlighted the measure unit of the Specific objective 1 has been fixed in line with ones foreseen by the programme (7,75 Km²).</p> <p>7. (criterion 3.3 - Project main outputs are durable in relation to the problems that afflict the two islands (The proposal describes the concrete measures able to guarantee the sustainability of the outputs and results achieved by the project)) it is noted the section of the AF has been completely revised. Regarding the LP he is confirmed that decided to be part of the Consortium that manages the CapoMilazzo protected marine area and therefore he will take care of updates the data collected after the end of the project. This governance will also ensure the maintenance of output "Source geodatabase management system and WEBGIS" (WP5). Regarding the management Inħawi tar-Ramla site it will be signed a specific protocol with the Ministry of Gozo and also involving the local council of Xaghra.</p> <p>Finally, regarding the collaboration between Unict and UNImalta, the project will achieve the creation of a fully automated, remote-controlled and low-maintenance plastics identification protocol, the strength of which will be the ability to learn the artificial intelligence that will have to control the system. The prototype will be made available for free and it is assumed that more spin-offs will be developed to develop industrial derivative products for the market. regarding WP 4 it is noted that the</p>

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
		<p>the deliverable in correspondence of each expenses</p> <p>16. Localisation: make coherent the localization of travel and accommodation</p> <p>17. LP – Erasing of at least 50% the amount of 17.000 allocated for the travels of the coordinator</p> <p>18. PP2 – Using part of its budget allocated in WP2 for assuring the full involvement of the partner in project activities</p> <p>19. Clarifying if the costs listed under the line item “Equipments” are related to core activities or depreciation rules have to applied.</p> <p>20. Erasing all the activities and the corresponding budget related to meetings, events and travel (within WP 1 and WP 2) in connection with the year 2020</p> <p>21. Timeplan: updated working plan with project activities starting between the 13th of July and the 1st of September 2020</p>	<p>robot prototype (UGV) will be made available by UNICT, that will take care of its custody, for other protected marine areas, accompanied by a user manual in order to be used in periodic scanning and waste collection missions</p> <p>8. <i>(criterion 5.1 - Management structures (e.g. project steering committee) are proportionate to the project size and needs and allow partners' involvement in decision-making))</i> it is noted that the main LP activities have been clarified.</p> <p>9. <i>(criterion 5.2 - The procedures to generate the expenditures (n. of the procedures, public procedures typology, n. of contracts to sign, and so on) are clear and detailed in order to ensure efficient and effective transparent processes)</i> it is noted that per each procurement the legal basis and the procedures have been clarified.</p> <p>10. <i>(criterion 6.1 - The communication objectives clearly link to the project specific objectives)</i> it is noted that the communication objectives, approach/tactics, activities and deliverables have been reshaped.</p> <p>11. <i>(criterion 7.2 - Distribution of tasks among partners is appropriate (e.g. sharing of tasks is clear, logical, in line with partners' role in the project, etc.)</i> It is noted that has been clarified the participation of PP 2 Ministry of Gozo within WP3 by making available existing data as well as its contribution to development a global strategy for the reduction of plastics by participating in the development of the management model of the marine area of Inħawi tar-Ramla.</p> <p>12. <i>(criterion 7.3 - Time plan is realistic (contingency included) and takes into account the time of execution of the public procedures to be launched)</i> it is noted that per each procurement the legal basis and the procedures have been clarified.</p> <p>13. <i>(criterion 7.4 - Activities, deliverables and outputs are in a logical time-sequence) the activities aren't merged. The time plan for WP 3 and WP</i></p>

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS		FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
				<p><i>has been reshaped and fixed.</i></p> <p>14. <i>(criterion 8.1 - Project budget is proportionate to the proposed work plan and the main outputs and results aimed for) the budget for FLC has been fixed for PP 3 and PP 5</i></p> <p>15. <i>(criterion 8.1) - the deliverable in correspondence of each expenses have been fixed.</i></p> <p>16. <i>(criterion 8.1) - the localization of travel and accommodation has been fixed for all PPs.</i></p> <p>17. <i>(criterion 8.1) - it is noted that the line item Services and external expertise has grown of Euro 31.936,00 and the line item equipment has been reduced of Euro 30.436,00.</i></p> <p>18. <i>(criterion 8.1) - has been clarified the participation of PP 2 Ministry of Gozo within WP3 by making available existing data as well as its contribution to development a global strategy for the reduction of plastics by participating in the development of the management model of the marine area of Inħawi tar-Ramla.</i></p> <p>19. <i>(criterion 8.1) There isn't any clarification about the costs listed under the line item "Equipment".</i></p> <p>20. <i>(criterion 8.1) - the activities in connection with 2020 have been postponed and some costs has been erased accordingly under the line time travel and accommodation</i></p> <p>21. Time plan: The time plan has been updated. The project activities will start on the 1st of September 2020</p>
		Budget	Budget previous AF	Budget revised AF
			€ 1.660.300,44 of which	€ 1.651.800 of which

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS		FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
			ERDF: € 1.411.255,37 NC: € 249.045,07	ERDF: € 1.404.030 NC: € 247.770
		JS comment	<p>Regarding the comment list under point 17 the LP have to submit a new revised AF where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the expenditures and the corresponding costs listed under the line items "external expert and services" as well as "Equipment" have to be replaced in line with the previous AF submitted - The total amount of Euro 8400 concerning the travels of the coordinator have to be erased from the budget. <p>Regarding the comment listed under point 19 the LP has to duly justify and explain each costs included within the line item "equipment" in order to allow the ExC to understand if they are core activities or a depreciation rules have to applied (i.e. "<i>Hardware e software</i>", "<i>fixed cameras and supporting equipment</i>", "server, storage and GPUs" as well as "<i>RAMAM portatile e scanner vetrini, sensoristica</i>"). It is clarified that personal computer and scanner can be purchased with the depreciation rules.</p>	

