

---

## Hungary – Croatia CBC OP 2014-2020 Joint Workshop of the programming expert team and the ex-ante evaluator team

### „Environment“ Priority Axis

2014

---

**Date:** 4th February 2014

**Venue:** Danube-Drava National Park - Dráva Kapu Bemutatóközpont - Drávaszentes

---

Facilitators:

- Tamás Lunk
- György Márton
- Mirna Žunić
- Ana-Maria Boromisa
- Helena Čermak
- Zsanett Kaprinyák
- Nóra Kocsis

#### **Introduction**

This a summary report of the outcome of the workshop on Environment under the framework of **”The programming for the cross-border co-operation between Hungary and Croatia for 2014-2020”**. The workshop took place between 10:00-14:00 on 4th February 2014 in the Danube-Drava National Park - Dráva Kapu Bemutatóközpont (H-7570 Barcs-Drávaszentes, Fő u. 1.)

#### **Workshop objectives**

The workshop aimed to support the planning team in order to get feedback about the „Environment” Priority Axis. The participants had the chance to get an overview of the situation analysis, specific objectives, actions to be supported, result and output indicators, main target groups and type of beneficiaries.

The workshop provided opportunity for the planners to react on the evaluation judgements and when it is

justified revise their conclusions based on participants' feedback. This constructive iterative dialogue will lead to higher quality of the Operational Programme.

### **The composition of participants**

The main target group of the workshops are a wider scope of stakeholders. Altogether 41 participants (24 from Croatia and 17 from Hungary) participated in the discussions. List of Participants are presented in the Annex I.

Participants mostly came from authorities (water management authorities, national parks, county governments, local governments, development agencies, ministries). Seven people represented the programming expert team and ex-ante expert team.

### **The method of the event**

At the first part of the workshop the situation of natural and cultural assets and the proposed intervention logic of the „**Environment**” **Priority Axis** were presented by the planners. During the presentations participants could put sudden questions and could take sudden comments.

After the plenary session **participants were divided into three groups** according to the following topics:

- **Environment:** Protecting and restoring biodiversity, soil protection and restoration and promoting ecosystem services including NATURA 2000 and green infrastructures
- **Tourism:** Conserving, protecting and developing cultural and natural heritage
- **Waste management:** Promoting innovative technologies to improve environmental protection and resource efficiency in the waste sector, water sector and with regard to soil or to reduce air pollution

Based on the table, which includes the main topics and which was distributed as a working material (see below), in the first part of the discussion the participants talked about the specific objectives and the result indicators then the moderators presented the summary of the results. After the lunch the groups discussed the actions to be supported, the type of outputs and output indicators and the main target groups and beneficiaries.

### **Minutes of sessions:**

#### **1. Environment**

After the preliminary presentations during the second part of the workshop the participants had the possibility to get involved to the process and discussed the main topics related to the Environment protection.

This part was an interactive brainstorming. Participants were involved in the common thinking. The major part of participants was active. The members of the ex-ante team moderated the discussion and the members of the programming team answered the questions related to the TO.

There were several remarks, suggestions. General debate was evolved on the arisen problems. Participants were encouraged to take part of the debate, take comments and proposals.

The relevant **selected thematic objective is** “Preserving and protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency” (TO6).

This thematic objective will receive about 45% from the total budget, altogether 7-10 million euros.

**Investment priority:** “Protecting and restoring biodiversity, soil protection and restoration and promoting ecosystem services including NATURA 2000 and green infrastructures” (6d).

**Specific objective:** “Enhanced collaboration in restoration of biodiversity and protection and promotion of ecosystems in the border areas”.

**Result indicators:** “Level of cross border cooperation in development and integration of nature management”

An important question was how should be defined the result indicator. Qualitative indicator could be also appropriate. There was no suggestion for this type of indicator. Level of biodiversity could not be identified as a result indicator because it is hard to measure. There is no one overall measure about the improvement of biodiversity and situation is not strictly controlled.

