

## Short reporting

### Norrköping

Event SALAR

Place – Norrköping, 27 march

#### Description of the discussions during the event

See attached programme. East Central Sweden is a large region with five counties and considering travel times we elected to hold a full day conference. Brief information on the content of each part of the programme:

- **ECS cooperation – looking back**  
Describing how cooperation between the five counties in ECS has developed during the latest programme periods, how programme writing has developed, positive development of the organisation by way of a joint ECS coordinator, work with mobilising players, structural fund groups, management group, political steering group, etc.
- **ECS programme implementation – two managing authorities have the floor**  
Information about areas of intervention, budget, investments, results and conclusions so far, future challenges, areas for improvement, project bank, film about ERUF allocation within Sweden, presentation of website eufonder.se
- **Project #jagmed**  
ESF-funded project with focus on preventing early school dropout, showing film with participant interviews, describing how project measures have helped them finish their upper secondary schooling with complete grades.
- **ECS smart specialisation – cooperation and project**  
ERUF-funded project with focus on smart specialisation and the four common areas of strength within the ECS region – smart industry, tomorrow's energy solutions, sustainable food supply, life science/welfare technology.
- **EU long-term budget – EU Commission's perspective**  
Overall information about the EU long-term budget and how Sweden benefits from the inner market.
- **Prospects for cohesion policy – what are the thoughts of the commission?**  
Information about the aim of cohesion policy, the funds, the effects of the policy, the three future scenarios, time plan for the new long-term budget, focus.
- **Dialogue café: Which experiences do we bring into the next programme period?**  
See attached presentation with the questions discussed. Set-up: eight stations/tables, one question per table, 10 min per table, each participant had time to visit three tables to discuss with different representatives (EU Commission Sweden, EU Commission Brussels, Government Offices of Sweden, managing authorities, authorities responsible for regional development).
- **EU long-term budget – national level position**

Information about the Swedish Government's position, i.e. reduced spending level, Sweden's contribution must be kept down, re-prioritisation of spending, taking responsibility, more effective control.

- **Panel discussion – focus on added value of cohesion policy**

See attached programme listing the representatives who took part in the panel discussion.

The following issues were discussed; here are some of the comments:

- **What is the added value of EU cohesion policy if you could describe it with two words?**

*Collaboration, cooperation, solidarity, cohesion, strategic initiatives, multi-level governance, new knowledge, international contacts, smart specialisation, structural changes, shifting-up effect, bottom-up perspective, territorial adjustment, regional support.*

- **Are we good enough at highlighting the added value of EU cohesion policy and available structural funding?**

*No, particularly not at national level. The lower down you go in the system, the more knowledge there is about the value of EU cohesion policy. Important to draw attention with EU flags to make the policy more visible. Projects work with communication initiatives, although the managing authority would have liked to work more with this too. The project #jagmed is a clear example of added value of cohesion policy and structural funds; i.e. how you can achieve a great deal with small means, and we should become even better at giving prominence to such examples.*

- **Meta-regional cooperation is often shown as added value since we have a unique five counties cooperation within ECS. But do geography and territorial pre-conditions bear any significance on implementation and results?**

*Yes, it is significant, both for initiatives and results, that we can operate in a larger geographical area with a greater critical mass in order to create common learning and shared experiences, e.g. the #jagmed project involving five counties and more than 40 municipalities. The cooperation within ECS has developed to become a natural arena for exchanges and common measures. Meta-regional cooperation is a Swedish phenomenon, since our regions are so small compared to other regions in Europe.*

- **Initiatives receiving funding from structural funds should lead to long-term structural changes; can we demonstrate that this is the case? Are there areas where have not managed to achieve added value?**

*Yes, there is clear evidence in the presentation made by the EU Commission this morning: the differences between the regions are decreasing. Initiatives within smart specialisation have meant that we can now carry out joint initiatives internationally, which would have been impossible without EU funding. Within ESF, it has been difficult to reach the target groups people on sick-leave and non-native women.*

- **We are facing the fact of a shrinking EU budget, while we have great needs for structural initiatives relating to jobs, growth, exclusion, climate/energy. How will we solve this?**

*Take home message from national level – we cannot expect national compensation if EU funding is reduced. Instead, we must focus more and prioritise harder.*

- **What is the most important message that you take with you from the conference today?**

*Cohesion policy makes a difference and provides a force for development at local and regional levels. We must also continue to carry out active advocacy for a continued strong cohesion policy. It is important to ensure that cohesion policy includes all regions, even in the future. Focus on research/innovation, skills supply, integration, climate, and ensuring that ESF will continue to be part of cohesion policy.*

The presentations from the conference are available on the website of Region Östergötland, and you find them here. In annex, the discussion outcome of the world café.