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
3.2	C2-3.2-106 I-WAVENET	Submission of a new Application Form no later than the 18 th of May 2020	New Application Form submitted on the 18 th of May 2020
		Submission of a new Application Form both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version	New Application Form submitted both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version
		Submission of the Annex 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner	Annexes 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner: PP2 - Università degli Studi di Catania (UNICT), PP3 - Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia (INGV), PP4 - Istituto Superiore per la Ricerca e la Protezione Ambientale (ISPRA), PP5 - Istituto per lo studio degli impatti Antropici e Sostenibilità in ambiente marino del Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (CNR), PP6 - University of Malta (UM), PP7 - Malta Marittima Agency (MMA).
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Better clarifying PP7-MMA experience and its role in WP3 and WP5 (criteria 2.3 and 7.2) 2. Correctly defining the unit of measurement and target values of the project output indicators (criterion 3.2) 3. Revising communication objectives and tactics/approach (criteria 6.1 and 6.2) 4. Revising FLC budget for all PP3 and PP6 up to the ceiling of the 4%. (criterion 8.1) 5. Erasing all the activities and the corresponding budget related to meetings, events and travel (within WP 1 and WP 2) in connection with the year 2020 (criterion 8.1) 6. Timeplan: updated working plan with project activities starting between the 13th of July and the 1st of September 2020 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In WP3 the reference of PP7 has been deleted taking into consideration that it was a mistake. The role and experience of PP7 – MMA has been better clarified in WP5 as follow reported <i>"In particolare, MMA inserirà nel DSS i dati relativi alle rotte di navigazione sia attuali che pianificate, suggerendo le opportune dimensioni delle aree di zonazione del clima marino, sia in base delle esigenze presenti che future. Inoltre, MMA fornirà preziose indicazioni storiche sul clima meteo-marino e sulle relative criticità locali"</i>. 2. The unit of measurement and target values of the project output indicators have not been revised accordingly with the comment reported in criterion 3.2. Furthermore the values are expressed using a multiple of unit of measurement of the output indicator at programme level (square kilometres instead of square metres). 3. Communication objectives and tactics/approach revised and better described;

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS		FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
				<p>4. FLC budget revised for PP3 and PP6 up to the ceiling of the 4%.</p> <p>5. The activities related to meetings, events and travel (within WP 1 and WP 2) in connection with the year 2020 have been deleted. The corresponding budget has been re-allocated.</p> <p>6. The time plan has been updated. The project activities will start on the 1st of September 2020</p>
		Budget	Budget previous AF	Budget revised AF
			<p>€ 1.640.000,00 of which</p> <p>ERDF: € 1.394.000,00</p> <p>NC: € 246.000,00</p>	<p>€ 1.640.000,00 of which</p> <p>ERDF: € 1.394.000,00</p> <p>NC: € 246.000,00</p>
		JS comment		
		<p>- <u>Point 2 (criterion 3.2)</u>: during the phase of implementation the JS will provide to insert into Ulysses system the value expressed with the unit of measurement of the programme output indicators, if relevant</p>		

S.O.	PROJECT	ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS	FEEDBACK OF THE LEAD PARTNER
3.2	C2-3.2-124 GIFLUID	Submission of a new Application Form no later than the 18 th of May 2020	New Application Form submitted on the 18 th of May 2020
		Submission of a new Application Form both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version	New Application Form submitted both open version word/excel and signed/scanned version
		Submission of the Annex 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner	Annexes 1, duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner: PP2 - Energy and Water Agency; PP3 - Comune di Aci Castello; PP4 - Rabat Local Council; PP5 - Dipartimento Regionale Tecnico - Regione Siciliana
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revising result indicators as per the requirement of the AF, the coherence with programme result indicators and correct wording (criterion 3.1.2) 2. Clarifying for the Maltese sites which are the public administrative buildings and the corresponding entitled authorities responsible to carry out the installation of the pilot measures (criteria 3.1.4 and 7.1) 3. Properly implementing the sections dedicated to output indicators 4. Defining per each procurement the procedures to be followed specifying the provisions of law for each MS' (criteria 5.2 and 7.3) 5. Revising section C.6 in order to better understand what partners are purchasing (criterion 7.5) 6. Revising FLC budget for all PPs up to the ceiling of the 4%. (criterion 8.1) 7. Erasing the amount corresponding to "PC, printer and 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The result indicators have been revised and correctly re-worded. They are coherent with the programme result indicator ID 3.2 <i>Area monitored by cross-border technological system.</i> 2. For the Maltese sites the public areas, the public administrative buildings and the corresponding entitled authorities responsible to carry out the installation of the pilot measures have been specified. In particular in relation to porous pavement and rain garden <i>"two public areas in the vicinity to the National Water Conservation Awareness Centre in Rabat"</i> are indicated. Having regard to green roofs, in Malta <i>"the roof will be realized within GHAJN the National Water Conservation Awareness Centre, which falls under the administration of EWA. The installation will involve a green roof, and a demonstration area to capitalise on the educational and demonstration potential of this Centre"</i> 3. In relation to the section dedicated to output indicators it is highlighted that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the description is properly implemented; - even if all project output indicators are linked to programme output indicator 3.2.1 <i>Surface covered by pilot measures for the mitigation of the effects of climate change</i> their value is expressed through a multiple of the unit of

		<p>scanner for the realization of WP activities” for PP 3 and PP 5 that aren’t justified since they are already included within the flat rate expenditures of administrative costs (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>8. Erasing all the activities and the corresponding budget related to meetings, events and travel (within WP 1 and WP 2) in connection with the year 2020 (criterion 8.1)</p> <p>9. Timeplan: updated working plan with project activities starting between the 13th of July and the 1st of September 2020</p>		<p>measurement of the programme output indicator;</p> <p>- the table B “Project specific objectives” of the section C.2.1 has been revised only in relation to value of output indicator wrongly expressed in square kilometres instead of square metres.;</p> <p>4. Only for some procurement the procedures to be followed by the PPs have been revised specifying the provisions of law for each MS. For several procurement the procedure is missing;</p> <p>5. Only the table related the equipment has been revised better specifying the description of the following equipment: <i>Meteorological station/flow meter, Climate/Water Flow Measuring Equipment and Water Flow Measuring Equipment</i>. Any revision has been reported in the table related the external expertise and services;</p> <p>6. All PPs revised the budget allocated for FLC up to the 4% threshold;</p> <p>7. The amounts corresponding to “PC, printer and scanner for the realization of WP activities” for PP 3 and PP 5 have been erased;</p> <p>8. The activities and the corresponding budget related to meetings, events and travel (within WP 1 and WP 2) in connection with the year 2020 have been erased.</p> <p>9. The time plan has been updated. The project activities will start on the 1st of September 2020</p>	
		Budget	Budget previous AF	Budget revised AF	

			€ 2.120.500,00 of which ERDF: € 1.700.000,00 NC: € 300.000,00 Add. Co-financing: € 120.500,00	€ 2.105.500,00 of which ERDF: € 1.687.250 NC: € 297.750 Add. Co-financing: € 120.500,00
JS comment			- <u>Point 3</u> : during the phase of implementation the JS will provide to insert into Ulysses system the value expressed with the unit of measurement of the programme output indicators, if relevant	

The document will be part of the final Evaluation technical report.

Following the review of the revised AF, the Executive Committee decides the following.

