

STATEMENT OF CONCLUSIONS

INTERREG MONITORING COMMITTEE

Written procedure

From October 24 to November 14, 2025

INTERREG V INDIAN OCEAN PROGRAM





Table of contents

1. Summary of the opinions and responses from the Managing Authority.....	3
2. Decisions of the Interreg Monitoring Committee	3
ANNEX 1a : Observations from the European Commission (DG REGIO).....	4
ANNEX 1b : Response from the Managing Authority to the observations made by DG REGIO (European Commission)	5
ANNEX 2 : Observations from the Economic, Social, and Environmental Council of Réunion (CESER).....	6

The INTERREG Monitoring Committee was consulted through a written procedure from October 24 to November 14, 2025.

1. Summary of the opinions and responses from the Managing Authority

Two formal opinions have been received as part of this procedure (see annexes).

- **Opinion from the Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy (DG REGIO) of the European Commission**

In its "file note" dated November 4, 2025 (presented in Annex 1a), DG REGIO makes several observations, to which the Managing Authority proposes specific responses presented in Annex 1b.

- **Opinion from the Regional Economic, Social, and Environmental Council (CESER)**

The Managing Authority thanks the Council for its observations (presented in Annex 2), which highlight the rigor and constant efforts of the Managing Authority in steering and implementing the Interreg V program, which has been marked by an unprecedented health crisis.

Furthermore, the Managing Authority takes note of the CESER's recommendation regarding the creation of a strategic committee for regional and Indo-Pacific cooperation and proposes to continue discussions within the Commission on Territories, Europe, and Cooperation, particularly within the framework of the future Interreg 2028-2034 program.

2. Decisions of the Interreg Monitoring Committee

<p>The Interreg Monitoring Committee (IMC) takes note of the final implementation report of the Interreg VI Indian Ocean program.</p>



Interreg V Monitoring Committee

Written procedure – from October 24th to November 14th 2025



INTERREG V MONITORING COMMITTEE

**ANNEX 1a: Observations from the European Commission
(DG REGIO)**



COMMISSION EUROPÉENNE

DIRECTION GÉNÉRALE

POLITIQUE RÉGIONALE ET URBAINE

Coopération territoriale européenne, Macro-régions, Interreg et Mise en œuvre des programmes I
Macro-régions, Coopération Transnationale/interrégionale/Externe, Élargissement

Bruxelles 04/11/2025

REGIO.D.1/PEL

FILE NOTE

Subject: 2014TC16RFTN009. Draft final implementation report (RFMO) of the INTERREG V Indian Ocean program 2014-2020 (from 24/10 to 14/11/2025). Consultation of the Monitoring Committee by written procedure. Observations from DG REGIO.

The draft final implementation report (RFMO) of the INTERREG V Indian Ocean program (2014-2020) is a comprehensive document, illustrated with numerous concrete examples, and overall aligns with regulatory expectations. It prompts the following observations from DG REGIO, as listed below.

1. COMMON AND PROGRAM-SPECIFIC INDICATORS (SUB-SECTION 3.2)

1.1. Result Indicators for Priority Axes 1 (IR01a and IR02a) and 2 (IR01b):
To explain the zero value for the year 2023 for the indicators in question, the "observations" column of the reporting tables states that "the target counts the number of projects contracted per year, while it should have counted the cumulative total." This explanation is not convincing, as result indicators are not counted in cumulative values (unlike output indicators). The target set at the beginning of the program for 11 collaborative research projects per year was coherent since it was above the reference value set in 2014 for 9 collaborative research projects per year (the Managing Authority was thus expecting an increase of 2 contracted projects per year). We also note that it was possible to continue project implementation until February 2026, but we understand that this option was only made available by the STEP regulation in 2025, meaning the legal framework was not known in 2023. Finally, the text in sub-section 3.1 should be made consistent, as it mentions 29 "operations" for axis 1 and 15 "projects" for axis 2, while sub-section 3.2 (column "observations" of the result indicators table) mentions 27 "projects" (22 under OS 1a and 5 under OS 1b) and 11 "projects" (7 under OS 1a and 4 under OS 1b) for the same axes. It would be helpful to provide a table listing the projects planned and supported under axes 1 and 2, indicating their title, axis and specific objective, total cost, the FEDER amount, as well as the start and end date of each project.

