

Data “Beastie” or “Bestie” in Post 2027

Interreg Knowledge Fair session report | November 2025

This session introduced issues related to data collection and reporting proposed in the draft Post 2027 regulations. Compared with current requirements, the new framework increases the amount of information collected at project and beneficiary level and adds automated data exchange with the Commission and mandatory publication of harmonised datasets. Consequently, programmes will have to prepare for dealing with this task.

This session asked the question, how can Interact support Interreg programmes with this? What does Interact need to do, what do programmes need to do, to prepare for the new requirements?

Overview

- The session focused on the potential challenges that programmes might face during the next programming period in collecting and reporting data to the Commission, and in taking advantage of those data.
- During the first part of the session, Interact presented the requirements set out in the draft regulations regarding data collection and governance.
- During the second part of the session the representatives for each tool created by Interact to support data governance in Interreg presented each tool (HIT, Jems, keep.eu, INDEX) as solutions for data compliance and efficiency.
- Group discussions explored risks, opportunities and support needs from the perspective of programme design, project monitoring, programme management and control.

Methodology

- Presentation on data governance requirements.
- Group work discussion:
 - Participants discussed Post 2027 data requirements as they are now set in the current draft regulation considering risks, opportunities and support needed. At the end of the exercise, each table was asked to share with the rest of the participants the main discussion points.

Key Discussion Points

1. Risks / pain points

- **Reporting burden and contradictions:** wider data requirements especially on beneficiaries and project characteristics risks overloading both programmes and beneficiaries. Participants pointed out contradiction between data transparency requirements (e.g., on contractors) with the programme use of SCO a.
- **Data security and quality:** multiple data transmissions to different systems (national systems, programme MIS/Jems, SFC, Arachne/IMS, Interact tools) raise security concerns, duplication and errors. Uncertainty remains about who is responsible for, e.g., checking data entered by beneficiaries, validating semantic quality (understanding “what the data means”), and ensuring that automated data flows still produce meaningful and coherent records.
Data cleaning was flagged as a major risk.
- **Tool overlap and admin workload:** potential system overlaps can create inefficiencies and an increase in manual work. Participants noted open questions about who will manage, quality-check, and update the Single Gateway dataset, and how national and programme-level responsibilities will be divided.
- **Timing and readiness:** There is a strong risk that APIs, data dictionaries and interoperability specifications will arrive too late to be built into programme systems. Late changes would be expensive and might negatively affect planning. If requirements are not clarified early, programme design (including HIT and Jems configuration) risks being rushed or based on assumptions that later must be rebuilt.
- **Legal and audit risks:** participants worried about the new auditors focus under the new data and transparency framework, and about how automated datasets must match underlying documentation, especially when SCOs are used. Participants pointed out risks related to monitor finances based on performance-based approach (PBA) or use of Financing Not Linked to Costs (FNLC). Participants requested clarity on triggers for FLC under these modalities.

2. Opportunities / ideas for improvement

- **Harmonisation and interoperability:** alignment of data fields and a move from multiple toward a single-entry data point.
- **Automation and smarter tools:** to reduce manual work while ensuring accuracy.
- **Better design and planning:** define requirements early for better Post 2027 preparation.
- **Clear indicators and data flows:** standardise indicators and separate financial vs. implementation data.
- **Enhanced Jems role:** more modules, automated sharing from Jems to the Single data Gateway via API, and the introduction of a mandatory applicant IDs (PIC).
- **EC supported interoperability:** participants encouraged the Commission to facilitate interoperability by providing common standards, code lists, and early technical templates.

- Possibility to revise data: allowing correction or revision of data submitted in previous periods, especially for aggregated reporting was seen as important.

3. Support / clarification needed

- **Clear guidance:** define required data fields and collection methods.
- **Technical specifications: APIs, code lists, data dictionaries:** participants stressed the need for ready-to-use technical resources, delivered early, to avoid rework and system retrofitting.
- **E-monitoring system development and guidance for users:** clarity on whether Jems will be recommended or “default”, and how non-Jems systems should achieve the same interoperability and data exchange. All programmes would benefit from practical templates, mapping guidelines, and examples of exporting the harmonised dataset.
- **Technical support:** ready-to-use APIs and automation solutions. Early input from Interact and the Commission is needed to ensure programmes can design HIT, Jems configurations and national procedures correctly from the start.
- **Audit scope and early communication:** clarify auditors’ role and inform on how to set up data collection/reporting early on to avoid expensive changes later.

Regulations and Articles of Particular Significance

- **E-cohesion system:** electronic data exchange with beneficiaries Art. 58(2)(k) NRPP
- **Monitoring system:** data collection and recording Art. 51(1)(h), 58, 63 & Annex IV NRPP Art.
- Technical rules for data exchange 14(1) Performance Reg.
- **SFC 2028** electronic data exchange with EC, incl., obligations and required SFC dataset Art. 58(2)(l) & Annex XVI NRPP; interoperability and transmission rules Art. 14(1) Performance Reg.
- **Arachne:** reporting to other systems e.g. Art. 58(2)(g) NRPP Irregularity Management System (IMS)
- **Transparency obligations at national and EU level**, incl., Member State public websites (open, machine-readable) Art. 64, and EU-level publication through the Single Gateway Art. 12 Performance Regulation.

Conclusions and Follow-Up Plans

- Programmes must prepare for deeper data integration and transparency.
- Interact tools (HIT and Jems) are seen as essential for data governance compliance and efficiency.
- Future development priorities:
 - Interoperability and automation.
 - User-friendly design.

- No overlaps
- Follow-up actions:
 - Tool improvements.
 - Coordinate with the Commission early to ensure requirements are understood and integrated to programme/Interact tools from the programming phase.
 - Introduction of a Partner ID requirement.

Session leader: Rafael Agostinho, Kevin Fulcher

Delivery team: Jose Almeida, Rafael Agostinho, Elisa Bertieri, Ilze Ciganska, Kevin Fulcher, Janne Kiilunen, Alexandra Kulmer, Eva Martinez.

Report drafted by: Elisa Bertieri