Participants mentioned that there are international databases focusing on providing scientific data on biodiversity available via the Internet. These databases facilitate free and open access to biodiversity data to underpin sustainable development. Supporting the improvement of biodiversity is an important step towards effective ecosystem management and sustainable development, but there is no single, agreed-upon way how to express the achievement comprehensively. That is the reason why result indicator in this case should be related to results / outcomes of nature management in a qualitative way.

**Several actions are identified in the OP:**

- Management plans for Natura 2000 sights and other protected areas;
- Joint plans for the conservation of key species and habitats;



- Conservation and restoration of cross-border ecosystems, especially in Natura 2000;
- Joint research, monitoring projects aiming to support biodiversity, soil protection;
- Valorization and promotion of ecosystem services in the border area;
- Investments in nature interpretation infrastructure;
- Awareness-raising, education and training in relation to nature conservation;
- Community involvement in nature protection;
- Cooperation, exchange of experiences and knowledge between institutions;

Three additional topics came up related to environmental issues, which is not obviously related to current specific objectives, but need to be included in the Programme:

- **Demining activity:** approximately 1 million euros need to cost efficient action each in Croatia and in Hungary, but it is a bigger problem in Croatia and they don't have information about the mine polluted areas in Hungary and about the priority of this topic;
- According to the opinion of a participant the specific objective is a bit narrow. Possibility of the **usage hot water and geothermal energy** is missing. In addition, documents in this field have already been prepared in frame of the previous Programme. Probably 2.3 should be modified in order to involve these activities.
- In the field of **risk management** there are more topics to be integrated:  
  
prevention of pollutions; prompt response in case of disasters; improvement of the already existing information system; collection of dangerous waste materials;

According to the opinion of the participants there are new topics to be added to the list of actions. These are the following:

- controlling and harmonized monitoring of the invasive species: especially increasing the protected species and habitat restoration;
- water retention which could be connected to the climate change and it could be also linked to biodiversity;
- promoting/restoring traditional land use (traditional farming, land grass);  
  
activity connected the honey production (Protection of the acacia tree (controversy since acacia tree is invasive species))

After the discussion about this topic the members of the group were asked to score actions ranking which

actions they would like to be included in the OP. Everybody had three votes. According to the scoring activity the following actions got the most votes:

- Joint research, monitoring projects aiming to support biodiversity, soil protection
- Management plans for Natura 2000 sights and other protected areas;
- Conservation and restoration of cross-border ecosystems, especially in Natura 2000;
- Protection of invasive species;
- Cooperation, exchange of experiences and knowledge between institutions;
- Community involvement in nature protection (– could be integrated into all kind of actions)

‘Investments in nature interpretation infrastructure’ and ‘Community involvement in nature protection’ could be the part of all activities, so it should be defined as horizontal activity.

There were some actions which were not chosen:

“Joint plans for the conservation of key species and habitats” and the “Valorization and promotion of ecosystem services in the border area” were less important and interesting for the group, they suggested that these could be integrated into another actions.

#### **Types of outputs and output indicators:**

- Number of sites with new or improved nature interpretation infrastructure;
- Number of participants in joint education training schemes and awareness raising actions;
- Established or extended cross-border networks aimed at nature conservation;

The participants suggested the listed indicators to be added:

- Size of the restored area (restored traditional land use);
- Number of cross-border restored habitats
- Number of protected species;
- Number of joint, international studies (monitoring, survey, management plan etc.);
- Number of involved people / companies in cooperation / exchange of experiences
- Time of response in case of disaster;
- ‘Networks’ should be replaced ‘partnership’ due to already existing networks of Natura 2000 and Mura-Drava-Danube Biosphere reserve and very little possibility of new ones. Word “partnership” gives better platform for new cross border partnerships on local and regional level.

Furthermore, 'Number of sites with new or improved nature interpretation infrastructure' should be defined as **horizontal indicator**, in case this activity will be listed as horizontal.

**Main target groups and types of beneficiaries:**

- Regional and local development agencies;
- Local and regional self-governments and business undertakings of those;
- National level bodies (institutions, authorities, etc.) responsible for the nature, environment and waters.