1.2. Priority Axes 3 and 4: number of actions/projects:

It is indicated in sub-section 3.1 that priority axis 3 involved the programming of 43 "projects." However, the performance framework indicator for this axis reports 167 "actions." Please explain this discrepancy and ensure consistency between the text in section 3.1 and the tables in sub-section 3.2. The same observation applies to priority axis 4 (39 "projects" mentioned in section 3.1 and 205 "actions" reported in the performance framework).

1.3. Priority Axes 5 and 6:

It would be helpful to provide the list of the 7 programmed projects mentioned for each of these axes in sub-section 3.1.

1.4. Performance Framework Indicator CO43 (priority axis 9):

The value achieved for this indicator in 2023 represents 55% of the target value, which is below the 65% threshold. According to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 215/2014 (Article 6, paragraphs 3 and 4), this situation indicates a "significant inability to meet the target values set in the performance framework," which could lead to financial corrections. This issue will be included in the letter of observation to be sent to the managing authority once the final report is officially submitted. Moreover, the targets for several indicators in the performance framework have been exceeded, some by a large margin (IS03a: 145%; IS03b: 273%; IS05a: 322%; IS05b: 225%; IS06a: 120%; IS06b: 150%). It would be necessary to explore and clarify the reasons for these exceedances (e.g., underestimation of targets during program design).

1.5. Financial Information at the Priority Axis and Program Level:

Please indicate whether the program has made use of any contributions from third countries participating in the cooperation program. If not, please state "Not applicable."

1.6. Cumulative cost of all or part of an operation implemented outside the program area that belongs to the Union (Table 6):

Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013 (Interreg) provided flexibility to spend up to 30% of the FEDER envelope on operations taking place outside the program area that belong to the Union under the cooperation program (Article 20). It would be useful to provide reasons why this flexibility was not used during the 2014-2020 programming period.

2. SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS (SECTION 4):

This section should summarize the results of the evaluations (which are actually in section 10), not the work done. Please amend the text accordingly.

3. PROGRESS IN THE PREPARATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF MAJOR PROJECTS AND JOINT ACTION PLANS (SECTION 8):

Please indicate "Not applicable" for sub-sections 8.1 (Major Projects) and 8.2 (Joint Action Plans).

4. PROGRESS MADE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EVALUATION PLAN AND MONITORING OF EVALUATION RESULTS (SUB-SECTION 10.1):

This sub-section lists the evaluations carried out, their conclusions (which should be transferred to section 4), and their recommendations. Effort should be made to describe the progress made in implementing the evaluation plan and the follow-up

given to the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations, as requested in this sub-section.

5. **RESULTS OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION MEASURES RELATED TO THE FUNDS, IMPLEMENTED UNDER THE COMMUNICATION STRATEGY (SUB-SECTION 10.2):**
This sub-section lists communication activities but does not address the results of these actions, which is the purpose of this sub-section. Effort should be made to describe the results of the many communication actions carried out based on the communication plan.
6. **PROGRESS MADE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT APPROACH (SUB-SECTION 11.1):**
Please indicate "Not applicable."
7. **SMART, SUSTAINABLE, AND INCLUSIVE GROWTH (SECTION 13):**
The numbering of the various sub-sections should be reviewed.

These preliminary observations do not preclude further observations that may be issued by the Commission services during the review of the final report, which will be sent to the Commission after approval by the Monitoring Committee.