#### Number of participants 51

#### Type of participant

- 25 Regional authorities

Regional level (authorities responsible for regional development, officials, elected representatives, members of the Regional Executive Committee, County Administrative Board, Swedish Public Employment Service)

- 9 local authorities

Local level (officials and elected representatives from local level, municipal commissioners)

- 2 EU persons

EU level (DG REGIO, European Commission representation in Sweden)

- 11 national level

National level (Government Offices of Sweden, SALAR)

Managing authorities (Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth, Swedish ESF Council)

- 2 NGO

Civil society (Cooperation/social economy)

- 2 Project promoters

Lars-Inge Jonsson, Strategic Supply Chain, Region Östergötland

10.35 ÖMS Smart specialization - cooperation and projects

Mikael Hjorth, Development Manager, Region Västmanland

#### Media coverage

- List of media

Press release before the conference to five counties (see attached press release and media mailing list), 146 press contacts for all five counties in East Central Sweden from:

Eskilstunakuriren

Sveriges Radio Sörmland

SVT Sörmland

Södertäljeposten

Sörmlandsbygden

Östergötland  
Affärsstaden  
corren.se  
ETC Norrköping  
Extra Östergötland  
Folkbladet  
Kindaposten  
Linköping News  
Linköpings tidning  
Linköpingsposten  
Motala Vadstena Tidning  
Nollelva  
Nolltretton  
Norrköping News  
Norrköpings-Magazinet  
NT  
SR Östergötlan  
SVT Nyheter Öst  
Tv-redaktionen NT/Corren  
Östgötatidningen  
Västmanland  
Mittmedia  
Dagens ETC  
SVT Västmanland  
Sala Allehanda  
Västmanlands Television  
Taltidningen VKL  
Sveriges Radio Västmanland  
Magazin24.se  
Västerås tidning  
Uppsala län  
Arbetarebladet  
Sala Allehanda  
Uppsala Nya tidning  
24 Uppsala  
Sveriges Radio Uppl  
Norrteletidning  
Sigtunabygden  
Uppsala tidning  
Radio P4 Uppland  
SVT Uppsala  
Örebro  
SVT Örebro  
Örebrokuriren  
Värmlandsnytt  
Örebroarn  
Karlskoga tidning  
Länsposten  
Kumlant  
Sveriges Radio Örebro

- Social media activities before, during and after the event (Tweets, Facebook, etc.)
- Posts on social media at #EUinmyregion (Facebook, Twitter)

Before

Facebook event:

<https://www.facebook.com/events/1818608011494089/>

Facebook post: 32 views

During

- <https://twitter.com/regionost/status/978589146359959552> (2 retweets, 6 likes)
- <https://twitter.com/regionost/status/978568489727348736> (8 retweets, 12 likes)
- <https://twitter.com/regionost/status/978551331974762496> (5 retweet; 8 likes)
- <https://twitter.com/regionost/status/978543892751704064> (5 retweets, 10 likes)

Twitterpost 1: 6 likes

Twitterpost 2: 12 likes

Twitterpost 3: 8 likes

Twitterpost 4: 10 likes

After

Post video on Facebook

<https://www.facebook.com/regionostergotland/videos/2166347163578817/>

Facebook post with attached video: 2513 views

Post video on You Tube

[https://youtu.be/\\_3TSYGoUF1o](https://youtu.be/_3TSYGoUF1o)

