

Twinning Simplification & Digitalisation

Presentation to Member States

April 2026

Welcome remarks

Anna VEZYROGLOU – Head of Unit, Institution Building, TAIEX and Twinning



TWINNING

MOVING FORWARD TOGETHER
WITH EU EXPERTISE

AGENDA

- (1) Welcome remarks**
- (2) Introduction & recap**
- (3) Feedback from MSs**
- (4) Next steps**
- (5) Q&A**



Introduction & recap

Francesca SPADOLA – Team Leader, Institution Building, TAIEX and Twinning



Twinning Simplification



Digitalisation



Simplification

A process steered by the Commission in strong coordination with Member States



Warsaw 2023
Intro to e-Grant
PBF - Results focus

IBDs
Brussels 2023
PBF - move to LS

Zagreb 2024
E-Grant and LS
= simplify

IBDs
Brussels 2025
Call for volunteers for
Shadow Testing

Berlin 2025
Shadow Testing
results

IBDs
Brussels 2026
Feedbacks



Feedback from MSs

Twinning Coordination Team



Feedback from MSs

Thank You for Your Engagement

Strong participation and valuable insights across Member States

**Inclusive Approach
Welcomed**



Strong appreciation
for involvement throughout
the process.

Diverse Perspectives



Wide range of feedback
received.

**Support for
Digitalisation &
Simplification**



Recognition of the need to
modernise and reduce
complexity.



Digitalisation

Topic

Member States

Twinning team

eGrants system

- Complexity of the platform



- **Positive reports from MS** on the use of the platform
- **Adequate training offer** to be made available

Role of MS NCP

- The workload of the NCP might increase



- **The role of the NCP will essentially not change**

PIC Number

- Obtaining a PIC number can be a lengthy process



- **No major challenge** foreseen
- **One time process**

Participants

- Do all institutions involved in a Twinning project need to be the system?



- **Situation remains the same as currently**

Call for proposals

- Timing of the call



- **Intermediary step to request publication = opportunity for additional time to prepare**

Lump Sum - 1

Member States' feedback on Lump Sum

Main Benefits

- Based on **trust**
- Significant **simplification** of administrative & financial management
- **No expenditure verification** and financial audit
- Stronger **focus on results and impact**

Main Concerns

- Application requires **detailed activities & estimates**
- Risk of **frequent addenda**
- Need to ensure sufficient **flexibility**

Lump Sum - 2

Topic	Member States		Twinning Team
Application	Frontloading effort at application stage	→	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Level of detail remains comparable to current system
Work Plan & Rolling Work Plans	WP defined without Partner Country involvement	→	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Work Plan based on key activities and no budget per activity• Rolling Work Plans developed with the PC
Budget	Detailed costing , unit costs, and justification requirements	→	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Budget based on realistic estimates (not precise costing);• Use of SCO methodology as current system.• Aggregation at Work package and not activity level• Guidance to be provided

Lump Sum - 3

Topic	Member States		Twinning Team
Addendum	Risk of frequent amendments	→	Addendum can be done ex-post and recommended before final payment
Flexibility	Requests for thresholds	→	Flexibility ensured through implementation
Consortium Agreement	Proposal for lighter pre-agreements	→	CA required but not submitted to EU



Lump Sum - 4

Member States Suggestions

- Quality of **Twinning Fiche**
- Organise **information & training sessions**
- Provide **guidance on flexibility & amendments**
- MS initiative - **Fact-Finding Missions**



Reporting & Logical framework

MS feedback

- Less administrative burden → **more focus on implementation and results**

MS concern

- Reduced reporting = **limited monitoring**
- Logical framework (at application stage) **without possibility to amend**

Twinning Team

- **Rolling work plan** and **Steering Committee Meetings** provide continuous structured project oversight + opportunities to introduce changes including in logical framework



Prefinancing

Feedback required: 40% initial, 50% further prefinancing
vs. 60% initial, 30% further prefinancing

MS feedback

- Preferred option: **60% initial, 30% further prefinancing**
- Allocated budget is typically **used in full**

MS concern

- **Even higher initial rate** would provide more balanced approach

Twinning Team

- **90% initial prefinancing**
- **Flexibility** to include a lower initial prefinancing + further prefinancing in case of large Twinning



Payment

MS feedback

- General appreciation for **simplification**, as no need for trail of expenditures incurred

MS main concern

- Payment linked to **results**

Twinning Team

- Payment is linked with **completion of work packages** (i.e. activities)



MS feedback/ main concern

- **Reduced levels of control**
- **Additional information** may be needed for auditors anyway

Twinning Team clarification

- Audits will focus on the **proper implementation of the work packages** (not based on financial aspects)



Next steps 2026

- **Launching a pilot**
- **Twinning Manual revision**
- **Trainings for eGrant platform & lump sum grant management**
- **Guidance material**
- **Helpdesk**



Thank you



© European Union 2025

Unless otherwise noted the reuse of this presentation is authorised under the [CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license. For any use or reproduction of elements that are not owned by the EU, permission may need to be sought directly from the respective right holders.

