Project closure 2021-2027

Interreg Knowledge Fair session report | March 2024

Overview

The session focused on various aspects regarding preparation to projects closure in 2021-2027 programming period. The backbone for the discussion (what is really needed, what is not for the project closure) was presentation of the final progress report template -prepared by the HIT Core Group. The report composes of obligatory and voluntary elements.

This was followed by the reflections on other elements related to projects end such as: ultimate output/results indicators check, quality check of delivered outputs (including SCOs specific outputs – lump sums), durability check, cooperation with project partners after projects closure, IT systems preparation for projects' closure.

During the session the updates on technical solutions in Jems regarding projects closure were also presented.

Methodology

Presentation of HIT closure report followed by the exchange with programmes on various aspects of project closure. As there are no big changes in requirements between previous and current programming periods, the experiences from 2014-2020 can utilized for the future simplifications and harmonisations. Discussions focused on:

1. programmes' approaches for indicators verification after project's closure;
2. cooperation after project's closure among partners and with project's institutions;
3. partner's involvement in programme improvements;
4. documents storage obligation;
5. preparation of IT systems for project's closure.

Key discussion points

What is working?

HIT is clearly evolving in terms of project closure. The first HIT could not agree on a template for the project closure report, this HIT managed to agree on a template with a high level of flexibility. Let's hope the next HIT can streamline this even further.

Programmes were positive about the implementation of HIT and the solution presented in Jems.

Due to the nature of the certain types of projects (e.g. with the infrastructure components), reports on the indicators are submitted sometime after project closure. This allows programmes for further exchanges with beneficiaries regarding the future of the partnership, feedback on the programme 'user-friendliness' and on the future challenges. These can help in better adjusting future calls and responding to applicants' needs.

What requires repairing / improvements?
The high level of optionality on the fields from section C3 till C7 reflects the procedures of the different programmes (some programmes collect necessary information through other sources than the closure report). Harmonisation on the procedure's programmes have for closing projects could be improved. Also, the way checks for project closure beyond the report seem to be different for different programmes points out that streamlining can be done on the closure procedures from programmes.

What is missing?
Programmes requested that the HIT template for optional fields will be present in Jems as a default checklist.

What would be your vision for the future?
Programmes are not yet at project closure for the 2021-2027 period but it seems that further exchanges on processes and procedures in regards to project's closure are very much welcome. If programmes could do a step into streamlining evaluation of project closure and having similar processes to monitoring progress beyond closure right now. More streamlined templates could be agreed in a future programme period.

Regulations and articles of particular significance

Common Provisions Regulation   65
Interreg regulation   36

Conclusions, plans for followed up

From 2025 webinars on exchanges on processes and procedures in regards to project's closure.

Session leader: **Grzegorz Gołda**
Delivery team: **Grzegorz Gołda, Pieter Louwers**

Report drafted by: **Grzegorz Gołda**