Participants agreed that the target groups and beneficiaries are adequate but civil organisations (NGOs) are missing from the list. There are a lot of NGOs which are active in the environment protection. The third point should be completed with regional and local level bodies. Still there was a question from several participants how is it possible for regional development agencies to be eligible applicants for calls under this investment priority of TO if they are not directly responsible for nature protection and preservation and have no experience in the field.

**Further questions:**

- Could a profit-oriented company (Ltd.- e.g.: forestry Ltd / development agencies ) be a potential beneficiary which operates in the name of the government (profit goes to the government) and / or is regarded as non-profit organisation?
- Is it possible to involve that area as eligible area which is not connected to the border area but connected to the protected field?
- Could the project implementation be longer (for example for 5 years) in case of monitoring activity which requires longer time frame to carry out follow-up?

**2. Tourism**

The relevant **selected thematic objective is** "Preserving and protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency" (TO6).

**Investment Priority:** "Conserving, protecting and developing cultural and natural heritage (6c)"

In line with agreed methodology and timetable, the discussion on Investment priority 2.1. Conserving, protecting and developing cultural and natural heritage dealt with five topics: (i) specific objectives, (ii) actions to be supported (iii) result indicators (iv) types of outputs and output indicators and (v) main target groups and types of beneficiaries.

### Specific objectives:

The discussion group endorsed specific objective 3 *Increase the potential of the region to generate economic value-added by the sustainable use of its natural and cultural heritage*. It was concluded that it was well formulated and necessary for the programme area.

As regards specific objective 4 *Improve the conservation status and the degree of protection of the region's natural assets and ecosystems*, the discussion group concluded that it supports investment priority 2.2. rather than 2.1 Thus, it was recommended that this specific objective should be linked primarily with investment priority 2.2.

### Actions to be supported:

- Joint strategies of sustainable tourism and culture-based tourism, pilot investments;
- Preservation, promotion and utilization of common or complementary elements of cultural and natural heritage;
- Common offer of products and services in the area of sustainable tourism.

The discussion group concluded that the actions to be supported in proposed wording correspond more to the needs of rural than urban areas. Also, it was recognized that in previous programming period numerous joint strategies were prepared. While some of them are not publicly available, they still present a solid basis for actions. It was suggested that in this programming period rather than joint strategies and other types of soft actions more attention should be given to infrastructure and implementation. In this context, the discussion group proposed following changes to the proposed actions.

~~Joint strategies~~ **Planning and implementing activities supporting** sustainable tourism and culture based tourism, pilot investments

Preservation, **refurbishment**, promotion and utilization of common or complementary elements of cultural and natural heritage,

Common offer of products and services in the area of sustainable tourism.

Discussion group considered that this type of activities should include thematic routes of cultural heritage and activities relevant for enabling access to sites.

Also, the discussion group considered that following activities linked to the investment priority 2.2. are also relevant for investment priority 2.1:

- Investment in nature interpretation infrastructure;
- Awareness-rising, education and training in relation to nature conservation.

### Result indicators:

- Level of valorisation of cultural and natural heritage;
- Level of information on the status of natural assets and ecosystems.

The group concluded that the level of valorization of cultural and natural heritage might be appropriate provided that adequate methodology for measuring level and defining baseline is applied.

As regard the second output indicator, level of information on the status of natural assets and ecosystem, the discussion group concluded that it was not appropriate for measuring progress towards specific objective 4 *Improve the conservation status and the degree of protection of the region's natural assets and ecosystems*. The main shortcoming of the proposed indicator is that it does not correspond to the status of natural assets.

However, as the discussion group considered that the specific objective 4 should be discussed under investment priority 2.2. this issue was not further elaborated.

#### **Types of outputs and output indicators:**

- Number of developed or preserved elements of cultural/natural heritage;
- Number of jointly developed sustainable tourism products and services;
- Number of organisations/entities participating in cultural and natural heritage development.

The discussion group suggests that outputs related to Preservation, **refurbishment**, promotion and utilization of common or complementary elements of cultural and natural heritage, should also include refurbishment.