Pierre-Emmanuel LECLERC

Copie: M. Gilland, O. Dordain, R. Roszalgoyi (DG REGIO.D1)



Interreg V Monitoring Committee

Written procedure – from October 24th to November 14th 2025



ANNEX 1b: Response from the Managing Authority to the observations made by DG REGIO (European Commission)

N°	Observations from DG REGIO (EC)	Responses from the Managing Authority
1.1	To explain the zero value for the year 2023 for the indicators in question, it is stated in the "observations" column of the reporting tables that "the target counts the number of projects contracted per year, whereas it should have counted the cumulative total."	<p>The MA takes note of the EC's observation. However, the "observations" column of the reporting tables also specifies to justify the zero value that "The program's closing schedule and the project implementation time (3 years) do not allow for the contracting of new research projects, so the indicator value for the year 2023 can only be equal to 0."</p> <p>Nevertheless, in the final submission, the MA will remove the sentence regarding the cumulative total mentioned by the EC for better clarity.</p>
1.1	Ensure consistency in the text of sub-section 3.1, which mentions 29 "operations" for axis 1 and 15 "projects" for axis 2, while sub-section 3.2 (column "observations" of the result indicators table) mentions, for the same axes, 27 "projects" (22 under OS 1a and 5 under OS 1b) and 11 "projects" (7 under OS 1a and 4 under OS 1b).	<p>In sub-section 3.1, the Managing Authority reports the number of operations programmed for axes 1 (29) and 2 (15). In sub-section 3.2, the Managing Authority specifies the number of operations contributing to the indicators, while clarifying that not all operations contribute. Thus, for:</p> <p>IR01a - Number of collaborative research projects on shared themes within the COI/TF countries: It is stated that "22 collaborative projects on shared themes were carried out and supported by INTERREG. The project for the extension of the plant protection center (Pôle 3P), which involves supporting infrastructure, does not contribute to this indicator."</p> <p>IR01b - Number of collaborative research projects on shared themes within the COI/TN countries: It is stated that "7 collaborative projects on shared themes were carried out and supported by INTERREG. Other scheduled files under this specific objective concern regional research allocations and do not contribute to this indicator."</p>
1.1	It would be helpful to provide a table listing the projects programmed and supported under axes 1 and 2, indicating their title, the axis and specific objective, the total cost, the FEDER amount, as well as the start and end date of each project.	The presentation of the axes is standardized at the RFMO level and follows the template.
1.2	<p>It is stated in sub-section 3.1 that priority axis 3 allowed the programming of 43 "projects." However, the performance framework indicator for this axis reports 167 "actions." Please explain this difference and ensure that the text in section 3.1 is consistent with the tables in sub-section 3.2.</p> <p>The same observation applies to priority axis 4 (39 "projects" mentioned in section 3.1 and 205 "actions" reported in the performance framework).</p>	Sub-section 3.1 reports the number of operations programmed for axes 3 (43) and 4 (39). The performance indicators in sub-section 3.2, IS3a and IS3b, refer to actions: "Number of actions facilitating the networking and exchanges of economic operators in the cooperation area (congresses, seminars, prospecting missions, etc.)." As mentioned in the indicator guide: "An action is a subpart or phase of an operation." Therefore, the projects supported under axes 3 and 4 can, by nature, include multiple actions.
1.3	It would be helpful to provide the list of the 7 programmed projects mentioned for each of these axes in sub-section 3.1.	<p>The Managing Authority takes note of the EC's observation and reminds that the presentation follows the template. Sub-section 3.1 already mentions, with the exception of the TIS project from IRD, the projects supported under axes 5 and 6: PIROI intervention programs, the RENOVIRISK project, and the PIROI Center.</p> <p>The Managing Authority will add the TIS project under axis 6 in sub-section 3.1 in the final report.</p>
1.4	CO 43 Number of participants in cross-border mobility initiatives (axis 9): The value achieved in 2023 for this indicator represents 55% of the target value, which is a percentage lower than 65%. In accordance with Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 215/2014 (Article 6, paragraphs 3 and 4), this is a case indicating a "significant inability to achieve the target values set in the performance framework," which could lead to financial corrections. This issue will be included in the letter of observation that will be sent to the managing authority once the final report is officially submitted.	<p>The Managing Authority takes note of the EC's observation. However, starting in 2021, the difficulties related to the health impact and the complete closure of borders were communicated to the EC. Indeed, during the 2021 RAMO, a modification of the program was introduced concerning the reallocation of credits, notably from axis 9, due to the absence of air links and, therefore, the material impossibility of mobility. These mobility difficulties were reiterated in the 2023 RAMO (under the "preparatory work for closure" section).</p> <p>Specifically regarding this indicator, the 2024 RAMO stated that "The COVID crisis affected mobility and significantly impacted the implementation of operations." Indeed, as this indicator measures mobility, it could only be impacted by travel restrictions. It is worth noting that travel restrictions by air were only lifted in the second half of 2022, unlike the situation in continental Europe.</p>