MEN - C2-2.2-102

The Executive Committee takes note that the lead partner has submitted the Application Form on time and in the manner requested by also transmitting the Annexes 1 duly signed, dated, and scanned by each partner.

The Executive Committee takes note that the eligibility conditions in points 1, 3, 4 and 5 of the above grid have been met.

Regarding the eligibility conditions in paragraph 2, the Executive Committee acknowledges the need for the lead partner to retransmit the project budget (Annex 1.b), making the following changes:

- 1) Lead partner-Municipality of Acireale: a reduction of 24.51 euros in the budget related to the first-level controls on the line item "Costs for services and external expertise".
- 2) PP4-Itaca Soc. Co-op: Increase of the budget for first-level controls on the line item "Costs for services and external expertise " by 140.20euros.

The Executive Committee gives mandate to the Managing Authority to request the lead partner the sending of Annex 1.b and to the Joint Secretariat to verify the changes made. The Joint Secretariat will communicate the results of the verification to the Executive Committee, which, in the face of a successful outcome of the verification, will approve the Application Form of the MEN project.

MOVE ON - C2-2.2-112

The Executive Committee takes note that the lead partner has submitted the Application Form on time and in the manner requested, and sent the Annex 1 duly signed, dated, and scanned by each partner also.

The Executive Committee takes note that the eligibility conditions for points 1 to 17 on the grid above have been met.

With regard to the eligibility condition in paragraph 6, the Executive Committee takes note of the observation made by the Joint Secretariat and recommends that the beneficiaries of the project have to be adequately informed about the principle of sound financial management of the resources dedicated to the project, i.e. the application of the principles of economics, efficiency and effectiveness.

The Executive Committee approves the application form of the MOVE ON project.

CROSSWORK - C2-2.2-128

The Executive Committee takes note that the lead partner has submitted the Application Form on time and in the manner requested, and sent the Annex 1 duly signed, dated and scanned by each partner also.

The Executive Committee takes note that the eligibility conditions in points 2, 3,4, 6, 7, 8 and 9 of the above grid have been complied with.

Regarding the eligibility conditions in paragraph 1, the Executive Committee requires that the financial capacity of the beneficiary Creolabs Ltd must be verified by calculating the arithmetic average and the weighted average of available balance sheets. This check returns a value > 0.2, resulting as a positive financial capacity proof.

With regard to the eligibility conditions in paragraph 3, it is agreed by the members of the Executive Committee that the activities proposed by the partnership do not impact on the issue of state aid, also taking into account what has been stated within the AF.

Regarding the eligibility conditions in paragraph 5, the Executive Committee acknowledges the necessity for the lead partner to retransmit the project budget (Annex 1.b), making the following changes:

- 1) Lead partner-LOGOS Cooperative Company: correctly allocate the 4% budget for first-level controls on the line item " Costs for external expertise and services "
- 2) PP2- Istituto professionale di Stato "Principi Grimaldi: Properly allocate the 4% budget for first-level controls on the line item "Costs for external expertise and services" "
- 3) PP3-Creolabs Ltd: properly allocate the 4% budget for first-level controls on the line item " Costs for external expertise and services "
- 4) PP4-Malta Chamber of SMEs: properly allocate the 4% budget for first-level controls on the line item " Costs for external expertise and services "
- 5) PP2- Istituto professionale di Stato "Principi Grimaldi": should reduce the D.C.C.6.3 output budget by 4,000.00 euros, and D.C.6.3 output budget by 1,200.00

The Executive Committee takes note of the observation made by the Joint Secretariat on the acquisition of goods and services and recommends that the Lead partner -LOGOS Società Cooperativa, PP3-Creolabs Ltd, and the PP4-Malta Chamber of SMEs have to be adequately informed about the principle of sound financial management of resources dedicated to the project, i.e. the application of the principles of economics, efficiency and effectiveness.

The Executive Committee gives mandate to the Managing Authority to request the lead partner the sending of Annex 1.b and the Joint Secretariat to verify the changes made. The Joint Secretariat will communicate the results of the verification to the Executive Committee, which, in the face of a successful outcome of the review, will approve the Application Form of the CROSSWORK project.

SENHAR - C2-3.1-115

The Executive Committee takes note that the lead partner has submitted the Application Form on time and in the manner requested, and sent the Annex 1 duly signed, dated, and scanned by each partner also.

The Executive Committee takes note that the eligibility conditions for points 1 to 15 on the grid above have been met.

The Executive Committee acknowledges the necessity for the lead partner to retransmit the project budget (Annex 1.b), making the following changes:

- 1) Lead partner- Università degli Studi di Palermo: the description of the line item "costs for external expertise and services " related to deliverables D.T.2.1.2 "Travelling camper set-up"; D.T.2.1.3 "Preparation of audio material, paper video, animations and infographics"; D.T.2.2.1 "Strategy for plastic harvesting at the Navies" of 18,950.00 must be correctly reported within the project budget

The Executive Committee gives mandate to the Managing Authority to request the lead partner the sending of Annex 1.b and the Joint Secretariat to verify the changes made. The Joint Secretariat will

communicate the results of the verification to the Executive Committee, which, in the face of a successful outcome of the audit, will approve the Application Form of the SENHAR project.

AMPPA - C2-3.1-119

The Executive Committee takes note that the lead partner has submitted the Application Form on time and in the manner requested, and sent the Annex 1 duly signed, dated, and scanned by each partner also.

The Executive Committee takes note that the eligibility conditions for points 1 to 17 on the grid above have been met.

The Executive Committee approves the AMPPA application form.

SEA MARVEL - C2-3.1-114

The Executive Committee takes note that the lead partner has submitted the Application Form on time and in the manner requested, and sent the Annex 1 duly signed, dated, and scanned by each partner also.

The Executive Committee takes note that the eligibility conditions for points 1 to 8 and 10 to 21 on the grid above have been met.

Regarding the eligibility conditions in paragraph 9, the Executive Committee acknowledges the necessity for the lead partner to retransmit the project budget (Annex 1.b), making the following changes:

- 1) Lead partner - Università degli Studi di Catania: correctly allocate the 4% budget for first-level controls on the line item "Costs for external expertise and services "

The Executive Committee gives mandate to the Managing Authority to request the lead partner the sending of Annex 1.b and the Joint Secretariat to verify the changes made. The Joint Secretariat will communicate the results of the verification to the Executive Committee, which, in the face of a successful outcome of the review, will approve the Application Form of the SEA MARVEL project.

FAST - C2-3.1-121

The Executive Committee takes note that the lead partner has submitted the Application Form on time and in the manner requested, and sent the Annex 1 duly signed, dated, and scanned by each partner also.