**Other outputs were considered well.**

#### **Target groups and types of beneficiaries:**

- Regional and sector development agencies;
- Local and regional self-governments and business undertakings of those;
- National level bodies (institutions, authorities etc.) responsible for the nature, environment and waters.

The discussion group recommended to include NGOs, cultural institutions and tourist board among main target groups and beneficiaries.

There was discussion on the status of undertakings, as development agencies in Croatia take form of ltds or public institutions.

Also, it was suggested that companies performing public services (such as Croatian Forests) should be included among target groups /potential beneficiaries.

### **3. Waste management**

The relevant **selected thematic objective is** “Preserving and protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency” (TO6).

**Investment Priority:** “Promoting innovative technologies to improve environmental protection and

resource efficiency in the waste sector, water sector and with regard to soil or to reduce air pollution (6ea)”

**Actions to be supported:**

- CBC solid waste management strategy and action plan;
- Solid waste management projects to reusing, recycling and energetic usage of solid waste;
- Innovative pilot and demonstration projects on solid waste prevention;
- Innovative pilot and demonstration projects regarding water management and soil protection.

**Present proposal are the following:**

**Diverting the waste:**

- joint activities in communication, awareness raising;
- 1 joint action plan in logistics and treatment – for diversion.

**Croatian concerns:**

Osijek solid waste plant with Strabag – it was cancelled, Strabag has sued the cities in the East.

In Koprivnica situation is different.

Nationally: 2 solid waste management centres were defined: Osijek, Koprivnica. 128 local governments have signed contract with solid waste centre (Piskornica). All issues of solid waste are coordinated nationally. Cities are obliged to build recycling yards. There is limited room for local actions in solid waste management.

**Common proposal:**

OPEN UP the scope of the intervention to other issues belonging to investment priority 6f:

- Innovative pilot and demonstration projects regarding waste management, water management and soil protection, air quality;
- Awareness raising actions.

**Result indicators in the OP:**

- Quantity of prevented and diverted (recycled or materially or energetically reused) waste in cross border cooperation

**Proposed result indicators:**

- CO<sub>2</sub> reduction: solid waste, waste water, air – it could be surely applicable.

There are CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents for all type of polluters – this result indicator could be applied.

- Number of people reached by awareness raising actions

Expert remark: CO<sub>2</sub> reduction: it is hard to find a baseline!!!

**Types of outputs and output indicators:**

- Number of jointly elaborated CBC solid waste management strategy and action plan for the border region;
- Number of jointly developed projects on diversion (recycling, reusing) of solid waste;
- Number of jointly developed pilot solid waste prevention projects.

**Proposed output indicators:**

- Number of innovative actions
- Number of awareness raising actions

**Target groups and types of beneficiaries:**

- Regional and sector development agencies;
- Local and regional self-governments and business undertakings of those;
- Service providers, national and regional authorities in the waste sector;
- Civil organisations.

**One additional topic came up related to the proposed additional beneficiaries:**

- Non-profit organisations

Profit oriented organisations should be omitted.

**The content and results of the event**

Several proper proposals were taken by the participants, which the evaluators agreed with. This definitely brought added value to the WS and to the planning process. More added values can be identified at this stage of the planning process.

For further comments and suggestions, two email addresses were given to the participants ([huhrcbc@vitalpro.hu](mailto:huhrcbc@vitalpro.hu), [hu-hr.cbc@razbor.hu](mailto:hu-hr.cbc@razbor.hu)).