1.4	Furthermore, the targets for many indicators in the performance framework have been exceeded, and in some cases, exceeded by a large margin (IS03a: 145%; IS03b: 273%; IS05a: 322%; IS05b: 225%; IS06a: 120%; IS06b: 150%). It would be necessary to explore and clarify the reasons for this series of exceedances (for example: underestimation of the target during the program's design).	<p>The reasons for the exceedances of the performance indicators are already stated in the draft RFMO:</p> <p>IS03a: The target set for the indicator has been greatly exceeded. This is explained by the emergence of new stakeholders such as the Grand Port and Scène Australe. These actors have, moreover, significantly contributed to the establishment of cooperation actions between economic operators.</p> <p>IS03b: The target set for the indicator has been greatly exceeded. This is explained by the emergence of new stakeholders such as the Grand Port, Scène Australe, and the CRESS of Mayotte. These actors have, moreover, significantly contributed to the establishment of cooperation actions between economic operators.</p> <p>IS05a: The target set for the indicator has been greatly exceeded. On the transnational side, the supported action programs allowed for at least two training sessions per project per year.</p> <p>IS05b: The target set for the indicator has been greatly exceeded. The supported action programs allowed for multiple training sessions throughout the year. For example, 30 sessions were organized as part of the PIROI prevention program for the year 2021-2022. These training sessions were held for each of the PIROI programs in the 5 islands of the COI.</p> <p>IS06a: The value corresponds to the number of projects supported under the axis. Two projects were programmed in 2022, thus exceeding the target value.</p> <p>IS06b: The value corresponds to the number of projects supported under the axis. Five new projects were programmed in 2022, thus exceeding the target value.</p> <p>However, in the final report, the Managing Authority will specify that, at the time of the program's design and the development of indicators, the new stakeholders were not known, and as a result, some targets may have been underestimated. The Managing Authority will also clarify that programming beyond 2022 had not been anticipated.</p>
1.5	Please indicate whether the program has made use of any contributions from third countries participating in the cooperation program. If not, please state "Not applicable."	The Managing Authority thanks the European Commission for its observation and will specify "Not applicable" for this point in the final report.
1.6	Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013 (Interreg) provided flexibility allowing up to 30% of the FEDER envelope to be spent on operations taking place outside the program area that belong to the Union under the cooperation program (Article 20). It might be useful to provide the reasons why this flexibility was not used during the 2014-2020 programming period.	<p>The Managing Authority thanks the European Commission for this clarification but reminds that this flexibility, as stated in point c of Article 20, is conditional upon agreements: "The obligations of the managing and audit authorities regarding the management, control, and audit of the operation must be fulfilled by the authorities responsible for the cooperation program, or they must conclude agreements with the authorities of the Member State or third country or territory where the operation is being implemented."</p> <p>In this particular case, the program only involves third countries outside the EU, for which the aforementioned obligations are, in practice, impossible to implement (Managing Authority, National Audit Authority, or even an international agreement between states), given the administrative cost and the complexities of such an implementation.</p>
2	This section should provide a summary of the evaluation results (which are actually found in section 10), not the work carried out. Please modify the text accordingly.	The Managing Authority thanks the European Commission for its observation and will modify the text in the final report accordingly.
3	Please indicate "Not applicable" for sub-sections 8.1 (Major Projects) and 8.2 (Joint Action Plans).	The Managing Authority thanks the European Commission for its observation and will specify "Not applicable" for sections 8.1 and 8.2 in the final report.
4	This sub-section lists the evaluations conducted, their conclusions (which should be transferred to section 4), and their recommendations. An effort should be made to describe the progress made in implementing the evaluation plan and the follow-up given to the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations, as requested in this sub-section.	The Managing Authority thanks the European Commission for its observation and will specify in the final report the actions implemented in response to these recommendations for the 2021/2027 program.
5	This sub-section lists the communication activities without addressing the results of these actions, which is the purpose of this sub-section. An effort should be made to describe the results of the many communication actions implemented based on the communication plan.	The Managing Authority takes note of this observation and will specify in the final report, where applicable, the results that can be achieved.
6	ITI: Please indicate "Not applicable."	The Managing Authority thanks the European Commission for its observation and will specify "Not applicable" in the final report.
7	(SECTION 13) The numbering of the various sub-sections should be reviewed.	The Managing Authority thanks the European Commission for its observation and will modify the numbering in the final report.