The Executive Committee takes note that the eligibility conditions for points 1 to 11 and 12 to 15 of the above grid have been met.

Regarding the eligibility conditions in paragraph 12, the Executive Committee acknowledges the necessity for the lead partner to provide the following clarification:

- 1) PP3-University of Malta: Provide clarifications about the costs included in the line item "equipment" corresponding to 20,000.00 specifying whether it is about core activities or project output and to what corresponds the generic description "Equipment required for the realization of project activities"

The Executive Committee gives mandate to the Managing Authority to request a clarification to the lead partner and the Joint Secretariat to verify the same. The Joint Secretariat will communicate the results of the verification to the Executive Committee, which, in the face of a successful outcome of the review, will approve the Application Form of the FAST project.

CORAL - C2-3.1-103

The Executive Committee takes_note that the lead partner has submitted the Application Form on time and in the manner requested, and sent the Annex 1 duly signed, dated, and scanned by each partner also.

The Executive Committee takes_note that the eligibility conditions for points 1 to 20 on the grid above have been met.

The Executive Committee approves the Application Form of the CORALLO project

BIOBLU - C2-3.1-129

The Executive Committee takes note that the lead partner has submitted the Application Form on time and in the manner requested, and sent the Annex 1 duly signed, dated, and scanned by each partner also.

The Executive Committee takes note that the eligibility conditions for points 1 to 16, 18, 20 and 21 of the above grid have been met.

Regarding the eligibility conditions in paragraph 17 and 19, the Executive Committee acknowledges the need for the lead partner to provide the following clarifications and retransmit the project budget (Annex 1.b), making the following changes:

- 1) Lead partner- Università degli Studi di Messina: The description and amounts related to the line items "Costs for consulting and external services" and "Equipment" must be restored as in the original application form
- 2) Lead partner- Università degli Studi di Messina: reduction of 8,400,00 euros of the budget related to the coordinator's line item "Travel and Accommodation"
- 3) Provide clarifications about the costs included in the line item "equipment" (e.g., " Hardware and software", "fixed cameras and supporting equipment", "server, storage and GPUs" as well as "portable RAMAM and slide scanners, sensors") specifying whether it is core activities or project output.

The Executive Committee gives mandate to the Managing Authority to request a clarification to the lead partner and the Joint Secretariat to verify the changes made. The Joint Secretariat will communicate the results of the verification to the Executive Committee, which, in the face of a successful outcome of the review, will approve the Application Form of the BIOBLU project.

I-WAVENET - C2-3.2-106

The Executive Committee takes note that the lead partner has submitted the Application Form on time and in the manner requested, and sent the Annex 1 duly signed, dated, and scanned by each partner also.

The Executive Committee takes note that the eligibility conditions for points 1 to 6 on the grid above have been met.

The Executive Committee approves the application form of the I-WAVENET project

GIFLUID - C2-3.2-124

The Executive Committee takes note that the lead partner has submitted the Application Form on time and in the manner requested, and sent the Annex 1 duly signed, dated, and scanned by each partner also.

The Executive Committee takes note that the eligibility conditions for points 1 to 9 on the grid above have been met.

The Executive Committee approves the application form of the GIFLUID project.

It moves on to the discussion of **paragraph 3 - Examination and approval of the response to the counter-deductions transmitted by potential lead partners whose project has been assessed with the following status: "Project rejected" to apply to the specific objectives 3.1 of The Notice 02/2019".**

Following the review of the counter-deductions submitted to the MA - in the time and manner provided by The Notice 02/2019 - by a potential lead partner whose project has been assessed with the status of "project rejected", the Executive Committee decides to examine the counter-deductions in deeper detail and to postpone the decision to the 4 June 2020 (h 15:00).

At 2p.m., Executive Committee first day work is concluded

Day 4 June 2020 at 15:30 was held the second day of the eighth meeting of the Executive Committee of the INTERREG V-A Program, present members are: Luca Palazzo (ACT), Vincenzo Petruso (Dipartimento Regionale della Programmazione), Carmela Filì (Ambiente-Sicilia), Perit Frans Mallia (Malta Planning Authority), Andre Callus (National Commission for the Promotion of Equality), Carmel Vella (Ministry for Foreign and European Affairs), David Sammut (Ministry of Finance, the Economy and Investment). The meeting was attended by Marco Sambataro (JS), Ilva Parlato (JS), Chiara Di Bella (JS), Carmen Dalli (Funds and Programmes Division) and Maria Elena Muscat (Territorial Cooperation Unit-Malta). Giovanni Sarri (Managing Authority) chairs the meeting.

The meeting was held in video conference due to mobility limitations caused by the Covid-19 emergency

Giovanni Sarri, as delegated President, restarts the work of the 8th Executive Committee of the INTERREG V-A Italy Malta Programme, greets the participants and gives reading of point 3 on the agenda whose discussion had been postponed during the first day of work.

After the verification of the legal number and the necessary quorum of the participants, Dr Sarri declares the meeting valid and invites the members of the Executive Committee to discuss **paragraph 3 - Examination and approval of the response to the counter-deductions transmitted by potential lead partners whose project has been evaluated with the following status: "Project rejected" to apply to the specific objectives 3.1 of the 02/2019 Notice"**

The meeting resumes with the discussion of the response to counter-deductions by the potential Lead partner- Università degli Studi di Catania whose COCREATE VALUE project has been assessed with the status of "rejected project".

The Executive Committee prepares, shares, and approves the response to the counter-deductions of the COCREATE VALUE project as follows

.

Selection criteria	Assessment by the Executive Committee	Counterclaims by the potential lead partner	Reply
<p>1.2 - The project results shall be achieved with adequate effectiveness due to its cross-border approach</p>	<p>The section offers a description explaining the need to jointly approach the main theme tackled by the project. Nevertheless, it is not so clear how/why the project results can be clearly achieved only through the cross-border cooperation also considering that the proposed actions are not symmetrical between the two MS'. In particular, the description of WPs highlight different needs between Malta and Sicily which suggest that the results could be reached through resources of the two member States without the need to use resources of the cross-border cooperation.</p>	<p>The observation "it is not so clear how/why the project results can be clearly achieved only through the cross border cooperation" is to be considered unfounded because in the project proposal section C.1.2 clearly described how the transfrontier cooperation between the Maltese and Sicilian territories is essential and crucial for the joint development of knowledge on pollinator transboundary diversity. In fact, it is noteworthy how this information is essential to contribute in reversing the loss of biodiversity and improving the conservation status of cross-border Natura 2000 target sites. From one side, Sicily has an existing information gap regarding bee biodiversity basically due to the discontinuity in research activities and the consequential lack of a consolidated experimental approach (that was partially developed through APESLOW project, please see C.1.4 of the project proposal). Conversely, Malta has already gained a robust information on its bee fauna and has developed a solid scientific-based approach in such investigation topic over the years. Therefore, the existing information gap between the two Member States will act as project strength. Namely, information exchange of consolidated research methodologies and developing synergies from Maltese to Sicilian partners is</p>	<p><u>Nevertheless they were not clearly demonstrated in core WPs . In particular, it is still not understandable how the tailored actions per each territory will serve to level out local differences between similar territories and contribute jointly to arrest the loss of pollinator biodiversity, maintain and reactivate the ecosystem and protected area.</u></p>