The Programme is co-financed by the  
European Union



# ANNEX



Hungary-Croatia

IPA Cross-border Co-operation Programme

The Programme is co-financed by the European Union



Investment priorities	Specific objective	Actions to be supported	Result indicators	Types of outputs and output indicators	Main target groups and types of beneficiaries
2.1 Conserving, protecting and developing cultural and natural heritage (6c)	3 Increase the potential of the region to generate economic value-added by the sustainable use of its natural and cultural heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Joint strategies of sustainable tourism and culture-based tourism, pilot investments</li> <li>Preservation, promotion and utilization of common or complementary elements of cultural and natural heritage</li> <li>Common offer of products and services in the area of sustainable tourism</li> </ul>	Level of valorisation of cultural and natural heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of developed or preserved elements of cultural/natural heritage</li> <li>Number of jointly developed sustainable tourism products and services</li> <li>Number of organisations/entities participating in cultural and natural heritage development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional and sector development agencies</li> <li>Local and regional governments and business undertakings of those</li> <li>National level bodies (institutions, authorities etc) responsible for the natural environment and waters</li> </ul>
	4 Improve the conservation status and the degree of protection of the region's natural assets and ecosystems		Level of information on the status of natural assets and ecosystems		
2.2 protecting and restoring biodiversity, soil protection and restoration and promoting ecosystem services including NATURA 2000 and green infrastructures (6d)	5 Enhanced collaboration in restoration of biodiversity and protection and promotion of ecosystems in the border areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Management plans for Natura 2000 sights and other protected areas</li> <li>Joint plans for the conservation of key species and habitats</li> <li>Conservation and restoration of cross-border ecosystems, especially in Natura 2000</li> <li>Joint research, monitoring projects aiming to support biodiversity, soil protection</li> <li>Valorisation and promotion of ecosystem services in the border area</li> <li>Investments in nature interpretation infrastructure</li> <li>Awareness-rising, education and training in relation to nature conservation</li> <li>Community involvement in nature protection</li> <li>Cooperation, exchange of experiences and knowledge between institutions</li> </ul>	Level of cross border cooperation in development and integration of nature management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of sites with new or improved nature interpretation infrastructure</li> <li>Number of participants in joint education training schemes and awareness raising programmes</li> <li>Established or extended cross-border networks aimed at nature conservation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional and sector development agencies</li> <li>Local and regional governments and business undertakings of those</li> <li>National level bodies (institutions, authorities, etc) responsible for the natural environment and waters</li> </ul>
2.3 Promoting innovative technologies to improve environmental protection and resource efficiency in the waste sector, water sector and with regard to soil or to reduce air pollution (6ea)	6 Promoting technological innovation and effective management of waste and water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CBC solid waste management strategy and action plan</li> <li>Solid waste management projects to reusing, recycling and energetic usage of solid waste</li> <li>Innovative pilot and demonstration projects on solid waste prevention</li> <li>Innovative pilot and demonstration projects regarding water management and soil protection</li> </ul>	Quantity of prevented and diverted (recycled or materially or energetically reused) waste in cross border cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of jointly elaborated CBC solid waste management strategy and action plan for the border region</li> <li>Number of jointly developed projects on diversion (recycling, reusing) of solid waste</li> <li>Number of jointly developed pilot solid waste prevention projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional and sector development agencies</li> <li>Local and regional governments and business undertakings of those</li> <li>Service providers, national and regional authorities in the waste sector</li> <li>Civil organisations</li> </ul>