Interreg V Monitoring Committee

Written procedure – from October 24th to November 14th 2025



ANNEX 2: Observations from the Economic, Social, and Environmental Council of Réunion (CESER)



A Saint-Denis, 18 novembre 2025

AGILE – Cellule Europe Réunion
4, allée des Topazes – Bellepierre
97400 Saint-Denis

N/ Réf. : N° 2025900176/CESER/VF/MPC//BL

Objet : Consultation sur le Rapport Final de Mise en Œuvre (RFMO) 2014–2020 du Programme INTERREG V Océan Indien.

Madame, Monsieur,

Dans le cadre de la consultation nationale relative à la clôture du programme INTERREG V Océan Indien 2014–2020, le CESER de La Réunion a été invité à formuler un avis sur le Rapport Final de Mise en Œuvre (RFMO).

Conformément à sa mission de veille stratégique et d'appui à la décision publique, le CESER souhaite, à travers la présente note de sa commission Territoires, Europe et Coopération (TEC), mettre en exergue plusieurs points d'analyse et propositions d'amélioration pour renforcer la valorisation et la lisibilité de ce programme de coopération régionale.

La commission Territoires, Europe et Coopération (TEC) du CESER rappelle que le programme INTERREG V s'inscrit dans la continuité de la stratégie indopacifique de l'Union européenne (2021), et des orientations de son rapport "La Réunion, Terre d'Europe 2050" (CESER, 2023). Dans ce rapport, le CESER affirme que "l'Europe doit s'incarner dans ses territoires, non par la distance mais par l'action", et que "La Réunion n'est pas une périphérie mais une tête de pont de l'Union européenne dans l'océan Indien".

INTERREG matérialise cette ambition en faisant de La Réunion un point d'ancrage d'une Europe de solutions, ouverte sur ses voisins et porteuse d'un modèle de développement fondé sur la durabilité, la solidarité et la résilience territoriale

1. Une exécution réussie malgré le contexte de crise sanitaire :

La commission salue la pleine mobilisation des crédits européens, avec 267 opérations programmées représentant 83,6 M€ éligibles pour 69,2 M€ FEDER, soit un taux de programmation de 109 % et une certification finale de 87 %. Ces performances confirment la solidité du pilotage exercé par l'autorité de gestion malgré les effets déstabilisants de la crise du Covid 19 et les restrictions des vols à l'international ayant impacté plusieurs axes, notamment ceux relatifs à la formation et à la mobilité régionale.



2. Renforcement du pilotage stratégique et de la coordination régionale :

La commission souligne la pertinence des ajustements successifs du plan de financement (en 2019 et 2022) qui ont permis de maintenir la dynamique de programmation et d'assurer la conformité avec le règlement (UE) 2022/562 C.A.R.E. (tel que mentionné en page 2 de la synthèse, vue d'ensemble de la programmation).

Pour les prochaines programmations, il préconise de formaliser une coordination des institutions locales de la coopération régionale pour plus d'efficacité, incluant l'ensemble des acteurs publics et des filières socio-économiques concernées, afin de mutualiser les expertises, les indicateurs de suivis et les retours d'expériences.