Selection criteria	Assessment by the Executive Committee	Counterclaims by the potential lead partner	Reply
		<p>imperative to fulfil the Sicilian transboundary know-how gap. Moreover, the ecotoxicological risk-assessment of pollinators is achievable only through the cross-border cooperation because of the close similarity between Maltese and Sicilian territories as well as their socio-economic context. Hence, the mutual information sharing between the two Countries is required to facilitate the best management practices and the promotion of sound environmental resources management policies in Malta and Sicily, supporting thus the objectives of the Cohesion Policy for 2014-2020. All these aspects were explicitly detailed in the WP3. The asymmetrical nature of some actions between the two MS is justified by specific cross-border territorial, environmental and infrastructural peculiarities that require, per each region, specific intervention measures to tackle the pollinator biodiversity loss. Moreover, such different actions are justified by the different levels of interventions that are allowed by the local regulatory. In fact, whether in Malta some wide interventions are strictly necessary to enhance pollinator biodiversity (see in WP4 A.T 2.1 Eradication of alien and invasive species in Maltese protected areas and A.T 2.2 Restoration of the degraded habitats for pollinators in Malta), in Sicily, narrower actions that are shared with Maltese areas are sufficient (e.g., see in WP4 A.T 2.3 Arresting pollinator biodiversity loss). Nevertheless, the</p>	

Selection criteria	Assessment by the Executive Committee	Counterclaims by the potential lead partner	Reply
		slight asymmetry of some actions will serve to level out local differences and contribute jointly for the project objective, namely to arrest the loss of pollinator biodiversity, maintain and reactivate the ecosystem and protected area. All these aspects were clearly detailed in WP4	
<p>3.1.2. - The project result indicators are clearly linked to the indicators of the specific objective (SO) of the Axis</p>	<p>Having regard the result indicator n. 1 namely "1. Protected terrestrial sites and areas that develop joint actions for the biodiversity protection", it is highlighted that:</p> <p>_the project doesn't foresee any specific and direct action addressed to the achievement of this goal;</p> <p>_the action regarding the cleaning alien and invasive species regards only the Maltese sites and in any case there isn't any specific measure able to demonstrate that such action could concretely achieve the programme result indicator 3.1 b</p>	<p>Such an observations can be considered unfounded because the improvement of habitat structure and functioning is achieved through actions that directly and/or indirectly lead to a reverse in biodiversity decline by enhanced conditions for growth of various pollinators and plant species. This objective is expected to be reached through direct and practical actions described in WP4 (A.T 2.1 Eradication of alien and invasive species in Maltese protected areas; A.T2.2 Restoration of the degraded habitats for pollinators in Malta; A.T2.3 Arresting pollinator biodiversity loss; A.T2.4 Increasing Sicilian local strain honeybee presence), and also by indirect actions that are mostly focused on information acquisition that is indispensable for long term action plan. The latters are described in WP3 (A.T1.1 Genetic characterization of indigenous pollinators; A.T1.2 Toxicological characterization on pollinators in transborder areas).</p> <p>The cleaning alien and invasive species only in Maltese sites is justified by the specific presence of alien plants in Malta as very well described in WP4. These actions</p>	<p><u>The counterclaim proposed by the lead partner clarifies that the result indicator n. 1 can be achieved through a match between direct actions mainly addressed to the Maltese territory (e g. eradication and restoration) and indirect actions mainly addressed to the Maltese territory (e g. genetical and toxicological characterization) which are indispensable for long term action plan. From the above, it was not demonstrated how the mix of direct and indirect actions could assure the achievement of the result for the whole cross-border area envisaged by the project, namely "15 Kmq of protected terrestrial sites and areas that develop joint actions for the biodiversity protection".</u></p>

Selection criteria	Assessment by the Executive Committee	Counterclaims by the potential lead partner	Reply
		<p>are direct and will give an important contribution to result indicator 3.1b, because one of the main reasons of pollinator biodiversity loss is the natural competition between native and exotic host plant species. This competition often lead, in the long period, to the abundance of single alien plant species and then to the reduction of native plants and their associated native pollinators. Through the plant eradication approach (A.T2.1) is possible to eliminate such plant competition directly, implementing thus the native plant biodiversity and the number of indigenous bee fauna in the short period. These actions are possible only in Malta because Maltese protected areas strongly required this intervention measure that is also allowed by the local regulatory. Conversely, in Sicily such need is absent or negligible, for this reason it was not considered by a specific action</p>	<p><u>The counterclaim proposed by the lead partner clarifies that the result indicator n. 2 is made up of 7 project activities that's to say the target value proposed. From the above it was not demonstrated and clarified how the 7 prospects can directly contribute to the achievement of the result indicators n. 2</u></p> <p><u>The counterclaim proposed by the lead partner clarifies that the result indicator n. 3 will be achieved thanks to the global promotion of biodiversity, although reached in different ways between Sicilian and Maltese protected sites. From the above it was not demonstrated and clarified how the proposed result indicator n. 3 is achieved through an indirect effect on project activities and output. It also difficult to measure the expected results taking place within the indicated 15 kms.</u></p>
	<p>Having regard the results indicator n. 2 namely "Prospects for increasing pollinator species diversity and conservation", it is highlighted that:</p> <p>_it isn't clear how many bees are necessary to guarantee the biodiversity protection of the sKm</p>	<p>"Prospects for increasing pollinator species diversity and conservation" for the biodiversity restoration of 15Kms of terrestrial sites, a total of 7 activities were addressed for the achievement of this specific goal through two direct measures:</p> <p>1. The creation of solitary bee habitats (bee hotels and soil nests) as well as the measurement of nest occupancy and flower visitation in restored habitats were included for increasing pollinator species diversity in both the MS. (See A.T 2.3 Arresting pollinator</p>	