Hungary-Croatia  
IPA Cross-border Co-operation Programme

The Programme is co-financed by the  
European Union



HUNGARY - CROATIA CROSS-BORDER CO-OPERATION PROGRAMME 2014 - 2020

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

04. 02. 2014 DRAVA SZENTES

NAME	ORGANISATION	E-MAIL	SIGNATURE
1. ZITA KOVALINE KISS	SEFAG ZRT.	kiss.zita@sefag.hu	
2. ISTVÁN MERCEZL	SMETE, SEFAFT.	mercezl.istvan@sefag.hu	
3. ANA-MARKA BODOMISKA	IRMO	anamarka@irmo.hr	
4. MIRVA ŽUNIĆ	RAZBOR Ltd	mirva.zunic@razbor.hr	
5. HELENA ČERMAR	IRMO	heleca@irmo.hr	
6. TATJANA ANŽIĆ ŠABO	Pi for nature VPC	tatjana.anzic@pi@gmail.com	
7. ÉSZKÖTT KAPRI NYÁK	EX-acte	eskozott@exactproject.hu	
8. ADÁM KALTIAR	BARAZA NYELVES ZFK.	kaltiar@baraza-police.hu	
9. ĐURĐKO KRŠKIN	HCR PDR. KOB-OSJEK	durbko.krskinski@hcr.hr	
10. DAMIR LOJŠIĆ	OSJEK-GRANICA POLICIJA	lojsic@osje.hr	
11. NADA KOBUŠIĆ	ERA Slavonija & Baranja	nada.kobusic@era.hr	
12. VERA CSABA	BIOKOM Nonprofit Ltd	vera.csaba@biokom.hu	
13. SILVIA GAJDIĆ	DEVELOPMENT AGENCY NORTH (DAN)	silvia.gajdic@dan.hr	
14. IVAN ŠIMIĆ	REA NORTH	ivan.simic@rea-sjever.hr	
15. BOŽIS KUHAČIĆ	REA NORTH	bozis.kuhacic@rea-sjever.hr	
16. ATTILA SEIZARTÓ	LAG RINA-DRAVA SZENTESÉ	seizarto@rinadrava.hu	
17. MARIJA PODOLSKI	GRAD KAZENCI	marija.podolski@kazenci.hr	
18. GILJANA STOSAVIČIĆ	KRIŽAN GRAD KAZENCI	giljana.krizan@kazenci.hr	
19. KATALIN IVÁNYI	DORUG Nonprofit Kft.	katalin.ivanyi@dorug.hu	



Hungary-Croatia  
IPA Cross-border Co-operation Programme

The Programme is co-financed by the  
European Union



NAME	ORGANISATION	E-MAIL	SIGNATURE
20. JASMIN SADIKOVIC	ZEDENI OASISER	JASMIN@ZEDENI-OASISER.HR	
21. ZDANKO MATHEVIC	TOURIST ASSOCIATION KROJAVICA-KRIZEVCI	URED@TZ-KCKZ.COM	
22. SUZANA BLEBIC	CCE - COUNTY CHAIRMAN	skolesaric@hkg.hr	
23. MILAN VANBURG	CCE -	mivanburg@hkg.hr	
24. SZUCS MARTON	HU-HR JTS	mszucs@vati.hu	
25. Tóth Vilmos	AUGUSZINA	aug.vilmos.toth@me.gov.hu	
26. JELENKA BUDAY	European Development Innovation & Energy	jejenka@szmogy.hu	
27. WEILING PETER	BM NATASZODFAUZELEM 16.	PETER.WEILING@NATVED.GOV.HU	
28. DOMJAN GABOR	Binn Katasztrófavédelem	GABOR.DOMJAN@katved.gov.hu	
29. Nemeth Gabor	DDVIZIG	nemeth.gabor@ddvizig.hu	
30. FRIKKE TERESIA	ORSZAGA DDVIZIG	frike.teresia-orsza@ddvizig.hu	
31. BALATONTI LASZLO	DDVIZIG	BALATONTI.LASZLO@DDVIZIG.HU	
32. KOCSIS TAMAS	DDVIZIG Pcs	tamas.kocsis@ddvizig.hu	
33. IPAMER Zoltan	STRDA	ipamer.zoltan@deldunantel.com	
34. FRANJO BABIC	PORF	info@porf.com.hr	
35. OLIVKA GILGAI	TZ GRADA KRIZEVICA	tz@krizevci.hr	
36. YANDA STAMPUT	HŠ DOO USPNAŠICE	usanda.stamput@hrsume.hr	
37. KARMELA GLOVA	HŠ DOO USPNAŠICE	karmela.glova@hrsume.hr	
38. NATASA RAY	HŠ DOO USPNAŠICE	natasa.ray@hrsume.hr	
39. MARTA LENAC	JAVNA AGENCIJA ZA UPRAVLJANJE PROMETOM PRIL. VJ. NA PODRUČJU KOPRIVNICE	info@zasista-petrole-kckz.hr	
40. BUCHNER ESTER	DDVIZIG	buchner@ddvizig.com.hu	
41. KOCSIS NORA	IG EX ANTE LTD	kocsis@IG-EXANTE.HU	
42.			