- Press conference no
- Press release yes
- <http://www.mynewsdesk.com/se/region-oestergotland-2/pressreleases/saa-paaverkar-eu-s-regionalpolitik-oestergotland-2461476>
- Webpage visits: 112 views  
Invitation and dissemination information published on the Region Östergötland website  
<https://www.regionostergotland.se/Regional-utveckling/Internationell-samverkan/>  
<https://www.regionostergotland.se/Om-regionen/Pressrum/Nyheter/Sa-paverkar-EUs-regionalpolitik-Ostergotland/>
- Video  
Film (attached), also published on Facebook at #EUinmyregion (Region Östergötland Facebook and the region's Brussels Office Facebook)  
[https://youtu.be/\\_3TSYGoUF1o](https://youtu.be/_3TSYGoUF1o) (english)  
<https://www.facebook.com/regionostergotland/videos/2166347163578817/> (swedish)
- Press clipping after the dialogue indicated and number of articles echoed by media  
Article published on Nyheter.se : <http://www.nt.se/asikter/debatt/ett-viktigt-eu-stod-om5128175.aspx>

## **Annex I Summary of discussion from world café**

### **What challenges should we prioritize in the next programming period?**

- The thematic objectives are still good and relevant
- Digitalization should be included
- The investment priorities should be applied as a circle with innovation and SME in focus (like for example Van Guard where different initiatives support other initiatives).
- Rural development should be included in the cohesion policy and managed by the regional authorities in charge of the operational programmes.
- It should be possible to revise the thematic objectives in the middle of a programming period to adjust.

### **How can we work more efficiently with a reduced budget for cohesion policy?**

- It is important that Sweden is active and engaged in the MFF negotiations
- Cohesion policy plays an important role in the strive for an EU close to its citizens
- We are concerned about reduced resources within cross-border cooperation
- It is important to find synergies between CAP and CP in order to maximize the effect of invested resources.
- We need to get more information about the national position on MFF (will all regions be involved, reduced funding opportunities etc).

### **What experiences do we have from the current programming period?**

The need for:

- Simplified application processes, reporting and regulations.
- Coordination of funding, the way the managing authorities are interpreting current regulations in different ways. One managing authority for the ERDF and ESF would be good.
- Increased consensus on horizontal criteria within and between managing authorities
- Reduction of the level of uncertainty regarding the reimbursement of participants in ESF-projects
- Consensus among managing authorities regarding the criteria for eligible lead partners (especially organizations in the social economy).
- Increased planning in advance when publishing new calls, and longer application periods in order to have enough time for mobilization of stakeholders.

### **What kind of needs should the CP match next period among our citizens?**

- It is important to highlight the added value of CP and concrete results. We have a tendency to only highlight EU and various funding opportunities, and we should focus more on the effect of the CP.
- We need to launch more campaigns and articles about current investments.
- In general, Sweden should try to highlight EU-funding more, there seems to be more visibility in other European countries.
- If the knowledge about EU, EU-funding and its added value had been higher I guess our government wouldn't have the budget restrictive position like today
- We need to be able to invest in projects involving migrants in an earlier stage.
- It is important to connect investments in ESF and ERDF to current trends in terms of digitalization, globalization and work. How can we build for the future and not just focus on existing structures?

**How can we make CP more visible to our citizens?**

- We could do a better job highlighting EU funding in general
- We disseminate information to stakeholders which are already involved, we should try to reach new target groups.
- We need to highlight the added value of EU funding
- Sometimes you get the impression that stakeholders in Sweden are ashamed about receiving EU-funding, we still have the approach that we should be able to solve our challenges without external funding
- We need to realize that our knowledge about EU and EU funding is too low and that is why we can't seem to increase the visibility of this kind of funding

**If we need to prioritize even more in the coming period, how do we do that and what should we prioritize?**

- We should only decide upon the direction and allocate funding
- The regional authorities responsible for regional development is already managing this task, let us continue!
- If the future research programme will become more important the universities should be included in the programming process
- If the budget is reduced the national authorities must receive more funding from the government in order to cover the funding which will be missing

**How can we mobilize stakeholders in an even better way in the next period? Which stakeholders are important to mobilize?**

- The mobilizing activities have been carried out in different ways. The ESF-project #jagmed is a good example, where we conducted a pilot study before the first call. We had a close cooperation between the ESF managing authority and the stakeholders.
- We need to identify challenges and prioritized areas in the same way as last time.
- Current regulations make it difficult for stakeholders in the social economy to engage in EU-funded projects, and in terms of implementation these stakeholders are very important.
- The cooperation in East Central Sweden has been very valuable and we should really try to evaluate this cooperation since there are areas for improvement such as planning in advance, clear rules and regulations and increased transparency.