Selection criteria	Assessment by the Executive Committee	Counterclaims by the potential lead partner	Reply
	<p>15 of the terrestrial sites.</p> <p>_the project doesn't foresee any specific and direct action addressed to the achievement of this goal due to the fact that any specific measure has been identified</p>	<p>biodiversity loss)</p> <p>2. A total of 16 bee-hives were included for the restoration of Sicilian local Black honeybee populations (see A.T 2.4 Increasing Sicilian local strain honeybee presence)</p>	
	<p>Having regard the result indicator n. 3 namely "Increasing access for sustainable tourism through setting up of nature trails", it is highlighted that: it isn't clear how it is possible to guarantee the biodiversity protection linked to the activity of pollinators in the cross-border area and to monitor the terrestrial sites of the cross border area, if the installation of the beehives will involve only the Sicilian sites."</p>	<p>"Increasing access for sustainable tourism through setting up of nature trails", the biodiversity protection linked to the activity of pollinators in the cross-border area is guaranteed through different local actions that aim at the same final goal. These actions mainly involve:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the installation of the beehives in Sicilian sites to specifically increase the Sicilian local strain honeybee (see A.T 2.4 Increasing Sicilian local strain honeybee presence); 2. the installation of the solitary bee nesting habitat provision and the restoration of ecosystems in arresting pollinator loss in both Sicilian and Maltese sites (see A.T2.3 Arresting pollinator biodiversity loss); 3. the eradication of alien and invasive plant species to restore pollinator degraded habitat and, as a consequence, the pollinator biodiversity in the Maltese sites (A.T 2.1 Eradication of alien and invasive species in Maltese protected areas; A.T2.2 Restoration of the degraded habitats for pollinators in Malta). 	

Selection criteria	Assessment by the Executive Committee	Counterclaims by the potential lead partner	Reply
		Hence, the global promotion of biodiversity, although reached in different ways between Sicilian and Maltese protected sites, would have an important impact to the increasing access for sustainable tourism through the setting up of natural trails	
3.1.4 - The project main outputs indicators are clearly linked to the project's specific objectives.	As a general point of view, the outputs foreseen by each WPs aren't symmetrical actions between the Maltese and Sicilian territories. This put in evidence the lack of a cross border approach as already reported in criterion 1.2	This is to be considered double penalization. Here the point is to evaluate whether the main output indicators (e.g., those presented in the second part of Table B of C.2 Project focus, third column) are clearly linked with the project specific objectives, i.e., improving conservation status of Annex I habitats, Increasing suitable tourism in the protected sites and knowledge implementation on pollinator biodiversity. However, most of the comments below rely on the lack of 100% symmetry of the actions between Maltese and Sicilian territories, and totally on other aspects. By contrast, evaluators gave a score of 0 and this is not coherent with the subcriterion topic.	<u>It is noted that the output indicators are strictly related to results indicators both contributing to the achievement of project's specific objectives and project general objective, respectively, thus, once the result indicators are not clearly detailed or drafted the deriving output indicators are affected accordingly</u>
	All the outputs related to WP3 are referred to the Sicilian territory only and it is not clear which is the starting point of the knowledge regarding the genetic and toxicological characterization of	As stated several times in the project proposal, the starting point of the knowledge regarding the genetic and toxicological characterization of pollinator in Sicily is low and null, respectively. While this is not the case for the Maltese side. The APESLOW project did not carry out such activities, but provided a very first characterization of the pollinator biodiversity in some	<u>Insufficient evidence has been provided to support the claim that APESLOW has not already provided the achievement of the indicated objective.</u>

Selection criteria	Assessment by the Executive Committee	Counterclaims by the potential lead partner	Reply
	pollinator bearing also in mind that the already financed APESLOW project carried out such activities	selected Sicilian areas (e.g., Etna slopes) that are very far from the transnational environment object of the present project with the selected seaside protected areas. No projects on bee toxicology have never been carried out in Malta and/or Sicily. Here, we propose to sample bees for toxicological studies both in Maltese and in Sicilian protected sites	
	Output O.T1.1 deals with the Genetic characterization on of indigenous pollinator interventions. It is noted that the unit of measure and the corresponding target isn't clear at all (n. of 4).	4 are the number of studies. There was no space to describe it properly in the table	<u>The counterclaim proposed by the lead partner clarifies the unit of measure and the corresponding target of Output O.T1.1</u>
	Output O.T1.2 deals with a Reduction of pesticide negative impact on cross-border Natura 2000 Site interventions and Output O.T1.3 deals with a Toxicological characterization of indigenous pollinators in protected areas buffer zones. These outputs will just deliver a chemical analysis in order to investigate the toxicology of routinely used agricultural pesticides on endemic pollinators	We do not understand why the evaluator is underestimating the value of such an investigation toward the prevention of the pollinator biodiversity losses. Depicting a clear picture of what is going on in the field is the very first step to understand how bees (managed and wild) are being affected by the routine agricultural crop protection practices. Moreover, has a typo error that does not really make it clear	<u>It is noted that the argument is not feasible enough. The project target group/stakeholders is made up of 250 Scientists, 200 beekeepers, 200 farmers, 500 academic students, 100.000 visitors of Natura 2000 sites The proposed communication activities that should make them aware of the risks posed by pesticides are: n. 4 multimedia products (such as website, social media channel etc), n. 4 Divulcation material (such as</u>

Selection criteria	Assessment by the Executive Committee	Counterclaims by the potential lead partner	Reply
	and as a consequence		<u>brochure, gadgets etc.), n. 4 seminars.</u>
	In addition this analysis will be trasfered among project partner towards local farmers and it isn't clear at all the coherence between the output delivered and the direct foreseen effect to reduce pesticide negative in cross border area	Farmers, turists and students are involved in the communication actions of the project. The project results will make all these stakeholders aware of the risks posed by pesticides used in the protected crossborder areas to bees	<u>From the above it was not demonstrated and clarified how the expected goals are achieved through the indicated proposed actions taking also into account that no base line has been indicated as well as the improvement achieved through the implementation of the final target.</u>
	Furthermore, in relation to O.T.1.3, it Is also noted that isn't clear how the Maltese partners will take part to this activity	As stated in the proposal Maltese partners will collect bee samples and will ship them to the Sicilian partner (UniCT) for chemical analyses	
	WP4 outputs related to the eradication of alien and invasive plant species and the restoration of degraded habitats are carried out in Malta only (I-Inhawi tal-Ghadira and Majjistral) despite the description of the output O.T2.2 reports in Malta and in Sicily. On the other side the restoring of local bees population seems to be realized in Sicily only. In particular: _Output O.T2.1 deals with the	Again, here the evaluator is trying to double penalizing, in multiple subcriteria, the proposal due to the lack of 100% simmetrical actions. Here we are pursuing the restoration of degradetad habitats for pollinators with the actions we believe that are more appropriated for the involved areas	<u>The main principle of the European territorial cooperation can be summarized as "common problem, joint solution". Thus, the lack of a common problem determining asymmetrical needs/solutions/activities should represent an alert firstly for the applicant.</u>

