Conclusions:

Item 2 –

GR - Issues with Pillar 1, too vague texts in horizontal and cross-cutting topics as well as indicators. We would need an expert in Pillar 1 to finalise texts of Pillar 1.

IT – Comments for Pillar 3 and Pillar 5 not considered.

Pillar 5 – They excluded the health.

Pillar 4 – received comments from SI, GR, ME, HR, after deadline AL comments, that were not considered in the final text.

Pillar 1 – external expertise is needed to complete Pillar 1

Pillar 2 – Incicators, in draft AP he tried to reply to comments of GR, what do we want to monitor with indicators. Are these sth to monitor what the Pillars do or to the evolution in the topics. This substantial approach is not clarified.

GR – A different approach, GR gave some inputs. They understand this issue, In prdr to have the action not just a book that will give general input or a whishlist, we need targets and dicators, to monitor the progress. These targets are indicative in AP, but they will be further defined, but we need them to have a way forward, otherwise we won’t be able to see the progress. External expert is needed who will contact all PCs and discuss with them what is needed. Not all indicators refer to Pillars, meetings and events are not right, what do you expect from the Masterplan. Each pillar has to have special indicators. We are aligned with Pierluigi, but more defined indicators are needed.

Pillar 2 - Progress needs to be monitor, progress in each action would be risky to monitor, if programmes will approve projects is not in domain of TSG, do we want to monitor the work of the push, or are we trying to monitor wheather the push will be successful and relevant projects will be financed.

Pillar 1 – Indicators as hot topic, there could be given some kind of priority, very diverse actions, but indicators would give us possibility to prioritise.

HR – next steps how to shape our work to be effective and meaningful.

IT- when will the IT comments be considered. Indicators, we are all involved in embedding, the indicators in cohesion will be linked to projects financed. We have to see how we can find the best match between cohesion and our AP, they hope an expert could help in this process.

HR – additional time needed, more consultation would be needed to see how this topic of health could be integrated.

EC – recall, SWD and Comm are two documents of the EC, Comm is sent to Council and Parliament, your ideas are welcome but it is up to them to write it. They do not need our input. For AP is more practical, we need an agreement we need to work in partnership with EUSAIR. There are deadlines and it is important to stick to them. 16 October we will not be done, work will continue and there are quite some areas where we need to work. The comments in consolidated drafts, there is need to further elaboration. There are many comments also from colleagues. If you send the documents, they will identify areas that need further work.

Proposal after mid October specific ad hoc meetings, 4 seprate contributions, horizontal and cross-cutting issues need to be further addressed, maybe even become priorities. Indicators for cohesion, here we want to measure more, there are several dimensions we need to grasp.

The issue is the following, you have to streamline the document, there are too many actions blue oriented and not enough green. We need inclusive strategy. Related to governance, many are with us, but not all are here. All countries need to participate in the Strategy. You cannot be just ov+bserver, all need to participate actively.

We claim Strategy need to support enlargement, buit ipa ,countries are not active enough. If these countries wish this to be a more highlighted topic, it would need to be more stressed in the AP

We need indicators that measure what we bring to the candidate countries.

External expertise we should try to organize.

HR – to put perspective on this process, we started this process in 2021, we had numerous meeting, surprised that some issues were raised today, that would need to be resolved at very beginning. If we do not succeed with this process with this EC, we will prolong the process very much. EUSDR – the input document was even worse and together with commission services and national coordinators, the work was done and document improved.

GR – We should not work for the document of quality, the whole issue with external expert was nor successful. We need an expert that will finalise the document. Concerns about the timeline. Not to restart from scratch, to further elaborate horizontal topics and indicators.

GR, Vasilis – confused, the revision process in the hands of the Strategy and EC tells us on the other hand what are the concern. What is then role of EC. Blue and green, EUSAIR evolved from the sea basin strategy.

EC – Commission services, they have the ability to hire experts, uncertainty, EC is commenting the document that is not ready. IT saying there are issues not taken on board, we need to put an end to this discussion. You need to be ready for phase two.

Reflection on our role, we would not like to return to co-chairing, SWD needs to be aligned with EC policies. Out of 10 priorities for the region, if you hit 1 you will not be visible, if you hit 6, would be great, but also to consider your capacities. It is not easy to assign role to you or us, we are together. Question of political visibility.

Eirini – who will say when it is enough, where do we stop.

B&H – he expected Gill will react to the words said by Vasilis. Wheather this strategy is sea basin strategy or MRS, is it blue or green? How we are now addressing the objective of the strategy. All the time our proposals have been rejected by the same countries. Is this Strategy sea bsin strategy or MRS, if it is sea basin, then strategy should address these topics.

HR – EUSAIR is based on sea basin strategy, given Strategy is zransforming and new member are coming, we could make it more green, not to lower the focus on blue, but to stress the hinterland more, this would improve the interest of non-eu countries.

GR – we are in a good point, we can close it as it is, even if without indicators at this point, we have to end it at one point.

IT- bilateral meetings

Pillar 3 – if comment is rejected needs to be clarified why. Climate change as new pillar was not established, they can discuss any further comments.

Filip – in favour of the proposal with IT, to do it on Wednesday morning at 10.00 or tomorrow afternoon or Monday next week on 9th.

Milena – for Pillar 1 they had not good exchange of information with external experts. TSGs are responsible for gathering of comments, they had no open discussion with experts. They have not intended themselves as experts for entire Pillar 1. The region is very interested , but TSG is not.

HR – PCs need to facilitate the discussion.

The first day of GB to resolve the remaining issues.

Methodology on indicators to be discussed at NC meeting.

Ad hoc meetings to be organized in the following months between EC,

This week we work bilaterally.

HR – conclusions - We try to do our best to resolve as much as we can in this week on bilateral and trilateral level. Approach all of you separately. To close as many comments as possible. Use the GB an NC meeting for any additional fine tuning. To close the documents and consideration further work needs to be done on horizontal topics and indicators, then EC will come back to us with some specific requests and ad hoc meetings in upcoming 2-3 months in smaller setting, to finalise the document.

EC – sea basin strategies two macroregional strategies with maritime focus,

Pillar 1 – what is deadline for discussion on horizontal topics and indicators?

GR – they will try to hire someone for pillar 1, they would also ask Presidency to higher someone to work on the final points to resolve.

Milena – PCs are coordinators, not experts. RWG gave a lot of responsibilities to PCs but also hear us, when we ask for help. Opposite comments from different countries.

Gilles – lack of expertise, the FP and Presidency can resolve this, we have to rely on our strengths. They will not insert any specificities for the region. To devide time in two blocks, two weeks to finalise something, how comments were considered. After mid October we can work in smaller groups, if at TSG level do not have enough expertise, therefore you could not , they could see if the EC experts could help, or national experts. Proactive role until mid October. 3 options and see if we can all agree. We have to have an overview. At a certain point we need to discuss the overall document. Online meetings, but from time to time, physical meetings are also possible.

Indicators – if we have a very specific question, they could help.

Midhat – the idea is not to reopen everything, but how to be more flexible.

Vasilis – in bilateral meetings will EC also be represented by relevant DGs.

This week and Monday before Dubrovnik to work on critical issues in the current AP, comments, bilateral, trilateral form, Presidency, PC, NC, FP. Requests for meetings, be on disposal, so we can move forward.