Dans la continuité du rapport "La Réunion, Terre d'Europe 2050", qui appelait à "coordonner l'action des institutions, des filières et des territoires pour donner une cohérence européenne à l'Indopacifique", le CESER recommande la création d'un Comité stratégique de la coopération régionale et indopacifique.

Cette instance, associant la Région, l'État, les chambres consulaires, les universités, les acteurs économiques et de la société civile organisée, aurait pour mission de mutualiser les expertises, harmoniser les financements INTERREG et NDICI, et positionner La Réunion comme chef de file d'une coopération européenne durable dans la zone.

3. Capitalisation et diffusion des résultats :

La commission invite à renforcer la dimension d'évaluation qualitative notamment par la mise en valeur de projets locaux (exemple : IOS-NET sur l'énergie solaire, PAREO sur la préservation des récifs, VSI sur la mobilité des jeunes) et par la diffusion de fiches sur les retombées locales, pays partenaires, axe de coopération et résultats, dans une logique de pédagogie auprès des citoyens.

4. Consolidation du dispositif d'évaluation et du retour d'expérience :

La commission salue la réalisation d'un plan d'évaluation INTERREG (cabinet Ernst & Young, 2020), il souligne la nécessité d'un meilleur RETEX afin d'identifier les marges d'amélioration possibles par la mesure de résultats de pilotage, une meilleure coordination des autorités locales, et l'articulation avec les politiques nationales étrangères.

La commission identifie l'importance d'articuler le programme INTERREG avec les autres instruments de l'action extérieure de l'Union européenne, tels que le NDICI-Global Europe et l'initiative Global Gateway. Cette approche rejoint la proposition du rapport "La Réunion, Terre d'Europe 2050", selon laquelle "l'efficacité européenne dans l'océan Indien passera par la convergence des programmes, la lisibilité des priorités et la continuité des actions".

La commission recommande également d'intégrer au pilotage un dispositif de veille géopolitique et de résilience régionale, afin d'anticiper les effets des crises politiques, climatiques ou sécuritaires sur la continuité des projets, notamment à Madagascar et aux Comores.

Une telle approche "intelligence et résilience" renforcerait la capacité d'anticipation, de gestion optimisée des fonds et de rayonnement de La Réunion, en cohérence avec la vision d'une "Europe utile et visible dans l'Océan Indien" défendue dans notre rapport.



5. Pérennisation des actions de communication, de visibilité des acteurs et des réussites locales :

La stratégie de communication et de valorisation du programme Interreg participe à mieux faire connaître la coopération régionale. Pour les programmes suivants le CESER invite à favoriser dans le cadre d'INTERREG une communication conjointe des programmes FEDER, FSE+ et NDICI, participant à une meilleure appropriation locale des programmes européens.

6. Développer la diplomatie des projets :

La commission invite à prolonger les efforts d'influence en développant une "diplomatie des projets", notion issue du rapport "La Réunion, Terre d'Europe 2050", où il est proposé de "donner à voir une Europe par ses œuvres et non par ses discours".

À ce titre, un rapport annuel sur la contribution de La Réunion à la stratégie européenne dans l'Indopacifique pourrait être publié, recensant les projets INTERREG et leur impact en matière de coopération, d'innovation et de transition verte.

En intégrant les enseignements du rapport « La Réunion, Terre d'Europe 2050 », le programme INTERREG 2021–2027 doit devenir le bras territorial d'une Europe agissante, inclusive et souveraine dans la zone indopacifique.

La Réunion assumera ainsi son rôle de plateforme de coopération et de projection européenne, démontrant que les Régions ultrapériphériques sont des leviers d'action extérieure de l'Union, au service d'une diplomatie des solutions.

En conclusion, la commission Territoires, Europe et Coopération du CESER salue les résultats atteints sur INTERREG V et réaffirme sa disponibilité pour participer aux travaux de capitalisation, d'évaluation et de co-construction des futurs programmes de coopération régionale, dans une perspective d'ouverture et de consolidation de la place stratégique de La Réunion comme point focal EU au cœur de la zone Océan Indien.

Je vous prie d'agréer, Madame, Monsieur, l'expression de ma haute considération.

Le Président du CESER



Dominique VIENNE