Selection criteria	Assessment by the Executive Committee	Counterclaims by the potential lead partner	Reply
	<p>Eradication of alien and invasive plant species from 355 ha. It is noted that this output and the correspond activity will be conducted only in the Maltese territory in two Natura 2000 sites (I-Inhawi tal-Ghadira and Majjistral). For sure it is confirmed from the information delivered in the AF that there isn't a similar action that will be conducted within the Sicilian territory.</p> <p>_Output O.T2.2 deals with the Restoration of degraded habitats for pollinators Ha 196. It is noted that this output and the correspond activity will be conducted only in the Maltese territory (with the use of machinery, clearing up debris, planting of trees, setting up of irrigation systems, and maintenance of the sites until the end of the project in the following sites Ghadira SAC and Majjistral SAC) despite the description of the Output 2.2 reports the word in</p>		

Selection criteria	Assessment by the Executive Committee	Counterclaims by the potential lead partner	Reply
	Malta and in Sicily. _Output O.T2.3 deals with the Arresting pollinator biodiversity loss and deals mainly with the installation of at least sm 10 solitary bee habitats per each Natura 2000 site in Malta and Sicily		
	The activity A.2.3 is unclear and refers to the creation of habitats for solitary bees which should give at least 10 m2 of restored Natura 2000 habitats per 1000 hectares of restored site. Thus, it isn't clear how it is possible to measure it in a reasonable and liable way	This is fully reliable. We have 4 Natura 2000 sites, so it means 40 square meters of honey bee and solitary bee nests. In 40 square meters there are billions of polinators that will exploit >1000 hectares.	<u>The counterclaimproposed by the lead partner does not demonstrate how the benefits covering the 1000 hectares will be achieved and which habitat will be addressed by the project actions and how.</u>
	Output O.T2.4 deals with the Restoring Sicilian local Black honeybee populations. It is noted that this activity will be conducted only in Sicily at Simeto Oasis and in the Pantelleria Natural Park, by using local black bee populations. For sure it is confirmed from the information delivered in the AF that there isn't a similar action that will	For sure there is not a similar action in Malta. The Black Sicilian bee is an endemic Sicilian honeybee subspecies. This species needs to be preserved in its native habitat and cannot be brought to Malta. We are aiming to preserve biodiversity losses, so we cannot move biodeversity outside its native range. Please also note that such comment does not deal with the subcriterion "the project main outputs indicators are clearly linked to the project's specific objectives."	<u>It is noted</u>

Selection criteria	Assessment by the Executive Committee	Counterclaims by the potential lead partner	Reply
	be conducted within the Maltese territory		
	Having regards the outputs of WP5 It deals with random actions that don't allow to understand how they reach the goal of "Increasing sustainable tourism and accessibility to the protected areas".	Evaluators are being to unpleasant depicting as random actions the activities we are proposing in order to increase the accessibility of the selected protected areas, e.g., setting up interpretation panels and signed walking trails, clean-up along the paths, KETs for pollinator focused protected areas, along with scientific actions aimed at estimating the cost-benefit and eco-turistic values of these actions. All these actions have been developed with the main aim of ensuring a sustainable fruibility of the selected Natura 2000 sites.	<u>It is noted that the set of activities and related outputs should match with the result indicator which is not properly defined considering that aims at "increasing access for sustainable tourism" and uses as indicator and measure unit "15 kms"</u>
	Output O.T3.1 and O.T.3.2 deals with the Setting up interpretation panels and signed walking trails in protected sites. Thus, it isn't clear how it is possible to measure it in a reasonable and liable way	This comment seems pointless. We provided crystal clear derivables and target values (e.g., number of interpretation panels and number of Km marked trials).	
	Output O.T3.3 deals with the Clean-up all along the paths interventions Ha 40. It is noted that this activity will be conducted only in Malta and in addition to this still remain the problem how it is possible to measure it in a reasonable and	Action simmetry is not the point of evaluation here. Why measuring 40 hectares of cleaned space or the number of new beehives is a problem is very unclear to us. All labour needed for that will be of course certified, panels in the cleaned areas will be used to correctly identify the cleaned areas and all behives will be marked up with the project logo and code	

Selection criteria	Assessment by the Executive Committee	Counterclaims by the potential lead partner	Reply
	<p>liable way.</p> <p>Output O.T3.4 deals with the installation of beehives. It is noted that the installation of the beehives will be assured only in the Sicilian territory while in Malta it will be installed a Multimedial turistic panels. Thus, it isn't clear how it is possible to measure it in a reasonable and liable way</p>		
	<p>Output O.T3.5 deals with the value of the eco-tourism and nature-based services by pollinators and Output O.T3.6 deals with cost benefits of the ecotourism and nature-based services by pollinators. They correspond to a Market Analysis able to identify the factors that can influence the user propensity on new eco-systems services based on pollinator biodiversity and a Cost benefits analysis of the ecotourism and nature-based services provided by pollinators. These outputs are in</p>	<p>These activities are perfectly in line with the project specific objective of "Increasing sustainable tourism in the protected sites" because the suitability of the turism is also (mostly) driven by its economical suitability. Knowing how many tourists would be willing to pay a given price for accessing to a Natura 2000 site will of course increase the suitability of the actions implemented to conserve the site and increase the turistic sustainability.</p> <p>Similarly, at least one programme output indicator (i.e., 3.1.3 Awareness campaigns for the proper enjoyment of protected areas) will greatly benefit from these economic analyses for the same reasons above mentioned</p>	

Selection criteria	Assessment by the Executive Committee	Counterclaims by the potential lead partner	Reply
	line neither with the project specific objectives nor with any programme output indicators.		
3.1.5. The result indicators of the project are clearly identified (measure unit and target value)	Please see the comment already reported in criterion 3.1.2	<p>In the subcriterion 3.1.2 (The project result indicators are clearly linked to the indicators of the specific objective (SO) of the Axis) the link between the project result indicators with the SO of the axis should have been specified. Here, the evaluators were requested to indicate whether the result indicators (i.e., those presented in C.2 project focus, Table A) have been clearly identified. The evaluators did not evaluated this aspect but gave a score of 0.</p> <p>In table A of the project proposal we very clearly indentified and described the project indicators as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 15 square kilometers of Protected terrestrial sites and areas that develop joint actions for the biodiversity protection (i.e., improving habitat structure and functioning will lead to reversal in biodiversity decline by enhanced conditions for growth of various pollinators and plant species, and clearing alien and invasive species eliminatating the competition with native biodiversity); – 7 activities for increasing pollinator species diversity and conservation (i.e., manipulating habitats for encouraging breeding success in various pollinator species, affecting a range of habitats available to these species improving their prospects for increase in their population); – 15 km of increased access to nature trails for 	<p><u>Actually, the evaluator is requested to evaluate if indicators have been correctly identified in terms of measure unit and target value.</u></p> <p><u>Please note answers already provided in criterion 3.1.2</u></p>

Selection criteria	Assessment by the Executive Committee	Counterclaims by the potential lead partner	Reply
		sustainable tourism (i.e., increasing the access within these sites via the promotion of biodiversity and the natural features present in these sites would raise the visibility and importance of these protected sites by increasing environmental awareness amongst visitors and schoolchildren. The sites will also become an asset to the local tourism industry).	
3.2. The project output indicators clearly link to programme output indicators	Please see the comment already reported in criterion 3.1.4	<p>In the sub criterion 3.1.4 (The project main outputs indicators are clearly linked to the project's specific objectives) the link between the project result indicators with the SO of the axis should have been specified. Here, the evaluators were requested to indicate whether the project output indicators (i.e., those summarized in the second part of the Table B in C.2 project focus) clearly link to the programme output indicators, i.e., three indicators we have selected: 3.1.1 Recovery and evaluation interventions of the zones of the Natura 2000 network; (CO023) Surface area of habitats supported in order to attain a better conservation status; 3.1.3 Awareness campaigns for the proper enjoyment of protected areas. The evaluators did not consider this aspect but gave a score of 0 out of the available 25 points, and this is not coherent with an objective and suitable evaluation of the project</p> <p>All links between our project indicators and the programme output indicators have been clearly presented along the project and summarized in the</p>	<u>It is noted that the whole coherence among objectives, results and outputs has been considered. Thus, the score and comment derives from previous comments already done.</u>

Selection criteria	Assessment by the Executive Committee	Counterclaims by the potential lead partner	Reply
		<p>second part of the Table B in C.2 project focus. Below some examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 1. Project output indicators related to 3.1.1 Recovery and evaluation interventions of the zones of the Natura 2000 network: reduction of pesticide negative impact on cross-border Natura 2000 site intervention; restoring Sicilian local Black honeybee populations; Genetic characterization of indigenous pollinator interventions; Toxicological characterization of indigenous pollinators in protected areas buffer zones; Spatiotemporal ecological characterization of wild and managed bees in protected areas – 2. Project output indicators related to (CO023) Surface area of habitats supported in order to attain a better conservation status: Eradication of alien and invasive plant species from 355 ha of habitats in Malta; Restoration of degraded habitats for pollinators; Arresting pollinator biodiversity loss interventions in Maltese and Sicilian protected areas; Clean-up all along the paths interventions. – 3. Project output indicators related to 3.1.3 Awareness campaigns for the proper enjoyment of protected areas: Setting up interpretation panels and signed walking trails in protected sites; Setting up walking trails in protected sites; Key Enabling Technologies (KETs) for pollinator eco-tourism and citizen-science in Maltese and Sicilian protected areas; Value of the eco-tourism and nature-based services provided by pollinators in Malta and Sicily protected areas; Cost benefits of the eco-tourism and nature-based services provided by pollinators in Malta and 	

Selection criteria	Assessment by the Executive Committee	Counterclaims by the potential lead partner	Reply
		<p>Sicily protected areas</p> <p>We believe that the links between the project output indicators and those of the programme have been clearly presented in the proposal being totally aimed at recovering the pollinator biodiversity in Natura 2000 sites and on increasing the awareness of these by promoting their availability for stakeholders.</p>	
<p>3.3 Project main outputs are durable in relation to the problems that afflict the two islands</p>	<p>Project generically describes the measures able to guarantee the sustainability of the outputs mainly related to the transfer of scientific knowledge, methodologies and management approaches which should be "eternal" values that could be spread out in different contexts and similar initiatives. Furthermore, it is pointed out that beneficiaries will further maintain the restored environments after the project closure and further ensure their collaboration with a specific protocol. However, it deals with obligations provided for EU Regulations. Nevertheless, due to the lack of symmetrical activities</p>	<p>The evaluator claimed the durability of the project outputs as unclear in terms of cross border value because of the lack of symmetrical activities between the two Member States. The evaluators, try to penalize the project proposal multiple times for the lack of 100% symmetrical activities in the project. However, we are happy to explain again the asymmetrical nature of the activities between Sicilian and Maltese territories. It was basically due to the intrinsic differences existing at ecological, infrastructural and regulatory levels between the two Member States. These different starting points require different approaches for the restoration of pollinator biodiversity (see description above) that depend by each singular Member State. Nevertheless, the expected project main objectives will be reached jointly by the two Countries through the cross-border approach that includes the close collaboration of the involved partners, as clearly described in the WPs. Moreover, the durability of the project outputs and</p>	<p><u>There isn't sufficient clarification or confirmation that the entitled entities will include the project findings in their institutional activities/duties after the project implementation.</u></p>

Selection criteria	Assessment by the Executive Committee	Counterclaims by the potential lead partner	Reply
	<p>between the MS', it is not clear how concretely the outputs and results can be considered durable in terms of cross border value</p>	<p>results will be guaranteed through the integration of multiple cross-border actions described in the project proposal section C2.2. Sustainability of project outputs and results, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Operation and maintenance of the restored environments post project in both Maltese and Sicilian protected areas; – Implementation of a monitoring protocol and participation to all the activities and events realized in the spirit of the project between Maltese and Sicilian Partners; – Maintenance of project signs, project outputs and visitor accessibility along the natural trails among all the protected areas of the two Member States involved in the project; – Sharing of project outputs, in terms of scientific results, publications among the partnership of the two Member States and outside (including EU and non-EU Countries). <p>The project durability will be also maintained through project replicability and scalability in other contexts, through the following mainstreaming activities that will be conducted at transboundary level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – organization of public events (presentations, conferences, workshops); – website (available even after the end of the project eligibility period); – long-term collaborations with the media (radio / TV / press contributions, interviews, social media); – publication of informative material 	

The Executive Committee gives mandate the Managing Authority to notify the response to the counter-deductions to the COCREATE VALUE project leader within the deadline set by the Public Notice.

At 6 p.m., the work of the Executive Committee is concluded.